

THE LEADERSHIP ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF DIVISION
CHAIRPERSONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHING
FACULTY, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, AND
CHAIRPERSONS IN A SELECTED
OKLAHOMA INSTITUTION OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

By

JAY B. MUNSELL

Associate of Arts
Labette Community Junior College
Parsons, Kansas
1960

Bachelor of Science
Kansas State College
Pittsburg, Kansas
1962

Master of Science
Kansas State College
Pittsburg, Kansas
1964

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1977

Ther's
1977D
M9692
cop. 2



THE LEADERSHIP ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF DIVISION
CHAIRPERSONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHING
FACULTY, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, AND
CHAIRPERSONS IN A SELECTED
OKLAHOMA INSTITUTION OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Blair
Thesis Adviser
Carl R. Anderson
William D. ...
...
Norman W. ...
Dean of the Graduate College

997309

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses sincere appreciation to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, chairman of the doctoral committee, for his guidance, encouragement, and generous investment of time. Appreciation is also expressed to the dissertation committee members, Dr. Carl R. Anderson, Dr. Frederick Gene Acuff, and Dr. William J. Davis, for their assistance, criticism, encouragement, and cooperation.

Gratitude is expressed to Northeastern Oklahoma State University for the sabbatical leave-of-absence, and to Oklahoma State University for financial assistance which made the completion of the doctoral program and this study possible. Recognition is also extended to Northeastern Oklahoma State University for services and facilities made available during the completion of this study. The writer also is indebted to those who participated in the research. The writer is especially grateful to the many student friends, associates at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, and Oklahoma State University faculty members whose help made this study possible.

The writer gives special thanks to members of his family, Burl and Elma Munsell, Donald and Carolyn Munsell, George and Zerita Packard, and Terry and Susan Connor, for their encouragement and support.

Finally, special appreciation and eternal indebtedness are extended to the writer's wife, Barbara, his son, Jason, and his daughter, Amy, who sacrificed the most in order that the doctoral program and this dissertation could be completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	5
Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses	6
Definition of Terms	10
Limitations of the Study	11
Organization of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
Definitions of Leadership	15
Introduction to Leadership Theories	18
✓ Trait Theories of Leadership	19
✓ Situational Theories of Leadership	22
✓ Humanistic Theories of Leadership	23
✓ Exchange Theories of Leadership	25
✓ Expectation Theories of Leadership	26
Historical Developments and Role Analysis of Higher Education Chairpersons	29
Evaluation Models of the College and University Division or Department Chairperson	42
A Rationale	50
Summary	53
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	62
Introduction	62
The Population	62
Instrumentation	66
Data Collection	68
The Statistical Treatment	71
Summary	72
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	74
Introduction	74
Testing the Hypotheses	74
Normative Data	77
Summary	85

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	88
Introduction	88
Summary	88
Conclusions of the Study	89
Implications	93
Recommendations	95
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	97
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER FOR THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	105
APPENDIX B - FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	107
APPENDIX C - THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Comparisons of Frequency and Percentage by the Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairpersons on Certain Demographic Variables	64
II. Questionnaire Responses	70
III. Bartlett's Tests of Homogeneity of Variance	76
IV. Sums of Raw Scores, Means, and Sums of Squares for Each Group and Total-- <u>ILBDQ</u>	78
V. Analysis of Variance of <u>ILBDQ</u> Scores Regarding the Division Chairperson as Perceived by the Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairpersons	79
VI. Comparisons of Responses by the Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairpersons on Certain Division Organizational Issues	81
VII. Frequency of Responses to the Most Important Leadership Role for the Division Chairperson as Viewed by the Teaching Faculty	84
VIII. Frequency of Responses to the Most Important Leadership Role for the Division Chairperson as Viewed by the Central Administration	86
IX. Responses to the Most Important Leadership Role for the Division Chairperson as Viewed by Each Division Chairperson	86

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

2 The role of the division or department chairperson in American higher education has increased significantly since the first college departments were established at Harvard University early in the last century. Effective administration is one key to the success of any institutional enterprise. (The successful organization has one major attribute that sets it apart from unsuccessful organizations: dynamic and effective leadership.¹)

One theoretical school of thought believes that effective operations in organizations necessitate that people appointed to administrative positions succeed in the majority of cases by establishing effective leadership over subordinates, and special mechanisms exist that greatly increase their chances of success in having subordinates accept their legitimate authority.² A different theoretical school of thought states that the organizational structure should be decentralized with responsibility and authority shared throughout the organization. As stated by Gibb, "a climate of participative administration should permeate the institution."³ Nevertheless, Litchfield notes that 6 "there has been far less thought devoted to the administrative process in university organization than in any other large and complex institution in contemporary society."⁴

Thus, the critical role of university administration in institutional success makes some systematic research and evaluation desirable, and probably instrumental, in improving the administration of higher education.

According to Miller, research and evaluation should include all segments of the collegiate enterprise: students, faculty, staff personnel, and administrators. There is much literature available on the experiences of students and faculty, very little on staff personnel, and still less on research and evaluation of higher education administrators.⁵ Consequently, even less on the university division or department chairperson is available.

(1) Yet, (as stated by Heimler, (probably eighty percent of all administrative decisions take place at the department/division level rather than at the higher levels of responsibility and policy formation.⁶)

(Fellman notes that the department is the main unit for the recruitment of new personnel and for decisions on promotion of staff and budgets, including salary recommendations; also, the department is the chief initiator of new courses and programs. The department handles most aspects of student relations and makes decisions on such vital matters as semester schedules, teaching loads, and assignment of courses, sections and facilities.⁷)

(Since the division or department is so important in the American higher education system, it follows that the chairperson is important also. Unfortunately, to this point, very little research has been completed on the chairperson's role in higher education administration.) It would appear that more data on the institutional role of the chairperson is needed. Heimler suggested that research might be directed

toward answering the following questions:

1. What is the annual rate of turnover of department chairpersons in a given college or in a system of colleges?
2. Will the rate of turnover be reduced if department chairpersons are paid a stipend above their regular salary?
3. How do college department chairpersons perceive their role? How is their administrative role perceived by the department faculty and the administration? What conflicts, if any, exist among these perspectives?
4. Is there a relation between the characteristics of a department chairperson and the quality of teaching within his or her department? What are the characteristics of department chairpersons in college departments identified by students in faculty evaluations as having high-quality teaching in contrast to college departments identified by students as having low-quality teaching?
5. Is there a relation between the characteristics of a departmental chairperson and the quality of research within the department? What are the characteristics of departmental chairpersons in college departments maintaining a commendable level of scholarship and research in contrast to college departments in which there is little scholarship and research?
6. How many hours per week do department chairpersons devote to administrative responsibilities?
7. For what reasons have department chairpersons of long tenure remained in their administrative assignments?
8. Can in-service education and training through seminars, lectures, and discussions contribute to the improvement of college departmental administration?
9. Can the administration of a college department be improved through the employment of a departmental executive?
10. How are the professional goals and values of professors affected and influenced by the administration of their departments?
11. To what degree is institutional leadership limited on the part of the departmental chairperson toward the responsibilities of administration?⁸

It is very apparent that many different research questions need to be answered concerning the role of the chairperson in higher education.

(The major research theme of analysis for this study has been the role concept of higher education chairpersons administrative leadership behavior as perceived by the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons.)

Castetter discusses the educational leadership role as:

. . . the educational administrative leader is one who is able to communicate to others the nature of system plans that are to be put into effect and the methods designed to achieve them. When plans are put into effect, the leader must enlist the voluntary cooperation of subordinates; interpret their work roles for them; make modifications in plans where conflicts arise between goals and plans for achieving them; assess the results of plans; adjust plans to fit changing conditions; and throughout this process seek to satisfy the needs of both the organization and subordinates.⁹

Thus, the division or department chairperson's leadership role is not a separate entity but an integral part of a larger entity made up of various functional roles that are related to one another as well as to the social system.

Statement of the Problem

It follows that such questions as how division or department chairpersons should be chosen, what should be the tenure, what should be the background experience, and the chairperson's authority and work should be defined and circumscribed. However, due to the inadequacy of current data, the question arises: What is desirable and what is undesirable for the chairperson's leadership roles?

(Clearly then, further information was needed concerning the parameters (position guidelines) of the role of chairpersons as evaluated and perceived by university personnel.

Purpose of the Study

(The purpose of this study was to determine whether selected groups--the teaching faculty, central administrators, and division chairpersons--hold differing leadership role expectations pertaining to division chairpersons at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma.)

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study was twofold: (1) to contribute to the literature on theory and research in higher education administrative leadership behavior; and (2) to provide information which may be used to guide university personnel at Northeastern Oklahoma State University in divisional self study, organizational development, and evaluation.

A strong case for needed research about academic institutions has been made by McConnell as an important factor in effective higher educational processes.¹⁰ Evaluation, as noted by Mortimer, is concerned primarily with educational effectiveness. Effectiveness is the degree to which the organization succeeds in whatever it is trying to do. "The process provides an opportunity for the organization to assess its own strengths and weakness and thereby to improve its operations and educational programs."¹¹ As stated by Hillway, little attention has been given to the formal research and evaluation of university administrators.¹²

Although a number of studies have approached the leadership role problem from an organizational context, little attention has been given to the orientation of organizational members. Basically, researchers

have tended to focus upon leaders and their behavior, often to the virtual exclusion of organizational members, their behavior, and their orientation related to the leader.¹³ This idea has been put well by

Ahmann:

(. . . The chairman is the man in the middle, and, at the same time, the man on the firing line. Students, faculty, administrative officers--even parents and alumni--interact with him regularly in terms of a variety of problems ranging from the trivial to those which are highly central to the welfare of the department.¹⁴)

Therefore, this study is very pertinent to the desires of Northeastern Oklahoma State University as the university is in the process of being reorganized from a college to a university with new job descriptions and new division chairpersons.

Thus, the significance of this research study has been in adding and synthesizing evidence to answers for desirable leadership roles and organizational issues concerning the university division chairperson and, perhaps, is reaching some defensible conclusions and recommendations.

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

Understanding the complex interrelations among the various dimensions of formal organizations is simplified to a degree by the use of theoretical frameworks. Such frameworks enable one to structure relationships between variables in a consistent and systematic fashion. Thereby, organizational behavior can be examined within the context of some logical scheme which includes a pattern of relationships between organizational events or characteristics. In a general sense, a theory, according to Merton, may be defined as "an integrated body of assumptions which are related in such a way as to explain and predict

relations between two or more variables." As used here, "assumptions are analogous to empirical generalizations or observable regularities in human behavior."¹⁵

A major development in the study of higher education administration in recent years has been the "social system theory model" approach to organizational variables. One of the basic assumptions of this theory has been stated by Champion. He states that:

. . . meaningful explanations of organizational behavior cannot be provided without due consideration to the processes of social interaction within organizations.¹⁶

Another basic assumption of the "social system theory model" which was particularly applicable to this research study of university division chairperson's leadership was the concept of "social role." Associated with every position in an organization, as defined by Stogdill, "there is a set of socially defined expectations concerning what is appropriate behavior for a person occupying that position." However expressed, there remain two major aspects of the concept of social role: role expectations and role description behavior. The role expectations represent the "ought to do" part of the role concept as viewed by others; and role description behavior is expressed by the "does" or "real" behavior, as perceived by them. Since these expectations are not always defined or agreed upon by the interacting individuals or groups, and as role description behavior does not always fit the pattern established by the expectations of others, a problem in organizational behavior results.¹⁷ Thus, the division or department chairperson may exhibit constant uncertainty and anxiety regarding what one "ought to do." In other words, the leader experiences "role conflict."

Several subcategories of "role conflict" have been proposed. Seeman observed that role conflict may have its origins in (1) differences between institutional requirements and reference group expectations, (2) differences between factions within a given reference group, and (3) differences between reference groups.¹⁸

Getzels and Guba theorize that as role conflict becomes more intensified, persons become increasingly ineffective in role performance. They acknowledge that the intensity of perceived role conflict may vary according to certain personal and value characteristics of the organization.¹⁹

In approaching an empirical analysis of this theoretical base, one must confront the functional utility of depth versus breadth. Would it be more propitious to sample many institutions within several institutional types? Or, would it be more appropriate to deal with a single institution in considerable detail? This question, of course, is pervasive to research efforts in many fields; the resolution of this question depends upon one's view of the differentiation existing among institutions. The resolution of this issue has prompted the emergence of a new organizational theory, "Organizational Development," as reported mainly by Schmuck and Runkel. Organizational development (OD) can be defined as a planned and sustained effort to apply behavioral science for system improvement, using reflexive, self-analytic methods. OD involves system members themselves in the active assessment, diagnosis, and transformation of their own organization.²⁰ Furthermore, this theoretical posture holds that there is such wide difference between institutions of a similar type that it is hardly worthwhile to generalize beyond a single institution. Perhaps in these times when

the concepts of "accountability" and "demonstrable effectiveness" have risen to very real considerations in higher education, the arguments of Schmuck and Runkel became all the more persuasive.

Another formulation of organizational development was compiled by Sikes, Schlesinger, and Seashore, to resolve the question of single institution research, as one of "action research" carried out by personnel for "renewing higher education from within the institution." This model assumes that there is a felt need for change, that systematic collection of data can provide for an accurate diagnosis of the specific causes of dissatisfaction and for the setting of goals for improvement, and that effective "action research" can be devised to move toward these goals.²¹ Generally, this theory postulates that innovation and change are generated better by interplay of research and action from within the higher education institution.

Finally, according to Cartwright and Zander, theoretically the leadership position should be directed toward the two fundamental objectives of all groups: (1) the achievement of some specific group goal and (2) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself.²² To fulfill these two group objectives, two forms of leadership behavior are required. Hemphill, Coons, Winer, and Halpin, in their research on leadership behavior, have placed these two objectives into two taxonomies of leadership behavior. The behavior concerned with achievement of specific goals is called "Initiating Structure Behavior." The behavior concerned with maintenance or strengthening the group is termed "Consideration Behavior."²³

(Therefore, based on the preceding theoretical framework, the present research was structured to specifically determine the role

expectations of selected behaviors concerning the university division chairperson's leadership role and organizational issues as perceived by groups of higher education personnel at Northeastern Oklahoma State University.)

In a theory, assumptions provide a foundation for the development of an explanatory framework which will lead to the deduction of more tentative statements which can be tested in actual organizational situations. These statements are labeled hypotheses. Hypotheses, as defined by Champion, are "statements which can be subjected to empirical test in order that the validity of any given theory from which they were deduced can be ascertained."²⁴

More specifically, the "null hypotheses" developed for this study were as follows:

(Ho₁: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectations of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "initiating structure behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.)

Ho₂: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectations of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "consideration behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.)

In addition, this study summarized demographic data of the population. Also, normative data in the form of eight introductory questions concerning organizational issues of the division chairperson were gathered.

Definition of Terms (8)

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:

1. Teaching Faculty--refers to the personnel at Northeastern Oklahoma State University whose primary role involves the teaching of students.
2. Division--refers to a structure within the university offering instruction in a branch of learning or knowledge. The seven units at Northeastern Oklahoma State University are: Arts and Letters; Natural Science and Math.; Social Science; Business; Practical Arts; Health, Physical Education, and Safety; and Education and Psychology. Each unit consists of instructional personnel whose organizational activities are directed by a division chairperson.
3. Division Chairperson--refers to the person designated by the university as the official administrative head of a division.
4. Central Administration--refers to any person that is not a full-time teaching faculty member or a division chairperson and who has been designated by the university to hold an administrative position.
5. ILBDQ (Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire)--an instrument published by the Ohio State University to measure leadership role expectations.²⁵
6. Northeastern Oklahoma State University--a state university located at Tahlequah, Oklahoma, offering the Bachelors and Masters degrees to a 1977 student body head count of 5,662.

Limitations of the Study

This investigation was concerned with division chairpersons' leadership role expectations and organizational issues as perceived by

the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons associated with Northeastern Oklahoma State University. Further, it was assumed that the measuring instrument and methodology would be adequate to the purpose of this research. The conclusions, therefore, should be limited to the population sampled and not be construed as necessarily applicable to other higher education institutions.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I of this investigation introduced the problem including the statement of the problem, significance of the study, definition of terms, and limitations of the study. Also, Chapter I contains the theoretical framework and the hypotheses which provided the direction of the study.

Chapter II contained a review of selected literature, which focuses on definitions of leadership, leadership theory, the historical developments, and evaluation models of college and university division or department chairpersons.

Chapter III described the population and provided a detailed presentation of the instrument, method of data collection, and an explanation of the statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter IV presented the findings and results of the investigation including the statistical outcomes based on the information secured from the measurement instrument.

Chapter V summarized the major findings, presented conclusions based on those findings, implications deduced from the findings, and made recommendations for future research.

FOOTNOTES

¹Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organization: Utilizing Human Resources (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969), p. 59.

²Peter M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life (New York, 1964), pp. 199-223.

³Jack R. Gibb, "Dynamics of Leadership," in G. Kerry Smith (ed.), In Search of Leaders (Washington, D. C., 1967), pp. 55-66.

⁴E. H. Litchfield, "Organization in Large American Universities: The Administration," Journal of Higher Education, 30 (1959), p. 490.

⁵Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation (San Francisco, 1974), pp. 77-78.

⁶Charles Hemler, "The College Departmental Chairman," Educational Record, 49 (1967), pp. 158-163.

⁷David Fellman, "The Departmental Chairman," in G. Kerry Smith (ed.), In Search of Leaders (Washington, D. C., 1967), p. 240.

⁸Charles Heimler, "The College Departmental Chairman," in James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet (eds.), The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role (Detroit, Michigan, 1972), pp. 198-207.

⁹William Castetter, The Personnel Function in Educational Administration (New York, 1971), p. 16.

¹⁰T. R. McConnell, "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration," in Terry R. Lunsford (ed.), The Study of Academic Administration (Boulder, Colorado, 1963), p. 113.

¹¹Kenneth P. Mortimer, Accountability in Higher Education, ERIC ED 058 465 (1973), p. 6.

¹²Tyrus Hillway, "Evaluating College and University Administration," Intellect (April, 1973), p. 462.

¹³Thomas J. Sergiovanni, R. H. Metzcus, and L. Burden, "Toward an Particularistic Approach to Leadership Style: Some Findings," American Educational Research Journal, VI, 1 (January, 1969), p. 62.

¹⁴J. Stanley Ahmann, "The Emerging Role of the Departmental Chairman: Be an Administrative Activist," in James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet (eds.), The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role (Detroit, Michigan, 1972), p. 195.

¹⁵Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois, 1957), pp. 95-96.

¹⁶Dean J. Champion, The Sociology of Organizations (New York, 1975), p. 27.

¹⁷Ralph M. Stogdill, Ellis L. Scott, and William E. Jaynes, Leadership and Role Expectations, Research Monograph No. 86, The Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio, 1956), p. 1.

¹⁸Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, 18 (1953), pp. 373-380.

¹⁹Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), p. 166.

²⁰Richard A. Schmuck and Philip J. Runkel, Handbook of Organization Development in Schools (Palo Alto, California, 1972), p. 324.

²¹Walter W. Sikes, Lawrence E. Schlesinger, and Charles N. Seashore, Renewing Higher Education From Within (San Francisco, 1974), p. 2.

²²D. Cartwright and A. Zander, eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (Evanston, Illinois, 1953), p. 54.

²³A. W. Halpin, "The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders," Harvard Educational Review, 25 (1955), pp. 18-32

²⁴Champion, p. 9.

²⁵Andrew W. Halpin, Manual for the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio, 1957), p. 1.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

The pattern followed in the selected review of literature was to investigate only that literature which appeared relevant to the problem of organizational leadership and the higher education division or department chairperson. The categories used for this purpose were: (1) definitions of leadership, (2) leadership theories, (3) historical developments and roles analysis of higher education chairpersons, (4) evaluation models of college and university chairpersons, and (5) a rationale for guiding the study.)

Definitions of Leadership

Higher education administrative leadership appears to be a rather complex area for investigation. There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define what leadership actually is.

Among the earliest American definitions of leadership is that presented by Cooley in 1902. He maintained that "the leader is always the nucleus of a tendency, and, on the other hand, all social movements, closely examined, will be found to consist of tendencies having such nuclei."¹ Mumford, in 1906, contended that leadership exhibits a

social aspect by stating that "leadership is the preeminence of one or a few individuals in a group in the process of control of societal phenomena."²

In 1911, Blackmar viewed leadership as a group expression of power through centralizing efforts in one person.³ This same theme was carried by Chapin in 1924, who viewed leadership as "a point of polarization for group cooperation."⁴ The definition used by Bernard in 1927 was of a similar nature. He indicated that, "the leader releases the needs and wishes of group members in a desired direction."⁵

Bingham, however, moved in a slightly different direction in the same year. He viewed the leader in terms of personality and character traits and stated that the leader possesses the greatest number of desirable traits of those types.⁶

Historically, many other academic definitions have been formulated. In 1939, Tead defined leadership as "the activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable."⁷ A year later, Anderson focused on the ability of the leader to use individual differences in identifying common purposes of the group and in using those differences to reveal to the group a stronger base for determining common purposes.⁸

As others continued to explore the problem of leadership, ideas and definitions surfaced that elaborated on previous thoughts. Krech and Crutchfield in 1948, for example, viewed leadership as "a special position in the group that serves as a primary agent for the determination of group structure, group atmosphere, group goals, group ideology, and group activities."⁹ In 1950, Stogdill spoke of leadership as a process of influencing the efforts and activities of an

organized group in its efforts toward setting and attaining goals.¹⁰

Koontz and O'Donnell inserted into the problem of defining leadership the element of persuasion. In 1955, they regarded leadership as an activity directed at persuading people to work together in achieving a common objective.¹¹ In 1956, Shartle hinted at persuasion when he defined leadership as actions which result in others moving in a shared direction.¹² Four years later, in 1960, Terry continued the idea by defining leadership as "the activity of influencing people to strive for group objectives."¹³

Tannanbaum, Weschler, and Massarik added to the aspect of influence the element of communication. According to their 1961 statement, leadership was a situational type of interpersonal influence using the communication process to develop direction toward the attainment of a specific goal or goals.¹⁴ Influence and persuasion, as well as communication, were brought into focus by Merton in 1969. He contended that leadership involved an interpersonal relation in which others desire to comply rather than feel compelled to do so.¹⁵

Also in 1969, Gibb proposed university and college administration leadership as "headship where the organization confers such recognition upon the person rather than the group itself."¹⁶ In 1970, Miller 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."¹⁷ Leadership, in 1972, was described by White as "the act of providing incentives to motivate others by satisfying their needs to perform in some desired manner."¹⁸

Finally, for the smooth functioning of a college or university, in

1974, Richman and Farmer 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.¹⁹

The great variety of definitions of leadership might suggest that there is little agreement as to the meaning of the concept. However, the nature of these leadership definitions can perhaps be better appreciated by noting a thought by Stogdill. Stogdill extended the notion that different definitions of leadership may serve the following variety of purposes:

1. Identify the object to be observed
2. Identify a form of practice
3. Satisfy a particular value orientation
4. Avoid a particular value orientation or implication for practice
5. Provide a basis for theory development²⁰

Introduction to Leadership Theories

Throughout history, people have recognized the difference between successes and failures. Whether in a war, a university, or a football game, success or failure can be largely attributed to leadership. Leadership is known to exist and to have a tremendous influence on human performance, but its inner workings cannot be precisely spelled out. A great deal is still either unknown or at best vaguely understood. Yet, despite these difficulties, a brief review of theory was beneficial to this study of the university chairperson's leadership behavior because considerable strides have been and are being made.

Trait Theories of Leadership

The trait theories of leadership were the first scientific analyses of leadership. The vital question that these theories attempted to answer was: What characteristics or traits make a person a leader? The pursuit of this question provided a beginning for the "great man" theory of leadership, suggesting that leaders were born, not made. Woods studied fourteen nations ex post facto over periods of five to ten centuries. He concluded that the man makes the nation and shapes it in accordance with his abilities.²¹

Eventually around 1930, the "great man" theory gave way, under the influence of the behavioristic school of thought. Acceptance was given to the fact that leadership traits are not completely inborn, but can also be acquired through learning and experience.

The Hawthorne Studies,²² beginning in 1927, are unquestionably the single most important historical foundation for the behavioral approach to administrative leadership theory. Two primary conclusions may be drawn. First, the Hawthorne Studies represented the first attempt at an intensive, systematic analysis being made of the human factor in administration and management. The studies, as reported by Roethlisberger and Dickson, dramatically demonstrated the existence and complexity of the human element in the organization. The second major conclusion was that the leadership climate of supervision has an important impact on the behavior of work groups. The studies did not prove that one type was better than another in attaining desired goals. Rather, as admitted by Luthans, "the conclusion to be made is that the supervisory climate has the ability to influence a work group to react

in a positive or negative manner toward formal organizational goal attainment."²³

Chester Barnard, also, had an early influence on the thinking regarding the behavioral elements of leadership. In his classic work, The Functions of the Executive, he defined a formal organization as a "system of consciously coordinated activities of two or more persons."²⁴ Barnard was dissatisfied with the classical view that authority came from the top down to the lowest levels of the organizational hierarchy. He formulated the proposition that authority came from the bottom up. This analysis has become known as the acceptance theory of authority. However, Barnard contended that most types of orders fall within an individual's "zone of indifference." If an order falls within this zone, the individual will respond without question, but if it falls outside the zone, he or she will question the command leading to rejection or acceptance. The width of the zone depends upon the degree to which the inducements and rewards exceed the burdens and sacrifices.²⁵

Later, attention returned to the search for universal traits possessed by leaders. Numerous physical, mental, and personality traits were researched from 1930 to 1950; the search is still underway for a set of traits which all leaders must possess.

In 1948, in a highly respected survey of the literature, Ralph Stogdill examined 124 studies on the relationship of personal factors associated with leadership. A summary of his findings follows:

1. The following conclusions are supported by uniformly positive evidence from fifteen or more of the studies surveyed: The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average members of his group in the following respects: (1) intelligence,

(2) scholarship, (3) dependability in exercising responsibilities, (4) activity and social participation, and (5) socioeconomic status. The qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader.

2. The following conclusions are supported by uniformly positive evidence from ten or more of the studies surveyed: The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of his group to some degree in the following respects: (1) sociability, (2) initiative, (3) persistence, (4) knowing how to get things done, (5) self-confidence, (6) alertness to and insight into situations, (7) cooperativeness, (8) popularity, (9) adaptability, and (10) verbal facility.²⁶

White's 1965 leadership study of educational administrators demonstrated that leaders' traits tended to include high self-confidence, and that they are practically oriented extroverts.²⁷

Keith Davis, in a 1972 review of research, found the following four traits which seem to have an impact on effective organizational leadership:

1. Intelligence: research generally shows that the leader has 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 tend to be emotionally stable and mature and to have broad interest and activities. They have an assured, respectful self-concept.
3. Inner motivation and achievement drives: leaders have relatively intense motivational drives of 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 empathize 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.²⁸

Situational Theories of Leadership

The situational or "zeitgeist" theories emphasized that leadership roles, skills, and behavior were dependent upon the situation in terms of the total setting.

One of the first situational theories is generally acknowledged as the "machine model." The primary objective of machine theory is to maximize efficiency of the situation. Therefore, attention was directed to those aspects of organizations which can be structured and rearranged so as to fulfill this objective. The most popular manifestation of the machine theory was bureaucratic leadership as proposed by Max Weber. Weber was concerned with an ideal organizational structure situation. He made explicit the following characteristics of an ideally effective organization: (1) impersonal social relations; (2) appointment and promotion on the basis of merit; (3) previously specified authority obligations which inhere in the position, not in the individual functioning in the position; (4) a hierarchy of authority; (5) abstract rules or laws covering task assignments and decisions; and (6) specialization of position.²⁹

Filley and House, in a 1969 review of the research literature, 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.³⁰

Although situations present opportunities for acquisition of leadership, other theorists have insisted that the situation is not in itself sufficient to account for leadership.

Humanistic Theories of Leadership

Humanistic theories raised new questions concerning the development of effective and cohesive organizations. The function of leadership is to modify the organization in order to provide freedom for the individual to realize his own motivational potential for fulfillment of his own needs and at the same time contribute toward the accomplishment of organizational goals.

For example, the leadership studies initiated at Ohio State University attempted to identify dimensions of leader behavior through the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The LBDQ found that the description of leader behavior had two major dimensions: Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior. Initiating Structure Behavior refers to endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure. On the other hand, Consideration Behavior is indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group.³¹

In a study by Hemphill using the LBDQ on twenty-two departments in a liberal arts college, it was found that the department chairmen with the best campus "reputation" for effective administration were

those who attended to facets of leadership concerning: (1) organizing departmental activities and initiating new ways of solving department problems, and (2) at the same time develop warm, considerate relationship with members of the department.³²

Another theoretical approach, that of Tannenbaum and Schmidt, depicted a broad range of administrative leadership styles on a continuum. Leaders whose behavior was found to be at the authoritarian end of the continuum tended to be task-oriented and use their power to influence their members, while leaders whose behavior appears to be at the democratic end tended to be group-oriented and thus give their members considerable freedom in their work.³³

McGregor, in 1960, identified two types of organizational leadership--Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X is the notion that people are passive and resistant to organizational needs. Theory Y, based on the notion that people already possess motivation and desire for responsibility, attempts to arrange organizational conditions in such a manner as to make possible fulfillment of their needs while directing their efforts to achieve organizational objectives.³⁴

In 1962, Argyris perceived a basic conflict between the individual and the organization. An organization will be most effective when its leadership provides the format whereby followers may make a creative contribution to it as a natural outgrowth of their needs for growth and self-expression. Argyris' basic thesis is that an incongruency exists between the needs of the mature employee and the requirements of the formal organization. Applying this theory, he says that the faculty member who experiences frustration, conflict, failure, and short time perspective may leave the organization, climb the employment

ladder, or defend his self-concept and adapt through the use of defense mechanisms. The faculty member may pressure himself to stay by lowering his work standards and becoming apathetic and uninterested, placing more value on material rewards.³⁵

As a result of research developed in several settings, Likert concludes that leadership is a relative process in that the leader must take into account the expectations, values, and interpersonal skills of those with whom he is interacting. The leader builds group cohesiveness and motivation for productivity by providing freedom for responsible decision making and exercise of initiative.³⁶

The dimensions of leadership styles have been given a variety of labels. Blake and Mouton conceptualize leadership in terms of a managerial grid on which "concern for people" represents one axis and "concern for production" represents the other axis. The leader who rates high on both dimensions (9-9) develops followers committed to accomplishment of work, and whose sense of interdependence through a common share in the organizational goals leads to relationships of trust and respect.³⁷

Exchange Theories of Leadership

In 1958, March and Simon developed a theory of leadership that is based on the assumption that social interaction represents a form of exchange in which group members make contributions at a cost to themselves and receive returns at a cost to the other members. Interaction continues because members find social exchange mutually rewarding.³⁸

Another social exchange theory described by Jacobs implies that leadership is an equitable exchange relationship between the leader and

group members. When role obligations are mutually acknowledged, each party can satisfy the expectations of the other on an equitable basis.³⁹

Expectation Theories of Leadership

In 1957, Getzels and Guba formulated a theory model for explaining organizational behavior as a "social system" which features an expectation hierarchical role structure.⁴⁰ For each role in the university structure--students, faculty, chairpersons, or central administration--there are certain behavioral expectations. Everyone in the university is an observer of other roles and, consequently has certain expectations of how those in other roles should behave. At the same time, there is an institutional role expectation: decisions that must be made, things that must be done, and ceremonies that must be performed. Thus, according to Getzels and Guba, there are two dimensions which are significant factors in producing organizational behavior (including leadership): (1) the organizational or normative (Nomothetic) dimension and (2) the personal (ideographic) dimension.⁴¹ Leadership may be viewed as a function of these two dimensions.

Stogdill, in 1959, described an expectancy reinforcement theory of role attainment. This theory asserts that as group members interact and engage in mutual task performance, they reinforce the expectation that each will continue to act and interact in accord with his previous performance. Thus, according to Stogdill, the person's role is defined by mutually confirmed expectations relative to the performances and interactions he will be permitted to contribute to the group. The leadership potential is defined by the extent to which he initiates

and maintains structure in expectation.⁴²

Etzioni has devised a theory scheme for organizational leadership which is based on the nature of the compliance behavior of participants. Compliance, according to Etzioni, is:

the relation in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to the orientation of the subordinated actor to the power applied.⁴³

In all organizations, members are subjected to the orders of members at a higher level in the hierarchy of authority. Higher level members may exercise authority over subordinates through force or coercion, reward or remuneration, or normative means. This implies that the recipients of directives generally vary in the nature of their involvement in the organization according to the nature of the directives focused at them. Etzioni's theory has many applications for higher education administration. For example, should the same means of leadership power be used on all personnel?⁴⁴

Fiedler, in 1967, proposed a contingency theory of leadership. The effectiveness of a given pattern of leader behavior is contingent upon the demands imposed by the situational expectations. The theory states that under very favorable and very unfavorable situations, the task-directed or "hard-nosed" type of leader is most effective. However, when the situation is only moderately favorable or unfavorable, the human relations or lenient type of leader is most effective.⁴⁵ In general, Fiedler's contingency model suggests that the effectiveness of group performance can be affected by changing the leader's style and/or the situation in accordance with the described relationships.

Many organizational theories of leadership suggest that clarity

of purpose and expectations, as expressed in institutional goals, is a fundamental prerequisite for any type of organizational efficiency.

This is one of the major themes for managing by objectives (MBO).

Peter Drucker is responsible for first publicizing the MBO approach in his Practice of Management, written in 1954.⁴⁶ However, Hersey and Blanchard contend that there has been a major missing link to more successful implementation of management by objectives and that is contracting for leadership style. According to Hersey and Blanchard:

MBO could be a powerful tool for productivity improvement if superiors negotiated with their subordinates not only the goals toward which the subordinates would work but also the leadership style they would use to help their subordinates meet their objectives.⁴⁷

Research in the last few years has clearly indicated that there is no best style of leadership that can be universally applied. Yet, most writers would agree that effective and desirable leadership--which would include that of the university division or department chairperson--is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation. As noted by Hersey and Blanchard, it follows that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and the situation:

$$L = f(l, f, s).^{48}$$

The importance to this study of a brief review of selected theories on leadership has been stated well by Stogdill. He suggests that theories of leadership "represent serious attempts to gain an increasingly more sophisticated understanding of the nature of leadership."⁴⁹

Consequently, there have been many opinions expressed about the meaning of the term leadership and leadership theory. These opinions

possibly have influenced the development of the analysis of the roles of departmental or divisional chairpersons in higher education. It is essential, then, that the developments in the area of the university chairperson's role analysis be examined from the historical approach.

Historical Developments and Role Analysis of Higher Education Chairpersons

The historical development of the university department or division is not entirely clear. As explained by Paul Dressel:

This lack of clarity is not surprising in view of the many forces that have helped to shape the modern university and that have resulted in individual departments which, in number, in size, in resources, and in range of functions, far exceed the departments of most colleges and universities existing prior to 1900.⁵⁰

Specialization, the first major factor leading to the modern departmental structure, was a gradual result of the increasing amount and organization of knowledge. Rashdall recorded an early reference to the department structure at the University of Paris. He writes:

The agreement in the year of 1213 recognized the right of each faculty--including the medical doctors (who are here for the first time mentioned in connection with the university)--to testify to the qualifications of candidates to the license in its own department, and this right practically involved the regulation of the studies and the discipline of the students.⁵¹

In this early reference, the department seems clearly to relate directly to the faculty organization and fields of study.

The early American college was not departmentalized, however, the trend toward specialization in the college and university curriculum, the needs of students, and the increase in enrollments are usually regarded as the basis for the development of the department in the

American organization of higher education. Corson notes that:

Departments have been created, schools have been formed, as initiative has come from each subject matter discipline or professional field. The growth has not come from institutional leadership so much as from the need to satisfy the requirements of individual areas of teaching and scholarship and of growing professional fields.⁵²

Rudolph further states that:

Size alone requires departmentalization. . . . It was not only a method of organizing an otherwise unwieldy number of academic specialists into the framework of university government; it was also a development that unleashed all of that competitiveness, that currying of favor, that attention to public relations, that scrambling for students, that pettiness and jealousy which in some of its manifestations made the university and college indistinguishable from other organizations.⁵³

Although George Ticknor may have suggested the idea,⁵⁴ the origin of the first American departments has been credited by Charles William Eliot to the Harvard Board of Overseers in 1766. He writes:

The influence of the Harvard Board of Overseers is not exerted through criticism and inquiry only. Their action has sometimes been constructive in a high degree. Thus, in 1766, it was the Board of Overseers, and not the President and Fellows, that accomplished the great reform of making the college instruction departmental by subject. Before that date one tutor had been assigned to each entering class, and had taught that class in all its subjects for four years. At the insistence of the Board of Overseers, each tutor thereafter taught the same subjects, or kindred subjects, to all the four classes . . . so that all the instruction in the college became from that date departmental.⁵⁵

For another historical landmark, when James Marsh in 1826 assumed the Presidency of the University of Vermont, he inaugurated an era of curriculum change. In a paper that he read to the Vermont faculty soon after he became President, he proposed that the studies of the college be divided into four departments and that students not seeking degrees be permitted to pursue the studies of a single department if they

desired.⁵⁶

Historians of higher education, however, usually credit Eliot of Harvard, after 1869, for rapid functional development of the department in higher education organization. During Eliot's forty years in the president's chair at Harvard, he produced a remarkable transformation in the organization of that institution and higher education in general. The introduction of elective courses offered the professor a greater opportunity to become a subject-matter specialist, and the departmental structure flourished. As quoted by Joshua L. Chamberlain, "by 1897, Harvard offered 346 elective courses in 33 different departments."⁵⁷

Thus, the major solidification of the American higher education departmental organization came in the 1890's, although Cornell and Johns Hopkins had established autonomous departments by 1880. The University of Chicago, at the end of the first year of operation, in 1892-1893, listed twenty-six departments organized into three faculties: Arts, Literature, and Science; Divinity; and University Extension.⁵⁸ Columbia was completely departmentalized by the late nineties, with Princeton and Yale adopting the department style a few years later.⁵⁹

At the same time, the concerns for department governance and leadership emerged. President Eliot insisted that each department needed a chairman and the policy to be followed in selecting this chairman was a matter of grave consequence. He believed that in small colleges which had but one faculty person for each subject, it was natural that he should be treated as the head of his department; however in larger institutions which have many faculty members in a

department, he advocated that the selection is best made from time to time either by the president, or by a faculty committee of which the president is chairman.⁶⁰

However, most head professors presided as virtual monarchs of departments, free to do anything which they could find the resources to support. It was not until 1911 that the National Association of State Universities addressed itself to the problem of department leadership.

At this meeting, Hill reported that "the type of organization quite common today is based upon the notion that only one man should have anything to do with policies and the administration of the department and that all other teachers in the department are to be regarded as his assistants." Hill believed this was not the proper role for the department head and he favored the chairmanship leadership organization. The advantages seen by Hill to a chairmanship structure were:

1. It is consistent with the organization of the larger groups of teachers to which the department faculties belong. If they vote on university policy, it is rational that they should vote on departmental policy.
2. It would tend to bring out in departmental discussions more than one educational opinion or viewpoint. Although his executive and administrative ability may have won his position, it is a mistake to suppose that all wisdom in a department clusters in the chairman.
3. It would tend to give each teacher a feeling of responsibility for the work of the department as a whole, encourage loyalty to the department and the institution, set free every teacher's power of initiative, give greater essential harmony in departmental effort, and provide greater flexibility of organization.
4. It would prevent the faculty from getting the notion that the university is primarily a business corporation and that the man held in greatest esteem is the one who can do administrative work rather than teach and investigate. The emphasis would remain on the educational ideals.

5. Experience seems to indicate that this system works better than the old one. Harvard has followed the system for a long time, Wisconsin has used it, and Missouri adopted it.⁶¹

Also in 1911, The Association of American Universities devoted considerable time in their annual meeting to the discussion of departmental organization and administration. Greene stated at this meeting that:

The serious problems of departmental administration, as they confront us now, are of comparatively recent origin. It may often happen that the qualities which are sufficient to secure the loyal support of subordinates are not such as to win the sympathetic co-operation of a group of men more nearly equal in scientific temper and achievement.⁶²

Greene's survey of a number of universities led him to make the following general recommendation concerning university departmental organization:

1. Choose a department chairman of scholarly standing with a view to getting something more than the smooth running of departmental routine. He should be expected to take the initiative in the consideration of larger problems which concern the development and the efficiency of the department.
2. Assignment to a chairmanship should be quite independent of seniority, and for a limited term. Appointment should be made by the president after informal conferences with members of the department concerned.
3. In large departments, a junior member should be assigned to the routine tasks with some definite recognition of the services performed, perhaps through the title of secretary and a special stipend.
4. Questions involving general policy should be considered by colleagues in departmental meetings.⁶³

The next large-scale investigation of the department chairperson was conducted by the American Association of University Professors. In the area of department administration, the following conditions were found in a 1939 and 1940 study of 228 institutions of higher

education:

In the typical college and university the deans and department heads are appointed without consultation with the faculty concerned. In a very few institutions the dean or department head is elected; in others nominating panels are elected by the faculty or some other kind of consultation takes place; but in most instances there is little or no regard for faculty opinion.

The typical college and university organization provides for consultation by the appointing officers with the department heads but not with the faculty members themselves regarding new appointments, promotions, and dismissals of teaching personnel, or budgeting needs. In some institutions greater consultation is undertaken; in some there is no consultation at all; but in most cases the department head above is consulted.⁶⁴

Currently, Dressel complains that very little empirical research regarding the division or department chairperson is available. Most research concerning university departments and their role in the university has been conducted by observation and reflection. He feels that perhaps, in 1953, the first most extensive empirical work was done by Rev. Edward Doyle on the department chairmen in thirty-three small private colleges. Dressel states that in Corson's (1960) notable book, Governance of Colleges and Universities, his comments on the role of the higher education department are largely based on Doyle's study.⁶⁵

Based on a 332-item checklist, Doyle's study sought to ascertain established practices regarding: (1) the qualifications of departmental chairmen; (2) the status of the chairman in the administrative organization of the college; (3) general duties of the chairman; (4) teaching functions of the chairman; (5) the chairman's relation to the administration, departmental faculty, and students of the department. Doyle concluded that most department chairmen are selected on the basis of three factors: (1) teaching experience, (2) teaching

ability, and (3) administrative talent. He also found that only two colleges had rotating chairmen, and only four specified the term of office. Least time spent by chairmen was in helping and supervising new professors, although about half felt it was important.⁶⁶

Recall that in 1955, John Hemphill examined the validity of using the reputation of department for being effectively administered as a criterion for determining the degree of quality of leadership in college departments. He found that larger departments tended to have better leadership reputations than smaller departments. Hemphill concluded that reputation may provide a criterion of effective department chairman's leadership.⁶⁷

At Ohio State University in 1963, Ramer found that the expectations for the leadership of the best qualified chairman was: (1) reasonably accomplished in the elements of academic scholarship, (2) possessing a genuine interest in and an aptitude for effective administration, (3) committed to democratic values and procedures, (4) humane and sensitive to the needs and desires of his associates, (5) one who possesses those character traits and abilities that inspire confidence and motivate personnel to high levels of achievement, (6) loyal and ethical, (7) enjoys vibrant physical and mental health, (8) sensitive to the educational needs and personal welfare of students, and (9) one who seeks to rise above the parochial and provincial in his personal and professional commitments. Ramer, also, discovered the faculties', deans', and central administrators' criticisms of the department chairman position to be: (1) is not regularly available to counsel with staff members, (2) when out of the office does not designate some responsible person to act for the department in his absence,

(3) does not give enough emphasis to the process of selecting new staff members, (4) gives little attention to departmental planning and long-range development, (5) does not regularly convene departmental staff meetings, (6) consultations with faculty are superficial and infrequent, (7) has practically no contact with students except in teaching situations, (8) mistakenly thinks that most everything must be submitted to the faculty for a vote, (9) too often takes no action on committee recommendations to the chairman, (10) the faculty gets very little feedback through the chairman from the dean and central administration, (11) is not aggressive enough in communicating departmental needs to upper university echelons, (12) is not providing enough supervision or assistance in professional development for beginning staff members, and (13) has allowed inequities to enter into faculty promotions and work load assignments.⁶⁸

A study of 338 professors in ninety departments at ten universities conducted by Patterson in 1966, indicated that faculty members regard the ideal departmental chairman as a facilitator of their own self-determined goals, as an intermediary between themselves and the dean, as an information handler, and as a scheduler of time and space. She found that the preferences in administrative leadership styles between individual orientation, hierarchical orientation, oligarchical orientation, and group orientation was related to the subject matter of the department in which a faculty is a member. For example, greater preference for the hierarchical style was shown by respondents in accounting, management, and chemical engineering. The oligarchy was favored by English and Romance language professors. Professor-oriented units were most strongly preferred by political science professors.

The highest value on all-group department style was expressed by psychology professors. Despite the apparent leadership style preference of most professors, Patterson noted that a large number of faculty predict growing centralization in departmental decision making.⁶⁹

Hill and French, in 1967, found that chairmen are perceived by the faculty to have less power collectively than any other administrative or faculty group. However, an important finding by Hill and French was that in departments in which the faculty reported relatively greater power for the chairman, faculty satisfaction and productivity was also relatively higher.⁷⁰

Also in 1967, Davidson in a study restricted to an examination of ten colleges in the State University system of New York, discovered that the chairperson's leadership role to be those aspects which deal in: (1) participation in institutional objectives and program, (2) involvement in college-wide curricula considerations as well as departmental courses and study programs, (3) advisement work with students and student academic affairs, (4) responsibilities for budget and financial matters, and (5) supervising and counseling with faculty members. One of his major conclusions was that the chairman cannot adequately accomplish at the same time the leadership roles of teaching, administration, and research. He further suggests that colleges must give greater recognition to the importance of the department chairman and to study more carefully the responsibilities and authority delegated to them.⁷¹

Using the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire on a sample of 52 deans, 118 chairmen, and 161 faculty from seventeen state colleges and universities, Schroeder, in 1969, found the following

major results: (1) the faculty expects significantly more "consideration" from the ideal chairmen than deans expect; (2) deans expect more "initiating structure" from the ideal chairmen than does the faculty; (3) chairmen would display significantly more ideal "initiating structure" than the faculty desires but ideal "consideration" was viewed similarly by both groups; (4) chairmen with large departments scored lower on ideal leader behavior than those with small departments; (5) neither institutional size, type of college, nor faculty rank were factors in reported leadership behavior; (6) personnel in the colleges of business administration expect significantly more ideal initiating structure from chairmen than do personnel in other colleges; (7) personnel in the colleges of education expect less ideal "initiating structure" than those in the other colleges. By using the Getzels and Guba social system model, Schroeder concluded that all three groups--deans, chairmen, and faculty--place the chairman's ideal leadership style in the area of the transactional dimension that is closer to the ideographic than the nomothetic dimension.⁷²

A study at the University of Alabama, in 1969, developed by Bullen, was designed to determine the perceptions of selected deans, departmental chairmen, and faculty regarding the department system and the chairmen's role. The most significant findings were: (1) that teaching faculty generally had no ambitions toward becoming departmental chairmen; (2) that the opportunity to incorporate personal ideas was a major factor in a chairman's acceptance of his position; (3) that development of a composite profile of desirable characteristics should be utilized in the selection process of a chairman; (4) that respondents favored a defined term of office for the chairman;

(5) that too much of a chairman's time was absorbed in clerical tasks; (6) that respondents' expectations and observations recorded projected the chairman's role as one of staff recruiter, personnel director, curriculum leader, coordinator, and chief liaison officer; (7) that respondents interpreted the chairman's role in faculty-administration conflicts as one of an arbitrator and mediator of disputes; (8) that considerable departmental isolation existed; (9) that respondents generally opposed the use of the committee system as the main method of disposing of all departmental business; (10) that efforts were almost non-existent to define departmental objectives in quantitative terms; (11) that considerable autonomy existed in the colleges and departments investigated in the matter of development of academic programs; (12) that standardization of staff recruitment procedures was generally non-existent; (13) that respondents generally felt that teaching cannot adequately be evaluated by the chairman; and (14) that budgetary controls appeared to be the most restricting factor in a chairman's performance and plans for departmental development.⁷³

In 1970, four large midwestern universities were selected by Novick for an investigation into the chairman's governance role as perceived by faculty, officers of central administration, and chairmen. Some of his findings and conclusions were: (1) in the chairman selection process, chairmen, faculty, and administrators felt that administrative ability and previous departmental administrative experience were highly important selection criterion (teaching ability and research were considered as important attributes by the faculty; chairmen and administrators rated these two criteria much lower); (2) faculty had only a limited concern for departmental affairs unless the faculty

member perceived some encroachment on his personal areas of interest; (3) most administrators stated that chairmen membership on university policy committees, other than the budget committee, was unimportant; faculty did not agree, stating that chairmen participation should increase; (4) a majority of chairmen responding expressed a preference for continuing with their own teaching responsibilities, however, faculty and administrators preferred that more time be spent on administrative functions; (5) administrators believed chairmen to have substantial influence in instructional matters, faculty said that his influence was minimal; (6) chairmen were rarely consulted by the officers of central administration on all-university academic matters; yet chairmen sought faculty opinion on these same items; and (7) staffing, planning, and organizing were considered the most important chairmen responsibilities by all respondents.⁷⁴

Darkenwald, in 1970, studied 284 chairmen at fifty-four colleges and universities in twenty-six states on the effects of organizational differentiation for several aspects of the department chairman role. He found the following variables to be related to the level of institutional differentiation: (1) conflict with the administration in decision-making, (2) method of chairman selection, (3) allegiance to the department, and (4) perceptions of departmental autonomy. Also, the majority of chairmen saw themselves in a leadership role.⁷⁵

Gerstenberger designed a 1974 study of all recreation departments in the United States' colleges and universities offering four-year curricula in the area. The investigation was limited to those departments with at least five faculty members and was based on the concept that chairmen actions are determined largely by situational demands.

She found that environmental variables represented by academic departmental location and geographical location of the institution significantly affected the chairmen leadership behavior. For example, geographically, chairmen in Mid-South institutions persuasively assumed leadership roles that were very impatient with defining that role as having an "initiation of structure" component as measured by the LBDQ XII. Too, Mid-South chairmen had a "low tolerance of uncertainty" three times as often as those in Pacific Coast colleges. Chairmen in agriculture/forestry divisions assumed stronger leadership roles and emphasized "production" fifty times more frequently than chairmen in social science/professional studies divisions.⁷⁶

A major 1975 finding by Meredith was that few chairmen have received either on-the-job training or specialized courses on the college level preparatory to their roles. It was his opinion that no two department chairmen face the same problems in administering their departments because no two departments operate under the same set of consitions.⁷⁷

In another 1975 study, Washington's purpose was to determine whether faculty job satisfaction is related to faculty perceptions of the department chairperson's leadership style. His research supported the premise that the degree of job satisfaction is highest in college academic departments in which the faculty perceives the chairperson's leadership style to be high in initiating structure and high in consideration. He further found that the degree of faculty job satisfaction is higher when faculty are allowed to select their chairperson.⁷⁸

McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass, in 1975, elected to survey

the department chairmen in thirty-two state universities (selected geographically) which award the Ph.D. degree. This study suggests that the departmental chairmanship should be viewed from two perspectives: (1) the roles required for the position and (2) the development of individuals for these roles. A taxonomy was provided for the duties of department chairmen. These duties include academic, administrative, and leadership roles. The authors concluded that:

The 1,198 respondents to the questionnaire indicate that they feel most comfortable in the role of the academician, although frustration occurs because of competing demands on their time by administrative and leadership functions they are required to fulfill. Although they state they derive the least enjoyment from the administrative role, they recognize the importance of the activities associated with it. Leadership and decision-making incorporate both positive and negative aspects, but, in general, the department chairmen surveyed felt both are important functions from which they derive satisfaction, if not pleasure.⁷⁹

While there has been a growing awareness of the importance of university division or department chairpersons' research, there has also began a new interest in higher educational accountability. Thus, it became necessary to review the literature on college and university division or department chairperson evaluation models.

Evaluation Models of the College and University

Division or Department Chairperson

The literature on higher educational division or department chairperson evaluation models is very limited. Based on a study of the available literature, Richard Miller suggests the following guidelines for evaluating chairpersons in higher education:

1. Evaluation system should be rooted in the traditions, purposes, and objectives of each college or university.

2. Overall purpose of the evaluative procedure should be to improve the quality of administration and its basic approach should be positive rather than punitive--as should be the case in faculty evaluation also.
3. Performance should be evaluated against expectations which requires that job descriptions exist, and are current.
4. The procedures of evaluation should employ objective measures as well as subjective ones.
5. Evaluations should be sought from those in a position to make valid judgments.
6. Evaluation should take place with the evaluated's full knowledge of the procedures, timetable, and results.
7. Confidentiality should be maintained throughout, with distribution of results clearly understood and controlled.⁸⁰

A committee at Western Michigan University lists three purposes for evaluating department chairpersons:

1. To facilitate and accelerate the effectiveness of a department.
2. To affect the behavior of the department head.
3. To replace or remove a department head.⁸¹

In addition to listing the purposes, the committee to develop procedures for the evaluation of department heads at Western Michigan University made eight recommendations:

1. The department should be regarded as a core and unique unit within the university, and its head regarded primarily as a member of the department, chosen to facilitate its achievement.
2. Although it is the primary responsibility of the faculty to plan and evaluate the work of a department and its head, involvement at all levels of a university is encouraged.
3. Evaluation should be treated as a serious and difficult process. It should be periodically scrutinized to insure that it continues to facilitate university effectiveness.
4. Evaluation of a department head should be linked to, and

an outgrowth of a serious and deliberate process of planning. In this process, the purposes and goals of the department and particular expectations for the department head could provide the basis for establishing criteria to be used in evaluation.

5. Information and interactions relevant to the planning should involve several levels within the university. Information on evaluative results should be of primary concern to the department head and to the evaluators. Evaluative results should not "bypass" the department head, except perhaps when the purpose is an appeal for replacement.
6. Criteria of evaluation need not be uniform across all departments. They should reflect the specific needs of a department at a given point in time.
7. The planning and evaluation process should be conducted so as to maximize opportunities for the department head and others to examine their interest in holding such a position. In some cases, trial periods may be indicated in lieu of replacement or resignation.
8. In cases where replacement is indicated, those seeking replacement should assume the burden of proof. A clearer university appeal process is needed for these situations.⁸²

One of the first evaluation models of educational administrators was developed, in 1950, by Hobson. The instrument developed was called the Purdue Rating Scale for Administrators and School Executives. Thirty-six items were formulated, each with five possible quantitative evaluation response categories, and grouped under the following ten headings:

1. Intellectual balance
2. Emotional balance
3. Administrative leadership
4. Administrative planning
5. Use of funds
6. Capacity for work
7. Accomplishment
8. Relations with subordinates
9. Public relations

10. Social responsibility⁸³

As already noted, around 1955, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed at Ohio State University by Hemphill and Coons. Forty items were formulated, each with five possible quantitative evaluation responses; the instrument measures two dimensions: (1) consideration and (2) initiating structure. The LBDQ has been used for the evaluation of higher education administrators.⁸⁴

Also at Ohio State University, in 1963, Stogdill developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII which has been used by some institutions for the evaluation of department chairpersons. The scale has 100 items, each with five possible quantitative evaluation response categories, and yields scores on the following twelve subscales:

1. Representation--speaks and acts as the representative of the group.
2. Demand Reconciliation--reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system.
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty--is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.
4. Persuasiveness--uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.
5. Initiation of Structure--clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.
6. Tolerance of Freedom--allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action.
7. Role Assumption--actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.
8. Consideration--regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers.
9. Production Emphasis--applies pressure for productive output.

10. Predictive Accuracy--exhibits foresight and ability to predict.
11. Integration--maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts.
12. Superior Orientation--maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.⁸⁵

Another instrument that has been demonstrated as a higher education administrator evaluative tool was formulated at the University of Michigan. In 1967, Rensis Likert and his colleagues designed a twenty-item instrument which gave scores from System 1 (least effective) to System 4 (most effective) of administrative characteristics on leadership, motivation, communication, decision making, interaction and influence, goal setting, and control process.⁸⁶

Miller, in 1970, developed a fourteen-item scale titled Administrative Effectiveness Appraisal. Rated on a seven-point scale, the model measures the following department chairperson's behavior:

1. Ability and willingness to "open doors" for faculty.
2. Attends to details effectively.
3. Instills enthusiasm for professional goals.
4. Judges people perceptively and fairly.
5. Keeps abreast of new developments and innovations in higher education.
6. Makes sound decisions.
7. Plans effectively and imaginatively.
8. Resolves human conflicts.
9. Says "no" effectively.
10. Understands and uses modern management procedures.
11. Willingness to appraise situations and problems impartially.
12. Willingness to put others first.
13. Works effectively with faculty members.
14. Works effectively with other administrators.⁸⁷

The committee from Western Michigan University, also in 1970, using a different approach, developed a rating scale that attempts to evaluate the performance of a department chairperson on a five-point scale (1, very good; 2, good; 3, average; 4, fair; and 5, poor). The sixteen items are:

1. Represents department to administration.
2. Represents department and school to the public and various organizations.
3. Obtains resources.
4. Effectively allocates resources.
5. Teaches.
6. Consults with students.
7. Is active professionally.
8. Provides encouragement and direction to staff.
9. Encourages professional growth of staff.
10. Develops long-range plans to meet the needs of students and the objectives of the department and the university.
11. Implements department and university policies.
12. Provides leadership to meet the objectives of the department.
13. Communicates effectively with staff and other parts of the university.
14. Recruits, recommends, promotes, and retains faculty in consultation with department and administration.
15. Effectively assigns responsibility and authority to department members and committees.
16. Sees that department members effectively fulfill assigned responsibilities.⁸⁸

The University of Kansas, as of 1971, used a questionnaire form for evaluating department chairpersons. It asked faculty to give written answers to the following questions:

1. Is the chairman effective in getting research facilities and outside funds for the department?
2. Is the chairman effective in obtaining university support?
3. Is he effective in recruiting new faculty?

4. Is he effective in his relations with the administration in the budget cycle?
5. Is he effective in creating a climate in which good teaching can take place.
6. Is he effective in stimulating research?
7. Is he effective in performing service functions for related departments?
8. Is he effective in carrying out departmental affairs and in maintaining departmental morale?
9. Is he effective in general departmental operations?
10. Are his personal relationships with members of the staff satisfactory? Does he have adequate communications with his staff?
11. Is he effective in his relationships with students in the department involving graduate student recruiting, local student relations, etc.?
12. Does the department obtain the maximum productivity for the staff and facilities available?
13. Is he effective in evaluating his staff?
14. Is he effective in planning for the future of the department?
15. Additional comments or suggestions. . . .⁸⁹

At the University of Northern Colorado, Hillway, in 1972, proposed the Rating Scale for Academic Administration: a rating scale of fifteen qualities and nine methods to evaluate higher education department chairpersons. On a scale from high to low the behavioral variables measured are:

1. Interest in the progress of education.
2. Educational and cultural background.
3. Sympathetic attitude toward students.
4. Fairness in dealing with students.
5. Considerate attitude toward faculty.
6. Fairness in dealing with faculty.
7. Self-adjustment and sense of humor.
8. Tolerance of new ideas.
9. Trustworthiness.
10. Skill in securing group action.

11. Ability to inspire confidence.
12. Ability to organize.
13. Ability to evaluate faculty performance.
14. Ability to maintain faculty morale.
15. Appearance.
16. Encourages democratic participation.
17. Communicates effectively with group members.
18. Presents appropriate materials for group action.
19. Adheres faithfully to group decisions.
20. Respects professional rights of faculty.
21. Assigns work fairly and suitably.
22. Makes fair decisions on promotions and salary.
23. Makes contributions to his academic field
24. Uses generally appropriate administrative methods.
25. Overall rating of the administrator.⁹⁰

Brownley and Harbaugh, in 1973, at the University of Tennessee, developed a model for evaluation of division directors and department chairmen. On a three-point scale (1, outstanding; 2, satisfactory; and 3, unsatisfactory) eight categories were formulated:

1. Planning--establishment of objectives and goals; anticipation of future developments; formulation of effective plans to achieve desired results.
2. Decision Making--ability to make sound, logical decisions under stress; exercise good judgment; ability to see problems objectively.
3. Provide leadership in:
 - (a) developing professional responsibility for teaching
 - (b) developing departmental morale
 - (c) developing institutional loyalty
 - (d) professional development through research
 - (e) departmental program for advising students
4. Administration--staffing, organization, handling problems, development of new and better methods, procedures, or ideas, implementation of committee assignments.
5. Communicative Skills--quality of reports and correspondence, listening ability, oral presentation,

participation in discussions and meetings, methods used for flow of information.

6. Initiative--drive, self-starting ability, capacity to act promptly, a striving to attain goals, willingness to work beyond ordinary requirements, independent action.
7. Adaptability--reaction to new responsibilities, handling of special projects, attitude, flexibility.
8. Institutional Commitment--dedication to service, willingness to strive for superior quality performance, sense of responsibility, concern for welfare of total university as well as specific responsibilities, promotion of favorable public relations, involvement in appropriate campus activities.⁹¹

In The Confidence Crisis: An Analysis of University Departments,

Dressel and others wrote:

The chairman may play the role of honest broker, attempting to interpret accurately to both the department and the dean the concerns and dissatisfactions of the other. He may play one against the other to enhance his own position, in which case his days as chairman may be numbered. Or he may attempt to cater to the dissatisfactions of one, enforcing its demands upon the other, in which case the days of his life may be lessened by ulcers, high blood pressure, or heart failure. Only the honest broker role produces healthy reciprocated confidence. Diminishing or no confidence was demonstrated by frequent replacement of the chairman, by high rates of faculty turnover, inadequate support, and decline in quality of the departmental program.⁹²

Obviously the chairperson needs to be evaluated and studied. If done sensitively and intelligently, such study should be very constructive to the leadership behavior of the college or university department chairperson.

A Rationale

As was seen in the foregoing review of the selected literature, a number of factors were related to the leadership role analysis of the university division or department chairperson. The final consideration

concerning the chairperson was the oughts, the shoulds, or the ideal and how these expectations related to the overall theoretical model of this research.

Griffiths, one of the leading proponents of leadership decision theory, suggests: (1) recognize, define, and limit the problem; (2) evaluate the problem; (3) establish criteria by which solutions will be acceptable; (4) collect data; (5) formulate and select preferred solution or solutions; and (6) put into effect the preferred solution.⁹³

All that Griffiths and other theorists (Van Dusseldorp,⁹⁴ Churchman,⁹⁵ Banghart,⁹⁶ and Shrode⁹⁷) are really saying is "find out how to get as much information as possible about the situation." The above is suggesting a system approach to problem-solving. The first step in the systems approach for the leadership role analysis of division chairpersons was to select and adopt a model. For this research, the overall model selected was the ideal model.

Since the chairperson's leadership role has to do with decisions to act in particular situations, leadership role behavior presupposes clear understanding of what the situation is. The ones who are required to act need to know the context of their actions. In short, before department or division chairpersons can know where to go, they need to understand from whence they are starting. How can there be oughts and shoulds without those prerequisites? The significance of the university department or division chairperson is to recognize group expectations of the ideal chairperson role and to consider their end products or outcomes. Unfortunately, this overwhelming significance of the higher education chairperson's leadership role is too frequently

neglected.

Heimler suggests that the qualifications requisite to success as department chairman in terms of what should be may be categorized as follows:

1. Character. The ideal chairman uses discretion, makes good judgments, is in control of his emotions, is committed to human values, has the courage of his convictions, is capable of independent thought, and gains satisfaction through the achievements of others.
2. Administrative frame of reference. The ideal chairman possesses or has a predilection toward the development of an understanding and appreciation of the role of administration in promoting the goals of a college, and is willing to accept administrative authority and responsibility as legitimate concerns in his attitudes towards college policies and programs.
3. Job skills. The ideal chairman is able to chair meetings, write letters, organize and direct work for secretaries and student assistants, make the semester schedule, prepare agenda, review research proposals, and maintain departmental records.
4. Human relations. The ideal chairman has a basic understanding of and skills in counseling, advising, compromise, compassion and democratic processes.
5. Professional ability. The ideal chairman is outstanding in teaching, research and scholarship, consulting, college and community service; has an informed vision of his department's discipline and of its contribution to a student's education.⁹⁸

Duryea takes the position that the character of each institution contributes most to the ideal expectations of its members. Molded by historical and sociological trends, character forming variables include such elements as geographical location, background and attitudes of students and faculty, internal organizational structure, size, objectives, personalities of strong leaders, sources of financial support, and traditional ways of policy making and implementation.

Duryea believes that the concept of institutional character has

the following implications for the department chairperson: (1) it delimits the area within which department chairpersons can exert effective leadership, (2) it determines in general the decisions which are made, (3) it will affect the manner in which decisions are made, (4) an understanding of it makes possible the predictions of the consequences of decisions, and (5) it affects the kind of faculty members and administrative personnel it attracts and employs.⁹⁹ Thus, the concept of institutional character would affect the ideal expectations toward the oughts and shoulds of the university department chairperson. Consequently, this research was completed at a single institution of higher education.

Recall that Max Weber's rationalization of bureaucracy was intended to be an ideal construct. Also, recall the theoretical framework that was presented in Chapter I of this study.

Therefore, the rationale for this research on the university division chairperson at Northeastern Oklahoma State University was that the ideal is only the starting point, not the end, of formal higher education organizational theory analysis.

Summary

Chapter II has attempted to review selected literature relevant to the leadership field of higher education department chairpersons and developed a rationale for the study. The intent of this research was guided by a statement of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education which states:

. . . anything that can be done now or in the future to improve the performance of higher education in the United States will improve also the lives of the many

persons who now receive some higher education, the conduct of the many institutions in which all citizens participate, and the welfare of the nation as a whole.¹⁰⁰

There is no known investigation completed or in progress which analyzes the university division chairperson in the state of Oklahoma. The present study endeavors to make such an analysis. The procedures used in the collection of data are specified in Chapter III.

FOOTNOTES

¹Charles H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order (New York, 1902), p. 357.

²E. Mumford, "The Origins of Leadership," American Journal of Sociology, XII (1907), p. 216.

³F. W. Blackmar, "Leadership in Reform," American Journal of Sociology, XVI (1911), pp. 626-644.

⁴F. S. Chapin, "Leadership and Group Activity," Journal of Applied Sociology, VIII (1924), pp. 141-145.

⁵L. L. Bernard, "Leadership and Propaganda," in J. Davis and H. E. Barnes (eds.), An Introduction to Sociology (New York, 1927).

⁶W. V. Bingham, "Leadership," in H. C. Metcalf (ed.), The Psychological Foundations of Management (New York, 1927).

⁷O. Tead, The Art of Leadership (New York, 1939).

⁸H. H. Anderson, "An Examination of the Concepts of Domination and Integration in Relation to Dominance and Ascendance," Psychological Review, 47 (1940), pp. 21-37.

⁹D. Krech and R. S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York, 1948).

¹⁰Ralph M. Stogdill, "Leadership, Membership and Organization," Psychological Bulletin, 47 (1950), pp. 1-14.

¹¹H. Koontz and C. O'Donnell, Principles of Management (New York, 1955).

¹²C. L. Shartle, Executive Performance and Leadership (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1956).

¹³George R. Terry, Principles of Management (3rd ed., Homewood, Illinois, 1960), p. 5.

¹⁴Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization (New York, 1961).

¹⁵Robert K. Merton, "The Social Nature of Leadership," American Journal of Nursing, 69 (1969), pp. 2614-2618.

¹⁶Cecil A. Gibb, "Leadership," in Gardner Lindzey and F. Aronson (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, IV (2nd ed., Reading, Massachusetts, 1969).

¹⁷Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York, 1970), p. 304.

¹⁸Harold C. White, "Perceptions of Leadership by Managers in a Federal Agency," Personnel Administration and Public Personnel Review (July-August, 1972), pp. 51-56.

¹⁹Barry M. Richman and Richard N. Farmer, Leadership Goals and Power in Higher Education (San Francisco, 1974), p. 21.

²⁰Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research (New York, 1974), p. 16.

²¹F. A. Woods, The Influence of Monarchs (New York, 1913).

²²Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1939).

²³Fred Luthans, Organizational Behavior (New York, 1973), p. 32.

²⁴Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1938), p. 73.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 168-169.

²⁶Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, 25 (1948), p. 63.

²⁷Kinnard White, "Personality Characteristics of Educational Leaders: A Comparison of Administrators and Researchers," School Review, 73 (1965), pp. 292-300.

²⁸Keith Davis, Human Behavior at Work (4th ed., New York, 1972), pp. 103-104.

²⁹Max Weber, "Bureaucracy," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York, 1946), pp. 196-203.

³⁰Alan C. Filley and Robert J. House, Managerial Process and Organization Behavior (Glenview, Illinois, 1969), p. 409.

³¹Andrew W. Halpin, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio, 1957), p. 1.

³²John K. Hemphill, "Leadership Behavior Associated with Administrative Reputation of College Departments," Journal of Educational Psychology, 46 (1955), pp. 385-401.

³³Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt, "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review (March-April, 1957), pp. 95-101.

³⁴Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York, 1960).

³⁵Chris Argyris, Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness (Homewood, Illinois, 1962).

³⁶Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York, 1961).

³⁷Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, "Breakthrough in Organization Development," Harvard Business Review (November-December, 1964), p. 136.

³⁸James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York, 1958).

³⁹T. O. Jacobs, Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations (Alexandria, Virginia, 1971).

⁴⁰Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review (Winter, 1957), pp. 423-41.

⁴¹Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process," in Andrew W. Halpin (ed.), Administrative Theory in Education (Chicago, 1958), p. 152.

⁴²Ralph M. Stogdill, Individual Behavior and Group Achievement (New York, 1959).

⁴³Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York, 1961), p. 4.

⁴⁴Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967), p. 71.

⁴⁵Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness (New York, 1967), pp. 133-153.

⁴⁶Peter Drucker, The Practice of Management (New York, 1954).

⁴⁷Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, "What's Missing in MBO?" Management Review (October, 1974), p. 26.

⁴⁸Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969), p. 60.

⁴⁹Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research (New York, 1974), p. 23.

⁵⁰Paul L. Dressel, F. Craig Johnson, and Philip M. Marcus, The Confidence Crisis: An Analysis of University Departments (San Francisco, 1971), p. 1.

⁵¹Hastings Rashdall, in F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (eds.), The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, I (London, 1958), p. 324.

⁵²John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York, 1960), p. 85.

⁵³Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York, 1962), pp. 399-400.

⁵⁴George Ticknor, Life, Letters, and Journal of George Ticknor, I (Boston, 1876), p. 362.

⁵⁵Charles William Eliot, University Administration (Boston, 1908), pp. 57-58.

⁵⁶Rudolph, p. 121.

⁵⁷Joshua L. Chamberlain, ed., Universities and Their Sons, I (Boston, 1898), p. 156.

⁵⁸Richard J. Storr, Harper's University: The Beginnings (Chicago, 1966), pp. 75-76.

⁵⁹Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago, 1965), pp. 320-321.

⁶⁰Eliot, p. 126.

⁶¹A. R. Hill, "Departmental Organization," National Association of State Universities Transactions (1911), pp. 133-140.

⁶²D. Greene, "Departmental Administration in American Universities," Journal of Proceeding and Addresses of the Thirteenth Annual Conference, Association of American Universities (1911), p. 19.

⁶³*Ibid.*, pp. 17-35.

⁶⁴R. Freeman Butts, "Formulation of Policy in American College and Universities," in G. Bereday (ed.), Higher Education Yearbook of Education 1959 (New York, 1959), p. 225.

⁶⁵Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus, pp. 241-242.

⁶⁶Edward A. Doyle, S. J., The Status and Functions of the Department Chairman (Washington, D. C., 1953).

⁶⁷John K. Hemphill, "Leadership Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputation of College Departments," The Journal of Educational Psychology (1955), pp. 385-401.

⁶⁸Hal Reed Ramer, "Perceptions of University Departments and of the Role of Their Chairmen: A Study of Some Attitudes and Opinions of Selected Professors, Department Chairmen, Deans, and Central Administrators of the Ohio State University" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1963).

⁶⁹Laura Marguerite Patterson, "Preferences in Administrative Styles Based on an Inquiry into Perceptions of the Ideal Structure of the University Department and the Ideal Role of the Department Chairman" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, 1966).

⁷⁰Winston W. Hill and Wendell L. French, "Perceptions of Power of Department Chairmen by Professors," Administrative Science Quarterly (1967), pp. 548-574.

⁷¹Robert Clement Davidson, "The Administrative Role of Department Chairmen in Public Four-Year Colleges" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1967).

⁷²Glenn Burnett Schroeder, "Leadership Behavior of Department Chairmen in Selected State Institutions of Higher Education" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1969).

⁷³Robert Abbott Bullen, Jr., "A Study of the Perceptions of Selected Deans, Departmental Chairmen and Faculty on the Role of the Departmental Chairman at the University of Alabama" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1969).

⁷⁴Jehiel Novick, "The Role of Department Chairmen in University Governance in Large Midwestern Universities as Perceived by Faculty, Chairmen, and Administrators" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1970).

⁷⁵Gordon Gerald Darkenwald, Jr., "The Department Chairman Role in Relation to the Social Organization of Colleges and Universities" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970).

⁷⁶Bessie Keeney Gerstenberger, "Relation of Task and Environment in Higher Education to Administrative Leader Behavior as Reflected by Recreation Department Chairmen" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1974).

⁷⁷Kenneth Ross Meredith, "A Descriptive Study of the Art and Art Education Chairman's Role in State Supported Four-Year Colleges and Universities in the United States" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1975).

⁷⁸Earl Melvin Washington, "The Relationship Between College Department Chairperson's Leadership Style as Perceived by Teaching Faculty and that Faculty's Feeling of Job Satisfaction" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975).

⁷⁹Gerald W. McLaughlin, James R. Montgomery, and Leslie F. Malpass, "Selected Characteristics, Roles, Goals, and Satisfaction of Department Chairmen in State and Land-Grant Institutions," Research in Higher Education, 3 (1975), p. 259.

⁸⁰Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation (San Francisco, 1974), p. 80.

⁸¹Evaluation of the Department Chairman, Committee Report, University of Western Michigan (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1970).

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Robert L. Hobson, "Some Psychological Dimensions of Academic Administrators," Studies in Higher Education LXXXXIII (Lafayette, Indiana, 1950), pp. 7-53.

⁸⁴Oscar K. Buros, Test in Print II (Highland Park, New Jersey, 1974), pp. 749-750.

⁸⁵Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII (Columbia, Ohio, 1968), p. 3.

⁸⁶Rensis Likert, The Human Organization (New York, 1967), pp. 4-10.

⁸⁷Richard I. Miller, p. 88.

⁸⁸Evaluation of the Department Chairman, University of Western Michigan (1970).

⁸⁹Evaluation of the Department Chairman, Committee Report, University of Kansas (Lawrence, Kansas, 1971).

⁹⁰Tyrus Hillway, Manual for the Rating Scale for Academic Administration (Greeley, Colorado, 1972), p. 2.

⁹¹Richard I. Miller, p. 86

⁹²Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus, p. 141.

⁹³Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory (New York, 1959), p. 113.

⁹⁴Ralph A. Van Dusseldorp, Duane E. Richardson, and Walter J. Foley, Educational Decision-Making Through Operations Research (Boston, 1970).

⁹⁵C. W. Churchman, The Systems Approach (New York, 1968).

⁹⁶Frank W. Banghart, Educational Systems Analysis (New York, 1969).

⁹⁷William A. Shrode and Dan Voich, Jr., Organization and Management: Basic Systems Concepts (Homewood, Illinois, 1974).

⁹⁸Charles H. Heimler, "The College Departmental Chairman," in James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet (eds.), The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role (Detroit, Michigan, 1972), p. 203.

⁹⁹E. E. Duryea, "The Theory and Practice of Administration," in G. P. Burns (ed.), Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Considerations (New York, 1968), pp. 38-40.

¹⁰⁰Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Final Report, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York, 1973), pp. 22-23.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

As previously mentioned, this study was concerned with the leadership role expectations of the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons regarding the ideal position of the university division chairperson. As defined by Kerlinger, "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."¹ This chapter, therefore, discusses the procedures and techniques followed in this research. This includes the population involved in the study, information about the instrument, method of data collection, and an explanation of the statistical treatment of the data.

The Population

(The population investigated in this study was comprised of three Northeastern Oklahoma State University groups which included the following: (1) teaching faculty, (2) central administrators, and (3) division chairpersons. An attempt was made to obtain a response from 100 percent of the teaching faculty, central administrators, and division chairpersons who were employed full time at the institution for the academic year 1976-1977. The total population for this study

was composed of 180 people: 153 teaching faculty members, 20 central administrators, and 7 division chairpersons.)

A further description of the population was obtained from answers to questions on the survey instrument. The answers to those questions were used in grouping the responses for statistical treatment described later in Chapter IV. A comparison of the demographic data of the population is presented in Table I. The answers indicated that 108 members of the population, or 60.00 percent, held the earned doctorate. It is interesting to note that of this number, 71, or 65.74 percent, had earned the Ed.D. degree. In regard to professorial rank, the greatest frequency was 64, or 35.55 percent, of the population were assistant professors. The answers also indicated that 177, or 65.00 percent, of the total population were on tenure.

Regarding the gender of the population investigated, the teaching faculty had 36 female instructors, or 23.52 percent. Central administration had two female administrators, or 10.00 percent, while there were no female division chairpersons. As Table I illustrates, the survey indicated that 163 of the respondents, or 90.55 percent, were Caucasian; and 17, or 09.44 percent, were of a minority ethnic group.

The average teaching faculty age was between 40 to 49, while the average central administrator and division chairperson ages were between 40 to 49 and 30 to 39, respectively. An additional descriptive item indicated the greatest percent of the population, 22.22 percent, had been employed at the present institution for 10 to 12 years. The results of further analysis of responses from the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons thus made possible the findings of this study.

TABLE I

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE BY THE TEACHING FACULTY, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION,
AND DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS ON CERTAIN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES*

Demographic Variables		TF N 153	%	CA N 20	%	DC N 7	%	TOTALS N 180	%
Sex	(a) Female	36	23.52	2	10.00	0	00.00	38	21.11
	(b) Male	117	76.47	18	90.00	7	100.00	142	78.88
Highest Earned Degree	(a) A.A.	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00
	(b) B.S./B.A.	2	01.30	1	05.00	0	00.00	3	01.66
	(c) M.S./M.A.	57	37.25	5	25.00	1	14.28	63	35.00
	(d) MBA/MFA	3	01.96	1	05.00	0	00.00	4	02.22
	(e) Ed.S.	2	01.30	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	01.11
	(f) Ph.D.	31	20.26	4	20.00	2	28.57	37	20.55
	(g) Ed.D.	58	37.90	9	45.00	4	57.14	71	39.44
Tenure	(a) Yes	100	65.35	11	55.00	6	85.71	117	65.00
	(b) No	53	34.64	9	45.00	1	14.28	63	35.00
Professorial Rank	(a) Instructor	18	11.76	3	15.00	0	00.00	21	11.66
	(b) Asst. Prof.	59	38.56	4	20.00	1	14.28	64	35.55
	(c) Assoc. Prof.	33	21.56	2	10.00	2	28.57	37	20.55
	(d) Professor	39	25.49	8	40.00	4	57.14	51	28.33
	(e) Other	4	02.61	3	15.00	0	00.00	7	03.88

TABLE I (CONCLUDED)

Demographic Variables		TF		CA		DC		TOTALS	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
		153		20		7		180	
Age	(a) 20-29	6	03.92	0	00.00	0	00.00	6	03.33
	(b) 30-39	32	20.91	3	15.00	4	57.00	39	21.66
	(c) 40-49	60	39.21	9	45.00	2	28.57	71	39.44
	(d) 50-59	45	29.41	7	35.00	1	14.28	53	29.44
	(e) 60-70	10	06.53	1	05.00	0	00.00	11	06.11
	(f) Over 70	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00
Ethnic Group	(a) Am. Indian	7	04.57	2	10.00	0	00.00	9	05.00
	(b) Asian	3	01.96	0	00.00	0	00.00	3	01.66
	(c) Black	4	02.61	0	00.00	0	00.00	4	02.22
	(d) White	138	90.19	18	90.00	7	100.00	163	90.55
	(e) Other	1	00.65	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	00.55
Number of Years with Present Institution	(a) 0-3	20	13.07	2	10.00	0	00.00	22	12.22
	(b) 4-6	18	11.76	3	15.00	0	00.00	21	11.66
	(c) 7-9	28	18.30	5	25.00	5	71.42	37	20.55
	(d) 10-12	36	23.52	2	10.00	1	14.28	40	22.22
	(e) 13-15	29	18.95	3	15.00	0	00.00	32	17.77
	(f) 16-20	12	07.84	1	05.00	1	14.28	14	07.77
	(g) Over 20	10	06.53	4	20.00	0	00.00	14	07.00

* The initials TF, CA, and DC denote Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairpersons groups, respectively.

Instrumentation

The Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire,² hereafter referred to as the ILBDQ, was employed to ascertain the differences in ideal leadership behavior of university division chairpersons as described by the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons themselves. The ILBDQ, composed of forty Likert-type items, is divided into two specific dimensions--Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior--for measurement of expectations about what a university division chairperson's leadership behavior ought to be.)

The definitions of Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior have been stated a little differently by various authors; however, according to Gibb, no better statements are available than those offered by Fleishman:

Initiating Structure Behavior--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 very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterized individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways.

Consideration Behavior--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with his subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between himself and them. / A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in his relations with group members.³

Only thirty of the forty items on the ILBDQ were scored; fifteen in each dimension of Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior. As stated by Halpin, the ten unscored items have been

retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire.⁴

For this study, the respondents indicated the frequency with which the division chairperson 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 from 4 to 0, according to scoring keys provided by the authors. Consequently, the theoretical range of scores on each dimension is from 0 to 60.

The ILBDQ used in this study was originally constructed by Hemphill and Coons for use in the Ohio State Leadership Studies in 1950. Hemphill and his associates developed a list of approximately 1,800 items describing different aspects of leader behavior. These items were sorted into 150 items that were used to develop the first form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.⁵ Several factor analytic studies of item intercorrelation 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.⁶

According to Halpin, the "reliability by the split-half method is 0.83 for Initiating Structure Behavior scores and 0.92 for the Consideration Behavior."⁷ (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.)

For example, one of these studies designed to check the validity of the instrument was conducted by Stogdill and Coon.⁸ They found that when the agreement among respondents in describing their respective

leaders had been checked by a "between-group versus within-group" analysis of variance, the F ratios all had been found significant at the 0.01 level.

On the other hand, Mitchell used a Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis of Validity design to determine the validity of the ILBDQ. He reported the evidence for construct validity is rather slight.⁹

However, for the purposes of this study, the instrument was considered reliable. It was also considered to be valid as the instrument was measuring the kind of behavior the investigator assumed it was as well as adequately sampling the kind of leader behavior.

In addition, the instrumentation consisted of several items constructed by the investigator to gather demographic data about the population as well as normative data in the form of introductory questions concerning organizational issues of the division chairperson. These items were examined and selected by a panel of experts. A copy of the instrument used in the study is included in Appendix C.

Data Collection

(To obtain the expectations of the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons, this study utilized the questionnaire method as a means of higher education investigation.) Koos encouraged the use of such methodology in educational research as early as 1928 when he stated:

Use the questionnaire to ascertain the state of practice in some field of activity, to secure basic data to be used in ways more fundamental than to afford a mere description of practice, and to secure opinion, judgments, or the expression of attitudes of respondents from which, if nothing more, tentative measures or evaluations may be derived. The questionnaire permits the gathering of such information

obtainable in no other way.¹⁰

This method of investigating has subsequently been realized as a valuable research tool, and in 1959, Good supported this method when he 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 enumerators. . . .¹¹

Scates and Yeomans likewise added support to the questionnaire method of higher educational research when they stated:

The questionnaire should be important not only to the investigator and to the particular field of knowledge, but also to the respondent, whose psychology of motivation involves his attention, sympathy, interests, cooperation, and honesty in answering questions.¹²

On January 19, 1977, the questionnaire survey forms were sent through the Northeastern Oklahoma State University campus mail to 210 respondents in the three selected groups. They received a cover letter (Appendix A) of explanation from the investigator, the preliminary demographic and normative questions, and the ILBDQ. When they had completed the instrument, they were asked to use the same envelope, cross out their name, and address the next box to the investigator who is a faculty member at the same university. In addition, another device was employed to ensure accuracy of return. This involved a series of dots inked over words on questionnaire items. The code employed there corresponded to a number assigned to each individual of the sample. This coding provided for the follow-up of those individuals of the population not responding.

Within two weeks of the initial mailing of the 210 questionnaires,

137 members of the sampel responded, representing 65 percent of the total population. On February 2, 1977, a follow-up letter (Appendix B) was sent urging those whose questionnaire had not been received to please respond. Following this effort, 26 more members of the sample responded, representing a new total of 163 members, or 78 percent, of the total population.

One week later, additional procedures for obtaining responses were employed; these involved telephone calls, personal visits, and the mailing of a questionnaire in response to requests from those individuals who had lost or misplaced others sent to them. These procedures continued until February 11, 1977, by which time an adequate number of responses had been obtained for the study to continue as evidenced in Table II.

TABLE II
QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Population	Total Sent	Total Returned	Percentage
Teaching Faculty	182	153	84.06
Central Administration	21	20	95.23
Division Chairpersons	7	7	100.00
Totals	210	180	85.71

In addition, after completion of further efforts to encourage individual participation, the researcher attempted to identify the different reasons why 14.29 percent of the total population were not willing to respond to the questionnaire. The following are some major reasons cited by the non-respondents expressing opinions to the researcher: concerned and upset that the questionnaire was coded, believed only in the pre-test and post-test experimental research design, some faculty members were concerned that individual answers would be read by administrators, some were too busy to answer the questionnaire, others thought the questionnaire was too long, some were concerned that the questionnaire was too personal, a few felt an ambivalence and vagueness of the research topic, some believed faculty members should not be research, some did not really care about the type or kind of division chairperson at this university, a few felt this university already has too many doctorates, and some believed it was not their duty or responsibility to fill out questionnaires.

The Statistical Treatment

All data were punched on cards and computation of all statistics involved in the study was done on a computer using a program in the library of the Oklahoma State University Computer Center at Stillwater, Oklahoma, and the Northeastern Oklahoma State University Data Processing Center at Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

The major purpose of this study was to identify the significance of differences among the population groups on reported selected ideal leader behaviors of the university division chairperson. Thus, a statistical tool was needed which would yield computation of

differences among groups of this study.

(The analysis of variance was selected as the appropriate statistical tool to test the research hypotheses.) According to Guilford and Fruchter, this is a statistical analysis which uses the mean and mean squares of two or more groups as a basis of comparing the groups on some chosen dimension. A significant F ratio reveals that the differences are between group sets and that the group sets are not similar in these dimensions which are being calculated.¹³

Summary

Chapter III has been concerned with the procedures, the population, measuring instrument questionnaire, and statistical treatment which were employed in this investigation. The data for this study were collected during the Spring, 1977, Semester at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, where the investigation was undertaken.

This study was initiated to ascertain if there were any significant differences concerning the ideal leader behavior and organizational issues of the university division chairperson as viewed by the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons. Data from the study will be presented and analyzed in Chapter IV.

FOOTNOTES

¹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York, 1964), p. 280.

²Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, Copyright (1977).

³Cecil A. Gibb, in Oscar K. Buros (ed.), The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (Highland Park, New Jersey, 1972), p. 1150.

* ⁴Andrew W. Halpin, Manual for the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio, 1957), p. 1.

⁵Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research (New York, 1974), p. 128.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Halpin, p. 1.

⁸Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coon, eds., Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, The Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio, 1957).

⁹Terence R. Mitchell, "The Construct Validity of Three Dimensions of Leadership Research," The Journal of Social Psychology, 80 (1970), p. 93.

¹⁰Leonard V. Koos, The Questionnaire in Education: A Critique and Manual (New York, 1928), pp. 147-149.

¹¹Carter V. Good, Introduction to Educational Research (New York, 1959), pp. 190-205.

¹²Douglas E. Scates and Alice V. Yeomans, "Developing a Depth Questionnaire to Explore Motivation and Likelihood of Actions," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 12 (1962), pp. 620-631.

¹³J. P. Guilford and Benjamin Fruchter, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York, 1973), pp. 229-281.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

(The purpose of this study was to determine whether there were differences among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons regarding the ideal leadership role expectations and organizational issues of division chairpersons.) The instrument used to gather the data to test the hypotheses of the study was administered to a population of 180 personnel at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, during the Spring Semester, 1977. The subjects included 153 teaching faculty members, 20 central administrators, and 7 division chairpersons. The data gathered also enabled the investigator to find answers to normative questions concerning division organizational issues and the leadership role. Presentation and analysis of the data are included in this chapter according to the procedures presented in Chapter III.

Testing the Hypotheses

The analysis of variance, single classification, was used to test each of the two null hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance:

H_{0_1} : There are no significant differences concerning the role expectation of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "initiating structure behavior" as measured by

the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Ho₂: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectation of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "consideration behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

The first task was to determine the homogeneity of variance for Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior among the three higher educational groups. (A major assumption to be satisfied before the application of analysis of variance is homogeneity of variance.) (To determine whether the data of the ILBDQ scores of the present study met this requirement, the following null hypotheses were tested: In the universe,)

Ho₁: No differences exist in the variance of the three subgroups with respect to Initiating Structure Behavior.

Ho₂: No differences exist in the variances of the three subgroups with respect to Consideration Behavior.

Because of the unequal sizes of the respective groups, (Bartlett's test of homogeneity of variance for samples differing in size was used to test the null hypotheses.¹) The necessary data computed for the respective groups for Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior are presented in Table III.

The results of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance yielded chi-square values of 3.151 for Initiating Structure Behavior and 5.307 for Consideration Behavior. The tabled chi-square value for two degrees of freedom is 5.991 at the 0.05 level of significance. The computed chi-square value for Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior was found to be less than the tabled chi-square value; therefore, (the null hypotheses for homogeneity of variances of the three groups is not rejected.)

TABLE III
BARTLETT'S TESTS OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCE

Subgroup*	df(n-1)	1/(n-1)	Σx^2	s^2	Log s^2	(n-1)Log s^2
Initiating Structure Behavior						
TF	152	.00657	5524.7189	36.3468	1.5604	237.1808
CA	19	.05263	437.8000	23.0421	1.3625	25.8875
DC	6	.16666	90.8571	15.1428	1.1802	7.0812
Total (Σ)	177	.22586	6053.3760	74.5317	4.1031	270.1495
Consideration Behavior						
TF	152	.00657	3670.0000	24.1447	1.3828	210.1856
CA	19	.05263	310.8000	16.3578	1.2137	23.0603
DC	6	.16666	27.4285	4.5714	0.6600	3.9600
Total (Σ)	177	.22586	4008.2285	45.0739	3.2565	237.2059

Chi-square for Initiating Structure Behavior = 3.1511.

Chi-square for Consideration Behavior = 5.3079.

Tabled chi-square value for two degrees of freedom at the 0.05 level of confidence = 5.991.

* The initials TF, CA, and DC denote Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairpersons groups, respectively.

Having completed the test for homogeneity of variance, the second task was to test the validity of the research hypotheses.

(The analysis of variance, single classification, was used to test each of the two null hypotheses at the 0.05 level:)

Ho₁: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectation of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "initiating structure behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Ho₂: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectation of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "consideration behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

The necessary data, including the mean, sum of scores, and sum of squares for each group and total population, are presented in Table IV. In the normal manner, the sum of squares and variance estimate were calculated for each source of variation and the degrees of freedom determined. The results are presented in Table V. With 2 and 177 degrees of freedom, the F tabled value at the 0.05 level is 3.05. The obtained F values for Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior was 0.759 and 0.454, respectively. In each case, the results evidenced that the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no basis for concluding that the ideal expectation for "initiating structure behavior" and "consideration behavior" for division chairpersons varies among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons in this population of higher education personnel.

Normative Data

The final portion of this chapter is utilized to summarize the normative answers concerning the division organizational issues and the

TABLE IV
SUMS OF RAW SCORES, MEANS, AND SUMS OF SQUARES
FOR EACH GROUP AND TOTAL--ILBDQ*

Subgroup	X_{TF}	X_{CA}	X_{DC}	X_{Tot}
Initiating Structure Behavior				
N	153	20	7	180
ΣX	7007.00	942.00	309.00	8258.00
\bar{X}	45.79	47.10	44.14	45.87
ΣX^2	326427.00	44806.00	13731.00	384964.00
Consideration Behavior				
N	153	20	7	180
ΣX	7446.00	952.00	338.00	8736.00
\bar{X}	48.66	47.60	48.28	48.53
ΣX^2	366042.00	45626.00	16348.00	428016.00

* The subscripts TF, CA, and DC denote Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairperson groups, respectively.

TABLE V
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ILBDQ SCORES REGARDING THE DIVISION
CHAIRPERSON AS PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHING FACULTY,
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, AND DIVISION
CHAIRPERSONS

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Variance Estimate
Initiating Structure Behavior			
Between Groups	2	51.95	25.97
Within Groups	177	6053.38	34.19
Total	179	6105.32	
$F_{obs} = 0.75 < F_{crit} 0.05 \text{ df } (2,177) = 3.05$			
Consideration Behavior			
Between Groups	2	20.57	10.28
Within Groups	177	4008.23	22.64
Total	179	4028.80	
$F_{obs} = 0.45 < F_{crit} 0.05 \text{ df } (2,177) = 3.05$			

chairperson's leadership role. Since no prior hypotheses were formulated, no statistical tests were made on these data. The comparisons of responses by the teaching faculty, central administrators, and division chairpersons on certain division organizational issues are presented in Table VI.

Comparing the responses, it was found that, on a percentage basis, the three groups were closely allied on some issues. As indicated in Table VI, 75.16 percent of the faculty, 75.00 percent of central administration, and 57.14 percent of the division chairpersons believed that graduate courses in higher education administration and instruction would be beneficial to those holding the position of division chairperson. However, only 57.14 percent of the division chairpersons had ever had a graduate course in administration and instruction of higher education. Also, it is interesting to note that 59.47 percent of the faculty, and 65.00 percent of the central administrators had completed a graduate course in higher education administration and instruction. In response to the question of who should the division chairperson represent there was disparity: 52.94 percent of the faculty, 90.00 percent of the central administration, and 85.57 percent of the division chairpersons felt that the division chairperson should represent central administration and the teaching faculty both equally. At the same time, 43.79 percent of the teaching faculty thought that the division chairperson should mainly represent them.

As illustrated in Table VI, some other points of disparity were on the issues of rotational chairpersonships and a time limit on holding the position of division chairperson. Seventy percent of the central administration opposed the rotation of division chairpersons

TABLE VI
COMPARISONS OF RESPONSES BY THE TEACHING FACULTY, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, AND
DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS ON CERTAIN DIVISION ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES*

Division Organizational Issues		TF N 153	%	CA N 20	%	DC N 7	%	TOTALS N 180	%
Graduate courses in higher ed. adm. and instr. would be beneficial for a chairperson.	(a) Yes	115	75.16	15	75.00	4	57.14	134	74.44
	(b) No	38	24.83	5	25.00	3	42.85	46	25.55
Ever taken a graduate course in higher ed. administration and instr.	(a) Yes	91	59.47	13	65.00	4	57.14	108	60.00
	(b) No	62	40.52	7	35.00	3	42.85	72	40.00
Who should the division chairperson represent.	(a) Adm.	5	03.26	0	00.00	0	00.00	5	02.77
	(b) Faculty	67	43.79	2	10.00	1	14.28	70	38.88
	(c) Both	81	52.94	18	90.00	6	85.57	105	58.33
Favor rotational division chairpersonship.	(a) Yes	65	42.48	5	25.00	3	42.85	73	40.55
	(b) No	88	57.51	15	75.00	4	57.14	107	59.44

TABLE VI (CONCLUDED)

		TF		CA		DC		TOTALS	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Division Organizational Issues		153		20		7		180	
Favor a time limit on holding position of chairperson.	(a) Yes	65	42.48	5	25.00	2	28.57	72	40.00
	(b) No	88	57.51	15	75.00	5	71.42	108	60.00
Your influence on division policies and procedures.	(a) Very little	70	45.00	5	25.00	0	00.00	75	41.66
	(b) Moderate	76	49.00	12	60.00	4	57.14	92	51.11
	(c) Very much	7	04.57	3	15.00	3	42.85	13	07.22
Extent of faculty participation in determination of division policies and procedures.	(a) Very poor	23	15.03	0	00.00	0	00.00	23	12.77
	(b) Poor	39	25.49	3	15.00	0	00.00	42	23.33
	(c) Average	55	35.94	3	15.00	2	28.57	60	33.33
	(d) Good	27	17.64	12	60.00	4	57.14	43	23.88
	(e) Very good	9	05.88	2	10.00	1	14.28	12	06.66

* The initials TF, CA, and DC denote Teaching Faculty, Central Administration, and Division Chairpersons groups, respectively.

but only 57.51 percent of the faculty, and 57.14 percent of the division chairpersons were in opposition. Forty-two percent of the faculty favored a time limit, while only 25.00 percent of central administration and 28.57 percent of division chairpersons thought there should be a time limit on being in the position of division chairpersonship.

Has the university division a "governance power elite" and a "tendency toward oligarchy," or is its decision system open to influence from its teaching faculty? There was a marked difference in the three groups' opinions concerning the extent of faculty participation in the determination of division policies and procedures. Of the total teaching faculty, only 23.52 percent viewed their participation as good to very good, while 70.00 percent of the central administration and 71.42 percent of the division chairpersons felt that the faculty participation was good to very good. Also as Table VI indicates, 45.00 percent of the teaching faculty believed that they have very little influence on the making of division policies and procedures at the university.

When the respondents were asked to write their own opinion on what should be the most important leadership role for the division chairperson at this university, the list illustrated a wide range of opinions.

As presented in Table VII, the frequency of responses showed that the teaching faculty felt the three most important leadership roles for the division chairperson should be: (1) a sincere representation of faculty views to central administration, (2) considerate and sympathetic attitude regarding faculty and students' needs, and (3) open lines for communicating effectively and clearly to the faculty and

TABLE VII
 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO THE MOST IMPORTANT LEADERSHIP
 ROLE FOR THE DIVISION CHAIRPERSON AS VIEWED BY
 THE TEACHING FACULTY

N	The Leadership Role
28	Sincere representation of faculty views to central administration
20	Considerate and sympathetic attitude regarding faculty and students' needs
11	Open lines for communicating effectively and clearly to the faculty and students
9	Fairness in dealing with faculty and students
7	Liaison between the faculty and central administration
6	Considerate attitude regarding and asking for faculty input for decision-making
6	Protection and improvement of faculty salaries
5	Development of programs for staff improvement
5	Coordination encouragement of improvement for quality instruction
5	Development of excellence in instruction and programs
4	Absorbing the frustrations and reduce the concerns of the faculty
4	Coordination of problem solving for faculty and students
4	Motivate the faculty for quality instruction
4	Coordination of division policies, procedures, and programs
3	Coordination of the division goals
3	Proper administration of divisional funds
3	Anticipation of future divisional developments
3	Establishment of divisional objectives and goals
2	Encouragement of quality programs
2	Inform the university of the achievements of the division
2	Work effectively with faculty members
2	Evaluate faculty fairly
2	Coordinate faculty talents to maximize use
2	Present an atmosphere for good and/or new approaches of instruction to take place
1	Promotion of harmony between faculty and central administration
1	Develop defined standards of achievements for faculty and students
1	Concern for the total welfare of the division
1	Ability to encourage division teamwork
1	Develop institutional loyalty
1	Ability to inspire confidence
1	Protect the professional rights of the faculty
1	Assign work fairly

students.

On the other hand, and as Table VIII illustrated, motivation and development of the faculty for quality instruction and service were cited more often by central administrators as being the most important leadership role for the division chairperson.

However, the seven division chairpersons, in response to the question, listed seven similar but different approaches as being the most important leadership roles of the division chairperson. As listed in Table IX, the most important leadership role for division chairpersons tends to be the encouragement for excellence in teaching.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of the present study resulting from a comparison of the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons concerning the leadership role and certain organizational issues of the division chairperson. The results were interpreted according to the (1) analysis of variance, single classification, and (2) proportions of questionnaire responses expressed as percentages.

The two null hypotheses involving Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior were not rejected. In the final portion of the chapter, normative data of the population of the present investigation were summarized and analyzed.

Chapter V will present the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations of the study based on these findings.

2

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO THE MOST IMPORTANT LEADERSHIP
ROLE FOR THE DIVISION CHAIRPERSON AS VIEWED BY
THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

N	The Leadership Role
9	Motivate and develop the faculty for quality and outstanding instruction and service to the institution
4	Coordination of division policies, procedures, and programs
3	Liaison between faculty and central administration
1	Considerate and sympathetic attitude toward faculty and students' needs
1	Protect the professional rights of faculty
1	Fairness in dealing with faculty and students
1	Interprets the needs of the division and coordinates efforts to meet those needs


TABLE IX

RESPONSES TO THE MOST IMPORTANT LEADERSHIP ROLE
FOR THE DIVISION CHAIRPERSON AS VIEWED BY
EACH DIVISION CHAIRPERSON

The Leadership Role
Selection and development of faculty for outstanding instruction
Coordination of problem-solving for the division
Present an atmosphere where faculty members and students can work to the limit of their capabilities
Coordination of division policies, procedures, and evaluation of instructional programs
Determine the needs of the division and coordinate efforts to meet those needs
Promotion of a positive division direction for quality performance of faculty and students
Keep the division faculty working as a team to provide high-quality instruction

FOOTNOTES

¹George W. Snedecor, Statistical Methods (5th ed., Ames, Iowa, 1956), pp. 285-287.



CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The previous chapter reported the statistical findings related to the major hypotheses and the normative data of the study. 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

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in responses among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons concerning the ideal leadership role expectations and organizational issues of the university division chairperson. The 180 subjects comprising the sample included 153 teaching faculty, 20 central administrators, and 7 division chairpersons employed at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, during the spring semester of 1977.

The instrument used in this study was the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (ILBDQ) in addition to eight introductory questions concerning certain organizational issues to gather normative data.

This investigation was designed to test the following null hypotheses at the 0.05 level:

Ho₁: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectation of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "initiating structure behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Ho₂: There are no significant differences concerning the role expectation of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "consideration behavior" as measured by the Ideal Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire.

The statistical treatment of the data to test the preceding hypotheses was the Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance and the analysis of variance, single classification. Also, the opinions of each group regarding certain division chairpersons' organizational issues were analyzed by proportions of responses expressed as percentages.

Conclusions of the Study

The following conclusions seem warranted from the results of the statistical treatment of the data:

1. The hypothesis of no significant difference concerning the ideal division chairperson leadership role expectation for Initiating Structure Behavior among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons was not rejected. It would appear that the ideal leadership role expectation for the division chairperson to play an active role in planning, communicating, scheduling, criticizing, and defining goals does not vary with the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons in this

population of higher education personnel.

2. The hypothesis of no significant difference concerning the leadership role expectation for Consideration Behavior by the ideal division chairperson among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons (was not rejected.) It would appear that the ideal leadership role expectation for the division chairperson to be characterized by mutual trust, respect for other people's ideas, and a climate of warmth does not vary with the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons in this population of higher education personnel.
3. On the basis of the results of this sample regarding Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior, it would appear that the three groups view the two dimensions as compatible forms of leadership behavior for the division chairperson.
4. In terms of effective ideal division chairperson leadership, it would appear from the results among the three groups of this present study to be associated with high scores above the median on both dimensions--Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior. However, central administration expects slightly more Initiating Structure Behavior by the division chairperson than the teaching faculty and division chairpersons themselves expect. Also, the teaching faculty expects slightly more Consideration Behavior than Initiating Structure Behavior from the division chairperson.
5. No major percentage difference existed among the high

percentages of the three groups in believing that graduate courses in higher education administration and instruction would be beneficial for a division chairperson. However, approximately one-half of the division chairpersons, one-half of the teaching faculty, and one-third of the central administration had never taken a graduate course in higher education administration and instruction.

6. There was a difference in attitude with reference to rotation of division chairpersons. Approximately one-half of the teaching faculty, one-half of the division chairpersons, and only one-fourth of the central administration favored rotational division chairpersonships.
7. There was a difference in opinions regarding a time limit on holding the position of division chairperson. Approximately one-half of the teaching faculty favored a time limit, while only one-fourth of the central administration and division chairpersons favored a time limit on holding the position of division chairperson.
8. There was some difference in attitudes of the three groups with reference to individual influence in determining division policies and procedures. Only five percent of the teaching faculty, fifteen percent of the central administration, and one-half of the division chairpersons thought they had "very much" influence in the determination of division policies and procedures. It would appear that many in the sample have a sincere feeling of powerlessness regarding the formulation of division policies and procedures.

9. There was a major difference in the state of feeling of the three groups with reference to the extent of the teaching faculty participation in the determination of division policies and procedures. Of the total teaching faculty, only one-fourth viewed their participation as "good to very good," while approximately three-fourths of the central administration and three-fourths of the division chairpersons believed that the faculty participation in the determination of policies and procedures at the division level was "good to very good."
10. The teaching faculty expressed a preference for a division chairperson leadership role to be: (1) a sincere representation of faculty views to central administration, (2) a considerate and sympathetic attitude regarding faculty and students' needs, and (3) open lines for communicating effectively and clearly to the faculty and students.
11. Central administrators considered the most important division leadership role to be: (1) develop and motivate the faculty for quality and outstanding instruction; (2) coordination of division policies, procedures, and programs; and (3) a liaison between the faculty and central administration.
12. Division chairpersons interpret their primary leadership role to be: (1) selection and development of a faculty for performance of quality instruction, (2) promotion of an organizational climate where the faculty and students can work to the limit of their capabilities, and (3) determination of the needs of the division and coordination of efforts to meet

those needs.

Implications

The rationale from which the research questions guiding the study were deduced stressed the ideal model and the organizational development model. (It was assumed that if the division chairperson leadership is to be effective, then the chairperson must recognize group expectations of the ideal chairperson leadership role and certain organizational issues and to consider their end products or outcomes.)

Failure to reject the hypotheses that no significant differences concerning the role expectations of division chairpersons among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons for "initiating structure behavior" and "consideration behavior" as measured by the ILBDQ raises some interesting questions and speculations.

The importance of an individual's conceptions regarding the division chairpersons' role behavior factors and their own role seemed very important to the outcome of this study. As reported in Chapter II, the theories of Argyris, Barnard, March and Simon, Etzioni, and Getzels and Guba were all concerned with interpreting role expectations. The absence of significant differences concerning the role expectations for division chairpersons' "initiating structure behavior" and "consideration behavior" among the three groups of this study may well have resulted because the respondents were reporting from personal vested interest. In other words, all of the respondents' views may be similar collectively as measured by the ILBDQ; but, each member may hold a difference in personal perceived expectancies of actions leading to various outcomes. Also, the respondents might have been reporting

according to how they felt about the total state of Northeastern Oklahoma State University at that particular time.

The findings concerning the extent of individual participation in the determination of division policies and procedures and concerning the most important leadership role for the division chairperson at this university lend some support to the above speculations.

Furthermore, the findings of the present study seemed to confirm the impressions of a number of research studies reported in Chapter II. For example, recall from Chapter II the study by Hemphill regarding the leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments: the departments with high reputation were those whose chairpersons scored high on both leader behavior dimensions; and the greater the departure from the norm of how ideal behavior on either dimension was perceived by the members, the poorer was the administrative reputation of the department. ✓

For other examples of similar research results, recall also from Chapter II the studies conducted by Ramer (chairperson is not aggressive enough in communicating faculty needs to upper university echelons), Patterson (faculty members regard the ideal department chairperson as a facilitator of their own self-determined goals), Schroeder (deans, chairpersons, and faculty place the chairpersons' ideal leadership style closer to the ideographic than the nomothetic dimension), and Novick (faculty, officers of central administration, and chairpersons perceived staffing, planning, or organizing to be the primary chairpersons' responsibilities).

The evidence based on the present findings, also showed that a major significant difference concerning the role description occurred

in the "extent of faculty participation in the determination of division policies and procedures" among the teaching faculty, central administration, and division chairpersons. This result may be due to a difference in faculty versus administration role description definition of participation. Nevertheless, this result does suggest a major divisional organizational role conflict.

Recommendations

In light of the findings of this study, recommendations pertaining to those items are suggested for consideration as follows:

1. Immediate attention should be given to the factors which cause the teaching faculty to perceive that they have "very little" influence on the determination of division policies and procedures.
2. There seems to be a general need in the area of organizational governance to investigate faculty-administrative conflict and misunderstanding. Research in the area would provide information that would be helpful in reducing faculty and administrative problems.
3. A replication of the present study employing a sample of university students would be useful.
4. A replication of the present study using different leadership instruments would serve to further validate the findings.
5. Studies of this type should be extended to other higher educational institutions in other geographical areas.
6. Data application of this study could be helpful in the teaching of higher education administration and organizational

theory courses, in searching for new chairpersons, in developing and conducting chairpersons' in-service training, and in the formulation of division or department goals.

Finally, the ultimate test of the worth of any division or department of higher education is three-fold in nature: (1) the mission of the division must be specified; (2) the philosophy, objectives, and needs of the division or department must be affirmed; and (3) the achievement of faculty and students must be evaluated in terms of division or department established goals or criterion-referenced. The effectiveness of any organization depends upon the quality of leadership exercised therein.

In short, before division or department chairpersons can know where to go, they need to understand from whence they are starting. Therefore, this research concerning the university division chairperson at Northeastern Oklahoma State University should be only the starting point, not the end, of study regarding formal higher educational leadership and organizational theory analysis of this role, its setting, and its incumbents.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Ahmann, J. Stanley. "The Emerging Role of the Departmental Chairman: Be an Administrative Activist." The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role. Eds. James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet. Detroit, Michigan: Belamp Publishing, 1972.
- Argyris, Chris. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin-Dorsey, 1962.
- Banghart, Frank W. Educational Systems Analysis. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Bernard, L. L. "Leadership and Propaganda." An Introduction to Sociology. Eds. J. Davis and H. E. Barnes. New York: Heath, 1927.
- Blau, Peter M. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Bingham, W. V. "Leadership." The Psychological Foundations of Management. Ed. H. C. Metcalf. New York: Shaw, 1927.
- Buros, Oscar K. Test in Print II. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1974.
- Butts, R. Freeman. "Formulation of Policy in American Colleges and Universities." Higher Education Yearbook of Education 1959. Ed. G. Bereday. New York: World Book, 1959.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Cartwright, D., and A. Zander. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1953.
- Castetter, William. The Personnel Function in Educational Administration. New York: Macmillan Company, 1971.

- Chamberlain, Joshua L. Universities and Their Sons. Vol. I. Boston: E. Herndon Company, 1898.
- Champion, Dean J. The Sociology of Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Churchman, C. W. The Systems Approach. New York: Dell, 1968.
- Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribners, 1902.
- Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Davis, Keith. Human Behavior at Work. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Doyle, Edward A. The Status and Functions of the Department Chairman. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1953.
- Dressel, Paul L., R. Craig Johnson, and Philip M. Marcus. The Confidence Crisis: An Analysis of University Departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Drucker, Peter. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper, 1954.
- Duryea, E. E. "The Theory and Practice of Administration." Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Considerations. Ed. G. P. Burns. New York: Harper, 1968.
- Eliot, Charles William. University Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1908.
- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Fellman, David. "The Departmental Chairman." In Search of Leaders. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.
- Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Filley, Alan C., and Robert J. House. Managerial Process and Organization Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1969.
- Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process." Administrative Theory in Education. Ed. Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

- Gibb, Jack R. "Dynamics of Leadership." In Search of Leaders. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.
- Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership." The Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. IV. 2nd ed. Eds. Gardiner Lindzey and F. Aronson. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- _____. "A Review." The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook. Ed. Oscar K. Buros. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Good, Carter V. Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.
- Guilford, J. P., and Benjamin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Heimler, Charles H. "The College Departmental Chairman." The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role. Eds. James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet. Detroit, Michigan: Balamp Publishing, 1972.
- Hersey, Paul, and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Jacobs, T. O. Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations. Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization, 1971.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Koontz, H., and C. O'Donnell. Principles of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- Koos, Leonard V. The Questionnaire in Education: A Critique and Manual. New York: Macmillan Company, Inc., 1928.
- Krech, D., and R. S. Crutchfield. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.
- Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- _____. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Luthans, Fred. Organizational Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

- March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- McConnell, T. R. "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration." The Study of Academic Administration. Ed. Terry R. Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.
- Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: McKay, 1970.
- Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Rashdall, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. Vol. I. Eds. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Richman, Barry M., and Richard N. Farmer. Leadership Goals and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Roethlisberger, Fritz J., and William J. Dickson. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Schmuck, Richard A., and Philip J. Runkel. Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1972.
- Shartle, C. L. Executive Performance and Leadership. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1956.
- Shrode, William A., and Dan Voich, Jr. Organization and Management: Basic Systems Concepts. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, Inc., 1974.
- Sikes, Walter, Lawrence E. Schlesinger, and Charles N. Seashore. Renewing Higher Education From Within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

- Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- _____. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Storr, Richard J. Harper's University: The Beginnings. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Tannenbaum, Robert, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik. Leadership and Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Tead, Ordway. The Art of Leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.
- Terry, George R. Principles of Management. 3rd ed. Homewood, Illinois: Richard Irwin, Inc., 1960.
- Ticknor, George. Life, Letters, and Journal of George Ticknor. Boston: James R. Osgood, 1876.
- Dusseldorp, Ralph A., Duane E. Richardson, and Walter J. Foley. Educational Decision-Making Through Operations Research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.
- Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Weber, Max. "Bureaucracy." Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Eds. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Woods, F. A. The Influence of Monarchs. New York: Macmillan, 1913.

Periodicals

- Anderson, H. H. "An Examination of the Concepts of Domination and Integration in Relation to Dominance and Ascendance." Psychological Review, Vol. XVII (1940), 21-37.
- Blackmar, R. W. "Leadership in Reform." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XVI (1911), 626-644.
- Blake, Robert R., and Jane S. Mouton. "Breakthrough in Organization Development." Harvard Business Review (November-December, 1964), 136.
- Chapin, F. S. "Leadership and Group Activity." Journal of Applied Sociology, Vol. VIII (1924), 141-145.
- Getzels, Jacob W., and Egon G. Guba. "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study." American Sociological Review, Vol. XIX (1954), 166.

- Getzels, Jacob W., and Egon G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review (Winter, 1957), 423-41.
- Halpin, Andrew W. "The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. XXV (1955), 18-32. ✓
- Hemler, Charles. "The College Departmental Chairman." Educational Record, Vol. XLIX (1967), 158-163.
- Hemphill, John K. "Leadership Behavior Associated with Administrative Reputation of College Departments." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLVI (1955), 385-401.
- Hersey, Paul, and Kenneth H. Blanchard. "What's Missing in MBO?" Management Review (October, 1974), 26.
- Hill, Winston W., and Wendell L. French. "Perceptions of Power of Department Chairmen by Professors." Administrative Science Quarterly (1967), 548-574.
- Hillway, Tyrus. "Evaluating College and University Administration." Intellect (April, 1973), p. 462.
- Hobson, Robert L. "Some Psychological Dimensions of Academic Administrators." Studies in Higher Education, Vol. LXXXII. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, The Division of Educational Reference (1950), 7-53.
- Litchfield, E. H. "Organization in Large American Universities: The Administration." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXX (1959), 490.
- McLaughlin, Gerald W., James R. Montgomer, and Leslie F. Malpass. "Selected Characteristics, Roles, Goals, and Satisfactions of Department Chairmen in State and Land-Grant Institutions." Research in Higher Education, Vol. III (1975), 259.
- Merton, Robert K. "The Social Nature of Leadership." American Journal of Nursing, Vol. LXIX (1969), 2614-2618.
- Mitchell, Terence R. "The Construct Validity of Three Dimensions of Leadership Research." The Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. LXXX (1970), 93.
- Mumford, E. "The Origins of Leadership." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XII (1907), 216.
- Scates, Douglas E., and Alice V. Yeomans. "Developing a Depth Questionnaire to Explore Motivation and Likelihood of Actions." Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. XII (1962), 620-631.

- Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership." American Sociological Review, Vol. XVII (1953), 373-380.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., R. H. Metzcus, and L. Burden. "Toward an Particularistic Approach to Leadership Style: Some Findings." American Educational Research Journal, Vol. VI, Number 1 (January, 1969), 62.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. "Leadership Membership and Organization." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. XLVII (1950), 1-14.
- _____. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology, Vol. XXV (1948), 63.
- Tannenbaum, Robert, and Warren Schmidt. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern." Harvard Business Review (March-April, 1957), 95-101.
- White, Harold C. "Perceptions of Leadership by Managers in a Federal Agency." Personnel Administration and Public Personnel Review (July-August, 1972), 51-56.
- White, Kinnard. "Personality Characteristics of Educational Leaders: A Comparison of Administrators and Researchers." School Review, Vol. LXXIII (1965), 292-300.

Other Sources

- Bullen, Robert Abbott, Jr. "A Study of the Perceptions of Selected Deans, Departmental Chairmen, and Faculty on the Role of the Departmental Chairman at the University of Alabama." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1969.)
- Darkenwald, Gordon Gerald, Jr. "The Department Chairman Role in Relation to the Social Organization of Colleges and Universities." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.)
- Davidson, Robert Clement. "The Administrative Role of Department Chairmen in Public Four-Year Colleges." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1967.)
- Evaluation of the Department Chairman. Committee Report. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, 1971.
- Evaluation of the Department Chairman. Committee Report. Kalamazoo, Michigan: University of Western Michigan, 1970.
- Gerstenberger, Bessie Keeney. "Relation of Task and Environment in Higher Education to Administrative Leader Behavior as Reflected by Recreation Department Chairmen." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1974.)

- Greene, D. "Departmental Administration in American Universities." Journal of Proceeding and Addresses of the Thirteenth Annual Conference. Association of American Universities, 1911.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957.
- Hillway, Tyrus. Manual for the Rating Scale for Academic Administration. Greeley, Colorado: University of Northern Colorado, 1972.
- Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, The Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, Copyright, 1977.
- Meredith, Kenneth P. Accountability in Higher Education. ERIC, ED 058 465, 1973.
- Novick, Jehiel. "The Role of Department Chairmen in University Governance in Large Midwestern Universities as Perceived by Faculty, Chairmen, and Administrators." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1970.)
- Patterson, Laura Marguerite. "Preferences in Administrative Styles Based on an Inquiry into Perceptions of the Ideal Structure of the University Department and the Ideal Role of the Department Chairman." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, 1966.)
- Ramer, Hal Reed. "Perceptions of University Departments and of the Role of Their Chairmen: A Study of Some Attitudes and Opinions of Selected Professors, Department Chairmen, Deans, and Central Administrators of the Ohio State University." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1963.)
- Schroeder, Glenn Burnett. "Leadership Behavior of Department Chairmen in Selected State Institutions of Higher Education." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1969.)
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII. Columbia, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1968.
- _____, and Alvin E. Coon. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Monograph No. 88. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.
- _____, Ellis L. Scott, and William E. Jaynes. Leadership and Role Expectations. Monograph No. 86. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1956.
- Washington, Earl Melvin. "The Relationship Between College Department Chairperson's Leadership Style as Perceived by Teaching Faculty and that Faculty's Feeling of Job Satisfaction." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975.)

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER FOR THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Northeastern Oklahoma State University
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

January 18, 1977

Dear Colleague:

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in securing data for a research study concerning the office of division or department chairperson. I am writing a doctoral dissertation under the chairmanship of Dr. Kenneth St. Clair at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

The title of the dissertation is The Leadership Role Expectations of Division Chairpersons as Perceived by Faculty, Chairpersons, and Central Administration in a Selected Oklahoma State Institution of Higher Education.

This research has the approval from the Northeastern Oklahoma State University President, Vice-President, and the three Deans of Colleges. All responses will be strictly confidential, and no individual's responses will be released. The questionnaire is organized for quick answering, so it will take no more than 15 minutes to finish.

When you have finished, please return the completed questionnaire by campus mail at your earliest convenience. Use the same envelope, cross out your name, and address the next box to:

Jay Munsell
Division of Education and Psychology

Thank you for your cooperation.

Jay B. Munsell
Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology
College of Behavioral Science
Northeastern Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Northeastern Oklahoma State University
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

February 2, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Recently you received my doctoral dissertation questionnaire pertaining to the division chairperson.

Faculty and administration responses have been good, but far short of the required ninety percent needed for a representative study. Since I am attempting to meet the deadline for a dissertation reading copy, I need to complete my questionnaire research as soon as possible.

If you have not already returned your questionnaire by campus mail, would you please do so at your earliest convenience? If you have misplaced the first questionnaire, please find enclosed a second questionnaire. I will be grateful for your cooperation.

I hope you are having a pleasant and successful spring semester, and I sincerely thank you for any assistance on the matter of the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Jay B. Munsell
Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology
College of Behavioral Science
Northeastern Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX C

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT

LEADERSHIP ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS

QUESTIONNAIRE

DEMOGRAPHIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND PERSONAL INFORMATION

(Please circle the letter that is most representative of your answer.)

1. Your primary professional work role is most clearly described as:

- (a) Central Administration--Pres., Vice-Pres., Dean, Asst. Dean, Director, etc.
- (b) Division Chairperson
- (c) Faculty--Teaching and/or Research
- (d) Other

2. Your age is:

- (a) 20-29
- (b) 30-39
- (c) 40-49
- (d) 50-59
- (e) 60-70
- (f) Over 70

3. You are:

- (a) Female
- (b) Male

4. Your highest earned degree is:

- (a) A.A.
- (b) B.S. or B.A.
- (c) M.S. or M.A.
- (d) Ed.S.
- (e) Ph.D.
- (f) Ed.D.
- (g) Other

5. You are on tenure:

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

6. Number of years with present institution:

- (a) 0-3
- (b) 4-6
- (c) 7-9
- (d) 10-12
- (e) 13-15

- (f) 16-20
- (g) Over 20

7. Your ethnic group is:

- (a) American Indian or Alaskan Native
- (b) Asian or Pacific Islander
- (c) Hispanic
- (d) Black
- (e) White
- (f) Other

8. Your teaching field:

(WRITE IN) _____

9. Your profesorial rank:

- (a) Instructor
- (b) Asst. Professor
- (c) Assoc. Professor
- (d) Professor
- (e) Other

10. Have you ever taken a graduate course in administration and/or instruction of higher education:

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

11. Compared with other members of this university, how much influence do you believe you have on policies and procedures at the division level:

- (a) Very little
- (b) Moderate amount
- (c) Very much

12. Do you favor rotational division chairpersons from within this university:

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

13. In your opinion, should the division chairperson represent:

- (a) Central administration
- (b) The teaching faculty
- (c) Both equally

14. Do you favor a time limit on holding the position of division chairpersonship:
- (a) Yes
 - (b) No
15. In your opinion, would graduate courses in administration and instruction of higher education be beneficial to those holding the position of division chairperson:
- (a) Yes
 - (b) No
16. In your opinion, the extent of faculty participation in the determination of division policies and procedures at this university is:
- (a) Very poor
 - (b) Poor
 - (c) Average
 - (d) Good
 - (e) Very good
17. In your opinion, what should be the most important leadership role for the division chairperson at this university?

(WRITE IN) _____

PLEASE GO TO NEXT PAGE

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Published by: College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
Copyright, 1977

DIRECTIONS:

Read each item carefully.

Think about how an "ideal division chairperson" should be, as described by the item.

Decide whether the "division chairperson" should always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never act as described by the item.

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 DIVISION CHAIRPERSON SHOULD DO:

1. Do personal favors for division members . . . (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
2. Make his/her attitudes clear to the
division members (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
3. Do little things to make it pleasant to
be a member of the division (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
4. Try out his/her new ideas with the division
members (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
5. Act as the real leader of the division . . . (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 division 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)
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 division members (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
14. Assign division members to particular tasks (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
15. Be the spokesperson of the division (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 division informed (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
20. Act without consulting the division members (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
21. Back up the division members in their actions (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
22. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
23. Treat all division 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 division members (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
28. Be friendly and approachable (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
29. Ask that division members follow standard rules and regulations (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
30. Fail to take necessary action (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
31. Make division members feel at ease when talking with them (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
32. Let division members know what is expected of them (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
33. Speak as the representative of the division membership (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

34. Put suggestions made by the division into
operation (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
35. See to it that division members are working
up to capacity (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
36. Let other people take away his/her leadership
in the division (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
37. Get his/her superiors to act for the welfare
of the division membership (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
38. Get division approval in important matters
before going ahead (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
39. See to it that the work of division members
is coordinated (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
40. Keep the division working together as a
team (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

VITA

Jay B. Munsell

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE LEADERSHIP ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHING FACULTY, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, AND CHAIRPERSONS IN A SELECTED OKLAHOMA INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lebanon, Kansas, May 21, 1939, the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Burl Munsell.

Education: Graduated from Parsons Senior High School, Parsons, Kansas, in 1957; received the Associate of Arts degree in social science from Labette Community Junior College, Parsons, Kansas, in 1960; received the Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Kansas State College, Pittsburg, Kansas, with a major in social science, in 1962; received the Master of Science in Education degree from Kansas State College, Pittsburg, Kansas, with a major in social science, in 1964; attended the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, summer, 1965 and 1967; attended the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, spring, 1966; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May, 1977.

Professional Experience: Teacher of social science at Wasson High School, Colorado Springs, Colorado, 1962-1963; Sociology teacher at Parsons Senior High School, Parsons, Kansas, 1963-1965; Assistant Professor of Sociology at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, 1966-1975; Graduate Assistant in the Department of Higher Education Administration, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1975-1976; Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology at Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, from 1976 until present.