



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

4-1977

A Study of the Role of the Liberal Arts Department Chairman in Selected Michigan Universities

Michael William Nicholson
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Nicholson, Michael William, "A Study of the Role of the Liberal Arts Department Chairman in Selected Michigan Universities" (1977). *Dissertations*. 2803.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2803>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS DEPARTMENT
CHAIRMAN IN SELECTED MICHIGAN UNIVERSITIES

by

Michael William Nicholson

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people played a part in making this study a reality. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a few of those people.

This study is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Robert D. Hellenga, who served as my original adviser.

Special thanks are given to Dr. Robert M. W. Travers, the chairman of the committee, for his patience, wisdom, and encouragement both during the transition period and throughout the course of the study. My thanks also go to the other committee members, Drs. Sidney Dykstra and Dale L. Varble, for their advice and guidance.

My appreciation is extended to Dr. Thomas A. Carey, whose recent study on the college deanship suggested the problem for this study, for his inspiration and advice.

Thanks are accorded to all those department chairmen who provided the data for this study.

My appreciation is extended to my wife, Sharon, and my mother, Mrs. Nettie Nicholson, for their continual understanding and support.

And, finally, my sincere gratitude is extended to Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Webster, Rick, and John, of the Bethel Baptist Church, Kalamazoo, for their friendship and hospitality.

Michael William Nicholson

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-16,905

NICHOLSON, Michael William, 1941-
A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN IN SELECTED MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITIES.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1977
Education, higher

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© Copyright by

Michael William Nicholson
1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	vi
CHAPTER	
I	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
	1
	Purpose of the Study
	1
	Review of the Literature
	2
	Significance
	21
II	RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES
	23
	Sample Population
	23
	Instrument
	24
	Data Collection
	25
	Data Analysis
	26
	Summary
	27
III	THE RESULTS
	28
	The Liberal Arts Department Chairmanship by Institution
	28
	Responses to the Open-Ended Questions on Job Attitudes and Career Goals
	81
IV	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
	88
	Summary
	88
	Conclusions
	94
	Recommendations
	95
APPENDICES	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY	144

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Rate of questionnaire return by institution . .	26
2. Number of full-time equated faculty members and enrollments by majors within departments	29
3. Numbers of degrees granted within departments in the last full academic year	31
4. Age and sex of department chairmen	33
5. Number of department chairmen with bachelor's, master's, doctor's, and other degrees or training	34
6. Dates when department chairmen received their degrees	35
7. Academic rank of department chairmen	36
8. Number of years department chairmen have continuously worked in their institutions and number of years they have held their positions as chairmen	36
9. Number of years of college and university teaching experience and number of years of administrative experience of department chairmen	37
10. Number of department chairmen with prior experience as a chairman or an assistant chairman . .	38
11. Numbers of professional and civic organizations to which department chairmen currently belong and numbers of positions they currently hold within those organizations	40
12. Numbers of theses and dissertations department chairmen have directed to completion	42
13. Department chairmen's annual rates of directing theses and dissertations to completion	44
14. Numbers of publications of department chairmen	46
15. Annual publication rates of department chairmen	48

16.	Method by which department chairmen are selected	50
17.	How department chairmen discovered that chair- manship was available	51
18.	Frequency of existence of search committees which resulted in appointments of department chairmen and frequencies of types of members of those committees	52
19.	Frequency of internal and external hiring of department chairmen	54
20.	Frequency of hiring of department chairmen whose highest degree was earned inside or outside employing institution	55
21.	Degree of importance of certain selection cri- teria as rated by department chairmen	56
22.	Lengths of terms of department chairmen	58
23.	Activities of department chairmen in hours per week	61
24.	Degree of importance of their activities as rated by department chairmen	63
25.	University committee participation of department chairmen	66
26.	Numbers of theses and dissertations department chairmen are currently directing	66
27.	Attitudes of department chairmen toward chair- manship on certain job-related concepts	69
28.	Ideal length of department chairman's term as perceived by department chairmen	72
29.	Ideal method of selecting department chairmen as perceived by department chairmen	74
30.	Attitudes of department chairmen toward teach- ing, scholarly and creative work, and adminis- trative work	75
31.	Length of time department chairmen expect to continue as chairmen of their departments	77
32.	What department chairmen <u>hope</u> to do upon leaving chairmanship	78

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		PAGE
A	Cover Letter and Questionnaire to University Department Chairmen	97
B	Cover Letter to Respondents	108
C	Responses to the Open-Ended Questions on Job Attitudes and Career Goals	110

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Purpose of the Study

This is a study of the department chairmanship in selected universities. The purpose is to determine the place that the position of department chairman plays in the career history of the incumbent, and to determine the extent to which the academic life of the incumbent is affected by his administrative role.

As universities have grown, the administration of departments has become more complex. The increase in faculty size, the diversity of faculty interests, and the problems associated with servicing a greater number of students tend to make the job of department chairman one that is increasingly concerned with administrative detail rather than one which fosters originality and creativity. Burdened with the necessary but routine activities of administration, the chairman may find that his scholarly career which contributed to his appointment has been jeopardized. One former chairman described the department chairman's dilemma:

Sooner or later in the life of a department chairman the question must be faced: Shall I sacrifice my academic integrity and become a mere administrator? Or shall I try to recover my status as a

scholar, a scientist, and a gentleman? (Macleod, 1954, p. 424)

It is for this reason that it is important to look at the place that the position plays in the career history of the chairman, and to determine the extent to which his academic life is affected by his administrative role.

Review of the Literature

The first academic departments in American higher education, according to Doyle (1953), were formed in 1776 when the Board of Governors of Harvard College decided to reorganize the school according to disciplines. One professor no longer would attend to the educational needs of an entire group of incoming students. Instead, the courses in the curriculum would be divided among the faculty to enable each professor to teach his own specialty. Thus the first department head was merely a professor teaching a particular subject. He was evaluated principally on the basis of his knowledge of his field and his skill in teaching it. His administrative functions were generally limited to correlating and coordinating the courses taught in his department.

During the next century as enrollments increased and faculties grew, the chairman found it necessary to spend more time in developing and implementing departmental objectives, in formulating new courses, and in other general administrative duties. By the end of the nineteenth century these new responsibilities resulted in his position as an

administrator becoming more firmly established.

Reeves and Russell (1929), in a series of surveys of church-related colleges, found that, while the department chairman had limited decision-making authority, he was expected to make a variety of recommendations to higher authorities. Some of these recommendations concerned the courses to be offered, the time schedule of courses, the work required of a departmental major, instructors to be added to the department, and salary changes for the instructors below the rank of department head.

Kinder (1934), in a study of the internal administration of 127 liberal arts colleges, pointed out several administrative duties of the department chairman: He promotes the welfare of the department; he represents the department before the general faculty; he sometimes exercises extensive supervisory functions; he counsels younger members of the department; he works with the department on courses of study, teaching load, scheduling classes, and, sometimes, on ways of improving instruction within the department. He also makes recommendations concerning appointments and promotions.

Kinder also found that in 50 percent of the colleges the chairman was appointed by the administration. Only 43 percent of the schools reported indefinite tenure for the department chairman, but he found no instances of rotation. In only five schools was the term limited to one year. In selecting new faculty members, Kinder concluded that the

president should consult with the chairman before making any recommendations to the board.

This study by Kinder and the earlier studies by Reeves and Russell were among the first attempts to examine the various administrative roles, including the departmental chairmanship, found in higher education.

Quarles (1950) reported on the findings of the Committee on Instruction of Dillard University, which was called upon to formulate a statement concerning the functions of the department chairmen of that school. Four major areas of responsibility were delineated as a result of this study: instruction (especially curriculum development); faculty personnel (selection, evaluation, retention and promotion, and professional growth); student personnel (counseling and guidance); and administration (coordination of activities between their own and other departments, and liaison between their own departments and the administration).

The first comprehensive investigation into the role of the department chairman in higher education was made by Doyle (1953). During the 1950-51 academic year he conducted an empirical study among 33 private liberal arts colleges concerning the status and functions of the departmental chairman. He found that in 78.7 percent of the colleges the chairman was officially appointed by the president subject to final approval by the board of trustees. In 48 percent of the schools the academic dean was normally consulted by

the president before the appointment was made. In only two of the schools was the chairman elected to the position by the faculty. The principal bases upon which the chairman was selected were: previous teaching experience, teaching ability, and administrative ability. Only 15 percent of the schools required the doctorate, although in 94 percent of the schools the chairmen either had a doctorate or were actively working toward it. In 87 percent of the schools the tenure of the chairman was for an indefinite period while in 12 percent of the schools a system of rotation was used. In only two of the schools did the chairman receive some compensation for assuming administrative duties.

The department chairmen devoted a total of 39.3 hours per week (median) to their jobs. Their time was distributed as follows: teaching, 11.8 hours; administrative duties, 7.9 hours; guidance activities, 7.1 hours; attendance at conventions, 4.9 hours; student activities sponsorship, 3.3 hours; committee and advisory board meetings, 2.8 hours; faculty and administrative board meetings, 0.8 hours; and supervision of teaching, 0.7 hours.

Staff planning through the committee work of department chairmen was heavily relied upon by college administrators, and the chairmen served on 3.9 (median) standing and ad hoc committees. In only 51 percent of the schools did the chairmen feel the need for any planned supervision of new faculty members. In 69 percent of the schools the preparation of

the departmental budget was one of the major responsibilities of the chairmen. In 84 percent of the schools there was a high interest in intra-institutional studies. In 94 percent of the schools, departmental meetings were held at least annually, while in 75 percent at least three meetings were held per year. In 94 percent of the colleges the responsibility for the planning of the policies, programs, and regulations of the department was placed upon the chairman by major administrators. The chairmen posted hours for student consultation in 94 percent of the schools, and in 96 percent the chairmen served as advisers to students majoring in their departments.

Data gathered in this study revealed that the chairman spent a majority of his time (56.5 percent, median) working with students. Doyle concluded that while the chairman's primary role was that of "a teacher and counselor of the students in his department" (p. 125), his administrative responsibilities had expanded to include the executive functions of planning, staffing, directing, and budgeting on the departmental level, which were virtually unknown to the chairman of 1929.

Although somewhat dated and limited in scope to private liberal arts colleges, Doyle's survey on the departmental chairman is the classic on the subject. He was the first to undertake a systematic investigation of the position by employing both the questionnaire and interview techniques.

Kingsbury (1953) conducted a study on departmental governance in 17 major American universities. She found that in 10 schools the department head was appointed by an official superior outside the department. In one university the chairman was elected by the faculty of the department and confirmed by a superior. In two schools the position was rotated among the more experienced professors in the department, while in three others there was some combination of these kinds of appointments. The chairman had the sole authority in seven universities to recommend the appointment of new faculty members; and to recommend the reappointment, promotion, and salary increases for present teachers. In nine schools the chairman did not have the sole power of recommendation in these areas. In only one university did the department chairman have the sole power to set up or discard courses of study. Kingsbury concluded that there existed a sizeable degree of scholarly freedom and democracy in the schools answering the questionnaire.

Macleod (1954), in his "Confession of an Ex-Chairman," wrote that a desire to maintain his academic integrity forced him to resign his departmental chairmanship of 20 years. He then contrasted his original and recent responsibilities to show how the emphasis moved from academic concerns to administrative trivialities:

When I started, I taught fifteen hours a week,
drew my own plans and blistered my hands with
my own screwdriver. During the past few years

I have taught three hours a week, argued with the Head of Buildings and Grounds, listened to the janitor's complaints about cigarette butts in the classrooms and spent the rest of my life attending committee meetings and writing letters in triplicate. I counselled lots of graduate students, but they soon realized that, if they were to receive any real help, they would have to go to other members of the department. As chairman of the Department I had to see to it that the broken window in the lavatory was fixed, that the notice of university fellowships was properly publicized, that some member of the department could be bludgeoned into serving on the Underclass Advisory Board and that the heat in the Animal Laboratory was not turned off during the weekends. (pp. 425-426)

While there may be some interesting moments in the life of a department chairman such as "the occasional fun of out-maneuvering an opponent or seeing a long cherished plan finally become actual" (p. 426), Macleod doubts that they produce ultimate satisfaction. He therefore cautions those aspiring to the chairmanship accordingly:

If there are any junior colleagues who still dream of a chairmanship as the crowning achievement of an academic career, I should like to urge them to pause and think before they bend their steps towards administration. If they really believe in the academic ideal, if they are deeply and persistently curious about the problems of their field, they will find little in a chairmanship but frustration and grief. (p. 426)

It is evident that from Macleod's viewpoint involvement in the administrative activities of the departmental chairmanship precludes any in-depth involvement in academic concerns. The academic and scholarly ideals of the new department chairman soon give way to administrative realities.

Minelli (1958) studied the role of the departmental chairman in industrial teacher education. He sent questionnaires to 123 chairmen of industrial teacher education departments and received usable returns from 104 of them. He found that the doctorate, 4.4 years of teaching experience in public school industrial education, 3.8 years of experience in teaching at the level of industrial teacher education, and 2.2 years of industrial or trade experience comprised the academic and experience prerequisites which the chairmen considered desirable for performing their jobs. Concerning working conditions, 97 percent of the chairmen reported that they enjoyed teaching, while only 16.3 percent indicated a preference for administration and supervision. Seventy-five percent considered most of their work to be stimulating. Nearly 50 percent desired additional office assistance and time for administrative activities.

The department chairmen spent an average of 52 hours per week at their jobs. Their time was distributed as follows: general administration, 15.1 hours; teaching assignment, 14.6 hours; guidance and counseling, 3.9 hours; research and publication, 3.5 hours; local and state professional activities, 3.3 hours; supervision of student teaching, 3 hours; individualized instruction, 2.8 hours; community participation, 2.3 hours; national professional activities, 2 hours; and cooperative enterprises with labor and industry, 1.5 hours.

The chairmen ranked the importance of these activities in the following order: (1) general administration, (2) teaching assignment, (3) local and state professional activities, (4) guidance and counseling, (5) supervision of student teaching, (6) national professional activities, (7) research and publications, (8) individualized instruction, (9) community participation, and (10) cooperative enterprises with labor and industry.

Minelli's study is an important contribution to the literature on the role of the university department chairman. Its limitations, however, are that it is confined to a subject discipline and is nearly 20 years old. As a result, its findings cannot be generalized to current practices among different departments.

Corson (1960) stressed the importance of departments and department chairmen in academic governance when he observed that the role and influence of deans in many institutions "tend to be directly, but inversely, related to the status and power of departments and department chairmen" (p. 84). He added, "Too little attention has been devoted to the large importance in the governance of colleges and universities of the department and its chairman" (pp. 84-85).

The importance of the chairman's administrative role, however, does not minimize the significance of his academic role. Citing Doyle's study, Corson stated:

Chairmen are only part-time administrators; that is, they devote only a part of their time to problems of budget and faculty compensation, selection, and promotion; to student admissions; to class scheduling; and to similar nonteaching or research tasks. Nearly all chairmen teach for a major portion of their time and are expected to maintain their scholarly productivity. (p. 88)

Again he stated:

The department head remains predominantly a teacher and a representative of his teaching colleagues. Even while he is looked to by his dean and his president as their representative and their channel of communication to the faculty, he remains basically a teacher in function and in loyalty. (p 89)

Thus, in Corson's view, while the chairman has important administrative functions, he remains essentially an academician.

Dodds (1962) acknowledged the importance of department chairmen in the administration of higher education when he said, "In those schools which are subdivided into departments, the chairmen are critical figures" (p. 115). Furthermore, "They rank just below the deans in the success of a president's administration" (p. 115). Department chairmen, according to Dodds, are generally selected by one of three methods: departmental election, appointment by the administration, or nomination by the department and ratification by the administration. Dodds recommended short rotating terms for the chairman, recognizing, however, that the chairman's leadership potential would be limited because of the time needed to plan and develop the curriculum. The

department chairman "is usually a significant figure in building faculty strength" (p. 131). As the planner-in-chief of the department's personnel program, the chairman is the department's advocate with the administration for additional personnel to develop and strengthen its program. Characteristically, "his colleagues look to him to bring home the bacon" (p. 132).

Quick (1966) conducted a comprehensive review of the literature with respect to the role of the department chairman in patterns of faculty selection, promotion, and termination. He concluded:

- (1) The study of the role of the chairman is more neglected than any other university administrator.
 - (2) Inherent stress is brought to bear on the chairman as he actively participates, either formally or informally, in faculty selection, promotion or termination.
 - (3) Before acting, the chairman seriously takes into account what his peer groups may think about his anticipated action.
- (p. 3274-A)

He also concluded that there was a need for in-service training programs for departmental chairmen because none existed in America at that time.

Bruening (1967) studied department chairmen in 34 colleges and universities of the South, each having 100 or more faculty members. Using the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, he found that chairmen emerged as individuals who preferred work utilizing academic and intellectual skills rather than work involving sales, public relations, and military or high-risk occupations.

Heimler (1967), in an article entitled "The College Departmental Chairman," indicated that faculty leadership in program development is probably the most important function of the chairman. Furthermore, "The chairman's leadership is directly related to his own strength as a professor: his teaching, scholarship, and professional reputation" (p. 159).

According to Heimler, the ideal chairman is characterized by the following:

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 achievement 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, scholarship, consulting, college and community service; he has an informed vision of his department's discipline and of its contribution to a student's education. (p. 161)

Heimler added that the successful departmental chairman could also be identified in terms of what he should not be. The autocratic, authoritarian chairman would likely have a short tenure. Furthermore, weaknesses in character and professional reputation would generate an ineffective department chairman. Heimler felt that to attract the most qualified faculty members to the position, it would be necessary to offer sufficient incentives and rewards, the most obvious of which would be a stipend. Another means would be to offer a promotion in rank to those selected from the lower ranks to serve as department chairmen. These means are justified, Heimler implied, because the details of administration discourage otherwise qualified professors from seeking the position. He stated, "It is the rare professor who can continue to be academically productive when a significant portion of his time is taken up by the particulars of departmental business" (p. 162). Heimler also suggested the use of a departmental executive to handle the administrative routines of the department. The executive would be a specialist in administration and management who would be directly responsible to the chairman. To make it a full-time position, the executive could be assigned similar responsibilities in other departments.

The departmental executive-departmental chairman arrangement has the obvious advantage of freeing departmental chairmen of managerial details, and thus of making it possible to devote his full time to the improvement of instruction, student

counseling, staff relations, policy formulation, and program development. Moreover, the employment of a departmental executive would make for greater efficiency and economy in management. (p. 162)

Englund (1967) studied the selection, orientation, and in-service education of department chairmen in seven mid-western schools of education. He interviewed deans, department chairmen, and, in some instances, members of faculty search committees. He found that chairmen in one school were elected for three-year terms by the members of their departments. At another school, after faculty members nominated candidates for the chairmanship the dean consulted with the chief administrative officer before making the appointment. The use of search committees was employed by three of the schools while the other two used methods which fell between a simple faculty election and a national search for a chairman. Englund also found that none of the chairmen initiated their own candidacies for the position and claimed to have very little interest in assuming a chairmanship. Orientation and in-service programs tended to be conducted in an informal manner by the dean in consultation with the new chairman. In two schools, a significant part in orienting new chairmen was attributed to the secretaries. In-service training usually consisted of regular meetings held by the dean with the chairman and the faculty. Englund concluded that some orientation to the position was needed by all chairmen, and that the ultimate responsibility for

providing it rested with the dean.

Davidson (1967) studied the administrative role of the department chairman in four-year colleges in the State University of New York system. From the data gathered, he concluded that the main role of the chairman in these schools was an administrative one because of the chairmen's estimate that 32.7 percent of their time was spent on teaching while the remainder was spent in administration. He said, "The chairman in these colleges is today a full-time administrator who accomplishes some teaching and attempts some research. But the majority of his time is spent in administrative work" (p. 2935-A).

Andersen (1968) indicated that departmental growth accompanied by an increased delegation of administrative authority had and would continue to produce greater decentralization. As a result there is pressure on the chairman to be more administratively involved with institutional concerns. However, "One must first recognize, and rejoice in the notion, that the chairman's basic loyalty is to his department and discipline" (p. 212). Andersen suggested that adequate supporting services including administrative assistants with business management backgrounds for large departments be made available "to save the chairman for teaching, research, and major academic decisions" (p. 212).

McKeachie (1968), in his "Memo to New Department Chairmen," said that an important aspect of the role of the

department chairman is that of "a teacher--a teacher who shapes the educational environment of his faculty" (p. 223). He felt that this could basically be accomplished by encouraging faculty participation in decision-making and by supporting and rewarding excellent teaching. He concluded that the chairmanship should be filled by "men who gain satisfaction from helping their colleagues grow, who enjoy enriching their department and their discipline, who like ideas and translating good ideas into realities" (p. 227).

Bullen (1969) conducted a study on the role of the departmental chairman at the University of Alabama. He solicited opinions from 4 deans, 5 chairmen, and 25 faculty members. He found that professors generally had no ambitions toward becoming chairman; that the respondents favored a definite term of office for the chairman; that the chairman's role in faculty disputes was one of an arbitrator or mediator; that too much of the chairman's time was consumed in clerical tasks; and that his role was one of "staff recruiter, personnel director, curriculum leader, coordinator and chief liaison officer" (p. 3213-A).

Walmsley (1970) made a comparative study of the duties and responsibilities of 473 chairmen of physical education departments in junior colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. He concluded that teaching experience was a factor of considerable importance in subsequent appointments to the chairmanship. He found that most physical education

chairmen held the earned master's degree in the field. He also concluded that supervisory duties required more time of collegiate and university chairmen than of junior college chairmen. He recommended that a constructive job analysis of the duties of physical education department chairmen be used in training students in the area of administration.

Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (1970), in their study of the academic department, said:

Departments also have problems with their executives. Tradition and faculty demand require the chairman to be a scholar, but the demands placed upon the chairman include many functions. (p. 13)

The authors proceeded to list a number of administrative duties before stating:

Most new chairmen lack familiarity with many of these activities, and there is usually no ready way to acquire familiarity [sic]. They attain the familiarity at the expense of their scholarly effort. (p. 13)

It is therefore apparent that the tension between his academic and administrative roles is one of the major problems faced by the departmental chairman. According to the authors, the danger of lingering in administration too long is that the chairman may reach the point of no return with respect to the pursuit of his academic and scholarly career.

Siever, Loomis, and Neidt (1972) studied the role of the department chairman in two land-grant universities. A series of questionnaire items which reflected characteristics of effective department chairmen were ranked by 481 faculty

members and administrators. Highly ranked characteristics included: the ability to recruit promising faculty, the support of good teaching, good organization of faculty duties, a personal reputation for scholarship, a reputation for achieving goals, and a capacity for decisive thinking and action. Characteristics that were rated lowest in importance included: being highly identified with one's own discipline; identifying as one of the faculty, a first among equals; maintaining a low faculty turnover rate; fund-raising outside the university; and extra-departmental involvement with other groups in the university, organizations in the community, and agencies of the government.

Edelson (1973) studied the role of the department chairman in collective and noncollective bargaining in institutions of higher education. He obtained usable questionnaires from 78 department chairmen and 402 faculty members from three matched pairs of unionized and non-unionized private liberal arts colleges and universities. He found that both department chairmen and faculty members in unionized schools had more congruent perceptions of the chairman's role than their counterparts in non-unionized schools. He also found that the chairmen in non-unionized schools viewed their involvement in personnel activities as being more important than did the chairmen in unionized schools. He found further that the chairmen in unionized institutions placed more importance in their involvement with administrative

activities than did the chairmen in non-unionized institutions. He concluded that, in general, chairmen from both types of institutions saw themselves primarily as spokesmen and representatives of the department, secondly as teachers, and thirdly as departmental administrators. He recommended that chairmen be provided with administrative assistance in recognition of their self-perceptions as teachers and teacher-colleagues.

Marjany (1974) studied the role of the department chairman at the University of Utah. The sample was composed of 145 deans, department chairmen, and full-time faculty members representing six departments of the university. The findings revealed that the chairmen had two main areas of concern: (1) establishing a climate which facilitated scholarly research, and (2) assisting in the development and review of long-range departmental goals and objectives. Marjany also found that the chairmen are closer to deans than to faculty. Furthermore, he discovered that the faculty's ideal priority for department chairmen was that chairmen should be involved in seeking their department's share of the university funds.

Young (1974) studied the effectiveness of women department chairmen in higher education by sending a questionnaire to selected deans and faculty members in the largest state university in each of the states that comprise the Deep South. She found that older respondents had a more favorable

view of the effectiveness of women department chairmen than did younger ones. Married respondents likewise had a more favorable view of their effectiveness than did divorced respondents. Women had a higher view of their effectiveness than did men. Those who had doctor's degrees perceived their effectiveness more highly than those with only master's degrees. Those who had taught below the level of higher education viewed their effectiveness more favorably than those who had never taught below that level.

Corson (1975) indicated that the department chairman is generally selected on the basis of his teaching ability and seniority as opposed to "any demonstrated capacity for administrative leadership" (p. 251). The demands of administration, however, tend to restrict his academic involvement:

Since his or her professional reputation is based on competence as a teacher and researcher, the departmental chairperson strives "to keep his hand in," to discharge the responsibilities of the chairpersonship while teaching a course and, in the more prestigious institutions, continuing his researches. (p. 252)

Corson implied that the addition of staff assistants to help with the details of administration would enable the chairman to spend more time in meaningful academic activity.

Significance

The review of the literature has indicated that the department chairmanship was not a planned innovation in

higher education, but evolved as a result of larger enrollments and greater diversification of programs. As the position has developed, a number of attempts have been made to define the qualifications and duties of the departmental chairmanship, the most notable of these being the study by Doyle (1953). Since that time a number of other studies have examined various aspects of the role while at the same time expressing a need for more research. Many of these studies are now out of date while others focus on limited aspects of the chairman's role or are confined to a particular discipline or university. Considering the importance of the department in the overall structure of the university and the key role in governance played by the department chairman, it seems clear that further research is needed to give a comprehensive view of the role of the department chairman in terms of his qualifications, functions, attitudes, interests, and ambitions in order to determine the place that the position plays in his career history, and to determine the extent to which his academic life is affected by his administrative role.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the sample population, the instrument used for data collection, and the procedures used for collecting the data. Also described are the statistical procedures by which the data were analyzed.

Sample Population

The population for this study is composed of the liberal arts department chairmen in the four major publicly supported universities in the State of Michigan: Western Michigan University (WMU), Michigan State University (MSU), Wayne State University (WSU), and the University of Michigan (UM). Liberal arts departments and their chairmen were identified from the current university bulletins of the four institutions. The departments represented disciplines traditionally classified as arts and letters as well as physical and social sciences. Excluded were chairmen of departments that provided only graduate programs because it was felt that they were not representative of the typical liberal arts department. Acting department chairmen were included in the sample. A total of 121 academic liberal arts department chairmen were ultimately identified as the population for the study.

Instrument

This study was designed to describe liberal arts department chairmen by investigating (1) the characteristics of the departments which they administer, (2) their personal characteristics, (3) their selection and tenure, (4) their functions, (5) their job attitudes, and (6) their career goals. Carey's study (1975) of the undergraduate college deanship provided a basis for determining many of the questions and the format of the research instrument because many of the issues raised in that study with deans were seen to be parallel to department chairmen. Other questions were taken from the literature on department chairmen or were developed in discussions with the researcher's adviser.

When a preliminary version of the instrument had been drafted, it was decided to pretest it with the department heads at Eastern Michigan University (EMU). It was further decided that personally delivering the questionnaires to the chairmen would insure a good return and would allow the chairmen an opportunity to ask questions about the instrument or to comment on matters not included in the instrument. Therefore, a questionnaire--accompanied by a cover letter introducing the researcher and inviting suggestions for improving the instrument, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope--was personally delivered to each of the 32 department heads or their personal secretaries at EMU on

April 26 and 27, 1976. By the last week in May, 23 questionnaires (71.9 percent) had been completed and returned. One more arrived during the first week in June but was received too late to have any bearing on the revision of the instrument. After considering the suggestions for improvement, the questionnaire was revised and photocopied. A revised cover letter was photocopied on the stationery of the WMU Department of Educational Leadership so as to lend status to the study.

Data Collection

Because of the success in the rate of return from EMU, the decision was again made to personally deliver the questionnaires to all the chairmen in the sample. Therefore, during the first two weeks of June the chairmen or their secretaries were personally handed the instrument accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

When the return rate had reached 53.7 percent and went into decline, follow-up visits were made on July 22 and 23 to the offices of department chairmen from whom no responses were received. Additional copies of the instrument were left where needed. When the rate of return had again gone into decline after reaching 61.2 percent, second follow-up visits were conducted on August 24 and 25. By the end of September, 80 out of 121 department chairmen (66.1 percent) had

submitted usable returns for the study. Three more questionnaires arrived during October but were received too late to be included in the final tabulation of the data. The rate of return by institution is found in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--Rate of questionnaire return by institution

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number distributed	25	43	23	30	121
Number returned	17	28	14	21	80
Percentage returned	68.0%	65.1%	60.9%	70.0%	66.1%

Data Analysis

The original intent of the study was to look at how the career goals of department chairmen influence their interpretation of the job requirements of the position. However, because only four MSU respondents indicated a desire to "move up the administrative ladder" as opposed to a "return to professorial duties" or "other" ambitions, an analysis of the data on this basis was ruled out. Rather, the department chairmen are compared across the four institutions selected for this study in terms of the characteristics of the departments which they administer, their personal characteristics, their selection and tenure, their functions, their job attitudes, and their career goals.

Nominal data are obtained from the research instrument. The .05 level of significance (Kerlinger, 1973) is used to

test the differences between institutions. The one-way analysis of variance with unequal N's (Glass & Stanley, 1970) is used to analyze the majority of the data. The frequency data require that the remainder of the analysis be accomplished by the use of the chi-square technique (Siegel, 1956). Throughout the study, all statistical probabilities are stated as p and are accompanied by appropriate designations with regard to their significance at the .05 level. Probabilities are omitted when both means and standard deviations equal zero and when expected frequencies are less than 1. The computer facilities at WMU were utilized to process the data and perform the relevant computations.

Summary

The focus of this study is on the university liberal arts department chairmanship in four Michigan institutions. The instrument gathers information on department characteristics, personal characteristics, selection and tenure, functions and activities, job attitudes, and career goals. The instrument was pretested at EMU. Of the 121 questionnaires that were personally distributed to the liberal arts department chairmen at WMU, MSU, WSU, and UM, a total of 80 (66.1 percent) were returned and formed the basis of the study. The data were analyzed according to the one-way analysis of variance and chi-square techniques.

CHAPTER III

THE RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the investigation. The first section reports the results of the comparison of the department chairmen across institutions. The second section gives a sampling of the responses to the open-ended questions on job attitudes and career goals.

The Liberal Arts Department Chairmanship by Institution

This section compares liberal arts department chairmen across the four institutions selected for the study: Western Michigan University (WMU), Michigan State University (MSU), Wayne State University (WSU), and the University of Michigan (UM). The chairmen are compared according to the characteristics of the departments which they administer, their personal characteristics, their selection and tenure, their functions, their job attitudes, and their career goals.

Department characteristics

The department characteristics that were explored in this study pertain particularly to departmental size and emphasis. Table 2 shows the mean number of full-time equated faculty and the mean numbers of undergraduate and graduate

TABLE 2.--Number of full-time equated faculty members and enrollments by majors within departments

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of departments	17	26	14	21	78
Mean number of full-time equated faculty per department	18.4	28.7	33.4	29.3	27.4
Standard deviation	10.9	19.0	24.7	19.8	19.3
	$F(3, 74) = 1.84; p = .15$ (N.S.)				
Number of departments	17	28	14	21	80
Mean number of undergraduate majors	285.2	231.0	311.1	201.1	248.7
Standard deviation	318.2	282.5	306.5	214.0	276.6
	$F(3, 76) = .57; p = .64$ (N.S.)				
Mean number of graduate majors per department	52.2	61.8	113.1	120.0	84.0
Standard deviation	68.1	59.5	88.5	88.7	79.5
	$F(3, 76) = 4.14; p = .01$ (SIG.)				

majors enrolled in the departments in each institution.

While no significant difference is indicated among the four institutions, WMU has strikingly fewer faculty members per department than the other institutions. WSU shows the highest average per department, but this could be attributed to the lower number of liberal arts departments within the institution (see Table 1). The mean number of undergraduate majors per department shows no significant difference among institutions. However, as with the mean number of faculty

per department, WSU has the highest number of undergraduate majors per department; UM, on the other hand, has the lowest. The number of graduate majors per department may account for these differences. A significant difference among institutions was indicated in this area. Both WSU and UM reveal much higher graduate enrollments than either WMU or MSU. In the case of WSU, much of the difference can be attributed to the lower number of liberal arts departments and to the greater institutional enrollments. The UM data seem to reflect an emphasis on graduate education.

Another indication of the size and emphasis of departments is the numbers of the various degrees that are granted annually. This information is presented in Table 3. Only with respect to the mean number of doctor's degrees that were granted per department in the last full academic year does a significant difference among institutions appear. UM evidently places a high emphasis on graduate and particularly doctoral level training. The low mean for doctoral degrees at WMU can be attributed to the fact that most of the departments do not have doctoral programs. The other degrees that were granted included sixth-year specialist in arts degrees, diplomas for advanced graduate study, and doctoral candidate certificates.

In conclusion, the evidence seems to indicate that there are some differences among universities in terms of the size and emphasis of their liberal arts departments.

TABLE 3.--Numbers of degrees granted within departments in the last full academic year

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of departments	17	28	13	19	77
Mean number of bachelor's degrees granted per department	51.9	65.9	78.7	66.7	65.2
Standard deviation	57.4	102.2	90.0	69.7	83.1
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = .25; \underline{p} = .86 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number of master's degrees granted per department	11.6	11.5	17.0	19.7	14.5
Standard deviation	18.8	12.0	16.5	24.2	17.9
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = 1.04; \underline{p} = .38 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number of doctor's degrees granted per department	0.3	5.5	6.3	12.1	6.1
Standard deviation	0.8	7.5	8.2	12.9	9.3
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = 5.78; \underline{p} < .01 \text{ (SIG.)}$				
Mean number of other degrees granted per department	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1
Standard deviation	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.5
Mean number of total degrees granted per department	63.9	83.0	102.0	98.7	85.9
Standard deviation	73.3	112.7	104.2	90.2	97.3
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = .51; \underline{p} = .67 \text{ (N.S.)}$				

WSU, with fewer liberal arts departments than the other institutions, has larger departmental enrollments. The UM departments seem to be more oriented toward graduate education and particularly doctoral level training than are their counterparts in the other institutions. These findings suggest that the WSU chairmen may be more administratively oriented because of the need to spend more time in administrative functions while the UM chairmen may be more academically oriented because of a greater involvement in research activities.

Personal characteristics

The personal characteristics of department chairmen that were examined in this study included age, sex, academic degrees, academic rank, experience, organizational memberships, thesis and dissertation advising, and publications.

Table 4 presents the mean age and sex of the department chairmen. No significant difference was found among institutions with respect to the age of the chairmen. The chairmen at WMU appear to be slightly younger while those at MSU are slightly older than those from the other institutions. Men are nearly always employed in the position. Most of the women hold chairmanships in the fine arts areas.

Table 5 records the percentages of chairmen holding bachelor's, master's, doctor's, and other degrees of training. There are no significant differences among chairmen from

TABLE 4.--Age and sex of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Mean age	46.1	48.1	47.1	47.4	47.3
Standard deviation	7.3	6.7	8.6	7.8	7.4
	$F(3, 76) = .28; p = .84 (N.S.)$				
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	16 94.1%	27 96.4%	14 100.0%	19 90.5%	76 95.0%
Female	1 5.9%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%	2 9.5%	4 5.0%

different institutions. All chairmen but one possess the bachelor's degree, and all but six possess the doctor's degree. However, 15 out of the 80 do not possess the master's degree. The most likely reason for this is that in a number of disciplines a graduate student who is ultimately interested in teaching and research may proceed directly to the doctoral degree. The other degrees and training that some chairmen completed include associate's degrees; second bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees; and post-degree work at all levels.

Presented in Table 6 are the mean years in which the chairmen received their various degrees. No significant differences among chairmen from different institutions are found at any of the degree levels. It is evident, however, that the MSU and UM chairmen received their doctoral degrees slightly more than two years before the others. This may

TABLE 5.--Number of department chairmen with bachelor's, master's, doctor's, and other degrees or training

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
<u>Bachelor's degree</u>					
Yes	16 94.1%	28 100.0%	14 100.0%	21 100.0%	79 98.7%
No	1 5.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.3%
<u>Master's degree</u>					
Yes	16 94.1%	24 85.7%	9 64.3%	16 76.2%	65 81.2%
No	1 5.9%	4 14.3%	5 35.7%	5 23.8%	15 18.8%
	$\chi^2 = 5.21$; $df = 3$; $p = .16$ (N.S.)				
<u>Doctor's degree</u>					
Yes	16 94.1%	27 96.4%	11 78.6%	20 95.2%	74 92.5%
No	1 5.9%	1 3.6%	3 21.4%	1 4.8%	6 7.5%
	$\chi^2 = 4.83$; $df = 3$; $p = .18$ (N.S.)				
<u>Other degree or training</u>					
Yes	3 17.6%	6 21.4%	1 7.1%	4 19.0%	14 17.5%
No	14 82.4%	22 78.6%	13 92.9%	17 81.0%	66 82.5%
	$\chi^2 = 1.38$; $df = 3$; $p = .71$ (N.S.)				

reflect a tendency to hire scholars rather than administrators. Generally, chairmen received their bachelor's degrees in 1951 at the age of 22. They earned their master's degrees three years later at the age of 25. Five more years were needed to complete doctorates which they received at the age of 30.

TABLE 6.--Dates when department chairmen received their degrees

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	16	28	14	21	79
Mean year bachelor's degree received	1951.7	1950.9	1951.6	1950.7	1950.9
Standard deviation	7.6	6.2	9.0	7.8	7.3
	$F(3, 75) = .19; p = .90$ (N.S.)				
Number of chairmen	16	24	9	16	65
Mean year master's degree received	1954.7	1953.7	1954.0	1954.0	1954.1
Standard deviation	5.8	5.7	8.8	8.0	6.6
	$F(3, 61) = .07; p = .97$ (N.S.)				
Number of chairmen	16	27	11	20	74
Mean year doctor's degree received	1960.8	1958.3	1961.4	1958.6	1959.4
Standard deviation	7.0	5.7	6.1	8.6	6.9
	$F(3, 70) = .85; p = .47$ (N.S.)				

Reported in Table 7 are the academic ranks of the chairmen. Eighty percent hold the rank of Professor. The chairmen at MSU hold a slight edge over the others in this regard.

Table 8 shows the mean number of years that chairmen have continuously worked in their institutions as well as the mean number of years that they have held their positions. In neither instance is a significant difference indicated among chairmen from different institutions. It is evident, however, that the UM chairmen have not worked continuously

TABLE 7.--Academic rank of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Professor	13 76.5%	25 89.3%	10 71.4%	16 76.2%	64 80.0%
Associate professor	3 17.6%	3 10.7%	4 28.6%	5 23.8%	15 18.7%
Assistant professor	1 5.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.3%

TABLE 8.--Number of years department chairmen have continuously worked in their institutions and number of years they have held their positions as chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Mean number of years continuously worked in their institutions	13.8	14.1	14.1	12.6	13.6
Standard deviation	6.8	8.3	10.6	6.9	7.8
	$F(3, 76) = .18; p = .91 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of years held their positions as chairmen	4.9	4.5	5.6	3.0	4.4
Standard deviation	3.2	4.4	5.9	2.0	4.0
	$F(3, 76) = 1.32; p = .27 (N.S.)$				

in their institution quite as long as the other chairmen nor have they held their positions as long. In the former instance, it may be that the university places more importance

on outside experience prior to initial hiring than the other institutions, while in the latter instance it may be that the institution maintains a more frequent turnover rate among its chairmen than the other institutions to enable them to concentrate on their academic interests. Generally, chairmen work for more than nine years in their institutions before assuming the chairmanship. This is perhaps the time it takes to acquire enough rank and academic status for the position.

Table 9 records the mean years of college and university

TABLE 9.--Number of years of college and university teaching experience and number of years of administrative experience of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Mean number of years of college and university teaching experience	19.0	18.5	17.4	18.0	18.3
Standard deviation	8.1	7.0	8.8	8.5	7.9
	$F(3, 76) = .12; p = .95 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of years of administrative experience	6.0	8.3	8.1	4.5	6.8
Standard deviation	3.9	5.4	5.3	3.2	4.8
	$F(3, 76) = 3.21; p = .03 (SIG.)$				

teaching experience and the mean years of administrative experience of the chairmen. No significant difference is indicated among chairmen at different universities in the

area of teaching experience. However, there is a statistically significant difference with regard to the administrative experience of department chairmen. The chairmen at UM have much less and the chairmen at WMU have somewhat less administrative experience than the chairmen at the other two institutions. This suggests that the UM chairmen and to a lesser extent the WMU chairmen are more academically oriented than the others.

Department chairmen were asked whether or not they had previous experience as a chairman or an assistant chairman. Table 10 presents the results. Significant differences were

TABLE 10.--Number of department chairmen with prior experience as a chairman or an assistant chairman

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
<u>Prior experience as a chairman</u>					
Yes	3 17.6%	5 17.9%	5 35.7%	3 14.3%	16 20.0%
No	14 82.4%	23 82.1%	9 64.3%	18 85.7%	64 80.0%
	$\chi^2 = 2.73; df = 3; p = .44$ (N.S.)				
<u>Prior experience as an assistant chairman</u>					
Yes	1 5.9%	10 35.7%	5 35.7%	4 19.0%	20 25.0%
No	16 94.1%	18 64.3%	9 64.3%	17 81.0%	60 75.0%
	$\chi^2 = 6.28; df = 3; p = .10$ (N.S.)				

not found in either instance among chairmen from different institutions. Only 20 percent of the chairmen indicated that they had been chairmen before. This figure included several who indicated that their previous chairmanship had been an acting chairmanship. Prior experience as an assistant chairman was indicated by another 25 percent including several who noted that they had actually been associate chairmen. Thus, the role of assistant or associate chairman is not necessarily a stepping stone to the chairmanship.

Memberships in professional and civic organizations are shown in Table 11. No significant differences among chairmen from different institutions were found in the mean numbers of organizations to which they belong nor in the mean numbers of positions which they hold in those organizations. The professional organizations to which they belong most frequently are: the American Association of University Professors (15 memberships), the American Association for the Advancement of Science (13 memberships), and the Society of the Sigma Chi (12 memberships). Chairmen rarely belong to civic organizations. This may be attributed to the fact that as academicians and administrators much of their attention is devoted to activities that demand extensive concentration. Memberships in the Boy Scouts of America, churches, and certain governor's commissions were each claimed by two chairmen. Memberships were also claimed in several other organizations including the Kiwanis and Rotary clubs and the

TABLE 11.--Numbers of professional and civic organizations to which department chairmen currently belong and numbers of positions they currently hold within those organizations

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean number of current memberships in professional organizations	4.2	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.1
Standard deviation	2.0	2.4	2.7	1.7	2.2
	$\underline{F} (3, 75) = .22; \underline{p} = .88 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of currently held positions in professional organizations	0.4	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.7
Standard deviation	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.0
	$\underline{F} (3, 75) = .69; \underline{p} = .56 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of memberships in civic organizations	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3
Standard deviation	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.7
	$\underline{F} (3, 75) = .23; \underline{p} = .88 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of currently held positions in civic organizations	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2
Standard deviation	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.5
	$\underline{F} (3, 75) = .30; \underline{p} = .83 (N.S.)$				

American Civil Liberties Union. Chairmen do not hold many positions in either type of organization.

A major concern of this study was to determine the chairman's degree of interest in teaching and research. One

indication of his interest in this regard is the degree of his involvement in supervising the research projects of students. The research instrument asked department chairmen to specify the number of theses and dissertations they successfully directed to completion before and since becoming chairmen. An annual rate of production before and since becoming chairmen could then be calculated in order to determine whether the chairmanship facilitates or retards this type of activity.

In order to determine the chairman's rate of production before becoming department chairman, his total production prior to becoming chairman had to be divided by the difference between the number of years he has served as chairman of the department and his total number of years of teaching experience. His production rate since becoming chairman was obtained simply by dividing his total production since becoming chairman by the number of years he has been chairman of the department. These calculations were based entirely on the time spent in current positions. No allowances were made for prior chairmanships because no exact figures were available as to the duration of those chairmanships.

Table 12 presents the mean number of theses and dissertations department chairmen from different universities have successfully directed to completion before and after becoming chairmen. No significant difference among chairmen from different institutions is indicated in the number of theses

TABLE 12.--Numbers of theses and dissertations department chairmen have directed to completion

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
<u>Completion prior to becoming chairman</u>					
Mean number of theses	3.3	5.5	5.6	2.4	4.2
Standard deviation	4.9	6.4	4.7	3.9	5.3
	$F(3, 76) = 1.86; p = .14 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of dissertations	1.8	3.9	2.4	9.0	4.5
Standard deviation	3.2	4.3	5.3	11.1	7.2
	$F(3, 76) = 4.50; p = .01 (SIG.)$				
Mean number of theses plus dissertations	5.1	9.4	8.0	11.4	8.8
Standard deviation	6.5	7.4	8.7	11.2	8.7
	$F(3, 76) = 1.78; p = .16 (N.S.)$				
<u>Completion since becoming chairman</u>					
Mean number of theses	0.9	0.6	3.4	1.5	1.4
Standard deviation	2.4	0.9	5.2	3.1	3.1
	$F(3, 76) = 3.04; p = .03 (SIG.)$				
Mean number of dissertations	0.2	1.2	0.9	2.3	1.2
Standard deviation	0.8	2.0	1.5	2.2	1.9
	$F(3, 76) = 4.24; p = .01 (SIG.)$				
Mean number of theses plus dissertations	1.2	1.8	4.4	3.8	2.6
Standard deviation	2.6	2.3	5.5	3.5	3.6
	$F(3, 76) = 3.51; p = .02 (SIG.)$				

that they had directed prior to becoming chairmen. However, in the matter of the number of dissertations directed to completion before becoming chairmen, a statistically significant difference is found among chairmen from different institutions. The chairmen at UM were much more involved in this activity before becoming chairmen than were the chairmen from the other institutions. With regard to the mean numbers of theses and dissertations directed to completion since becoming chairmen, significant differences among chairmen at different universities are indicated in both instances. The WSU chairmen report more theses directed to completion than do the chairmen from any of the other institutions. However, the chairmen at UM again lead in dissertations directed to completion. The low dissertation figure for the chairmen at WMU can be attributed to the small number of doctoral programs available at the institution.

Table 13 shows the mean annual rates of directing completed theses and dissertations before and after becoming department chairmen as well as the mean annual rates of increase or decrease. No significant difference is indicated with respect to their annual production rates prior to becoming chairmen. However, a statistically significant difference among chairmen from different institutions is indicated in the annual production rates since becoming chairmen. The chairmen at UM are more involved in these activities than are the chairmen from the other institutions. Also indicated

TABLE 13.--Department chairmen's annual rates of directing theses and dissertations to completion

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Mean annual rate prior to becoming chairman	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
Standard deviation	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
	$F(3, 76) = 1.40; p = .25 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean annual rate since becoming chairman	0.3	0.5	0.9	1.5	0.8
Standard deviation	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.1
	$F(3, 76) = 5.14; p < .01 \text{ (SIG.)}$				
Mean annual rate of increase or decrease since becoming chairman	-0.1	-0.3	+0.2	+0.7	+0.1
Standard deviation	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.0
	$F(3, 76) = 4.83; p < .01 \text{ (SIG.)}$				

is a statistically significant difference in the annual rates of increase or decrease. The chairmen at UM have more than doubled their production since becoming chairmen and, as a result, lead the chairmen from the other institutions in the rate of increase in production. These findings are consistent with previous findings on the emphasis on graduate training in the liberal arts departments at UM, and suggest that thesis- and dissertation-advising is an important aspect of the job of the department chairmen at UM.

Several weaknesses in the research instrument became

apparent with respect to the questions on theses and dissertations. First, the distinction between "thesis" and "dissertation" may not have been clearly understood by all chairmen. Classifying them as "master's theses" and "doctor's dissertations" would have served to define them more precisely. The total production rates would not have been affected had this been done. Second, the matter of directing postdoctoral research was not reflected in the questions. And third, the differences among disciplines were not taken into consideration in the formulation of the questions. One art department chairman, for example, indicated that he directs a number of advanced art students per year who write neither theses nor dissertations. While provisions should have been made on the instrument for these considerations, it seems safe to conclude that generally chairmen tend to maintain their level of involvement in guiding scholarly activity when they become department chairmen.

Another indication of a chairman's interest in research is his publication record. This is presented in Tables 14 and 15. Table 14 gives the mean numbers of the publications of department chairmen before and since becoming chairmen. A statistically significant difference among chairmen from different universities is recorded with respect to the mean number of books published prior to becoming chairmen. The chairmen at UM published more books on the average than the chairmen from the other institutions. While a statistically

TABLE 14.--Numbers of publications of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
<u>Publications prior to becoming chairman</u>					
Mean number books	0.4	1.0	0.4	2.0	1.0
Standard deviation	0.5	1.3	0.6	2.8	1.7
	$F(3, 76) = 3.73; p = .01 \text{ (SIG.)}$				
Mean number profes- sional articles	9.9	22.0	8.9	16.4	15.7
Standard deviation	9.5	28.0	11.0	16.8	9.0
	$F(3, 76) = 2.00; p = .12 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number other publications	1.1	4.9	4.1	8.1	4.8
Standard deviation	2.6	8.4	8.3	23.4	13.5
	$F(3, 76) = .85; p = .47 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number total publications	11.4	27.9	13.4	26.4	21.5
Standard deviation	10.5	30.7	11.8	25.2	24.1
	$F(3, 76) = 2.63; p = .06 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
<u>Publications since becoming chairman</u>					
Mean number books	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.5
Standard deviation	1.1	0.8	1.9	0.6	1.1
	$F(3, 76) = .68; p = .57 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number profes- sional articles	1.4	4.5	3.3	2.1	3.0
Standard deviation	1.5	9.3	5.4	2.8	6.2
	$F(3, 76) = 1.19; p = .35 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number other publications	0.1	4.4	4.5	1.5	2.7
Standard deviation	0.2	9.8	9.9	4.0	7.5
	$F(3, 76) = 1.65; p = .19 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Mean number total publications	2.1	9.3	8.5	4.1	6.3
Standard deviation	1.8	18.0	10.2	4.6	12.0
	$F(3, 76) = 1.70; p = .18 \text{ (N.S.)}$				

significant difference was not found with regard to the mean number of professional articles published before becoming chairmen, it is evident that the chairmen at MSU and UM published more than the chairmen from the other institutions. No significant difference was found in the matter of other publications which included book reviews, research reports, educational films, art exhibitions, and musical compositions. Statistically significant differences were found in none of these three areas of publication since department chairmen became chairmen. Neither were statistically significant differences found among department chairmen from different institutions with respect to their mean annual publication rates prior to and since becoming chairmen as recorded in Table 15 nor in the mean annual rates of increase or decrease since becoming chairmen. Only the chairmen at MSU produced substantially fewer publications annually since becoming chairmen, perhaps because administrative duties interfere with scholarly activities. It can be concluded, therefore, that while there may have been a few differences in the numbers and rates of publications among chairmen from different universities, assuming the chairmanship has very little effect on the publication production of chairmen. This implies that they behave as scholars rather than as typical administrators.

In summary, a study of the personal characteristics of department chairmen suggests some differences among chairmen

TABLE 15.--Annual publication rates of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Mean annual publication rate prior to becoming chairman	1.0	3.9	1.2	1.7	2.2
Standard deviation	1.0	8.3	0.9	1.1	5.1
	$\underline{F} (3, 76) = 1.64; \underline{p} = .19 (N.S.)$				
Mean annual publication rate since becoming chairman	0.7	1.2	2.0	1.6	1.6
Standard deviation	1.2	3.1	3.0	1.8	2.5
	$\underline{F} (3, 76) = 1.09; \underline{p} = .36 (N.S.)$				
Mean annual rate of increase/decrease in publications since becoming chairman	-0.3	-1.9	+0.9	0.0	-0.6
Standard deviation	0.9	7.6	3.0	1.2	4.8
	$\underline{F} (3, 76) = 1.30; \underline{p} = .28 (N.S.)$				

from different universities. The chairmen at UM have considerably less administrative experience than the chairmen from the other institutions. Before becoming chairmen, they directed many more dissertations than the chairmen from the other institutions. Since becoming chairmen, they have directed annually more theses and dissertations to completion than the chairmen from the other institutions and show a greater annual increase in this regard than do the chairmen from the other institutions. On the average, they wrote more books before becoming chairmen than did the chairmen from the

other institutions. These findings, particularly that the UM chairmen have had less administrative experience but more involvement in academic concerns such as in directing research and to some extent in publications than the chairmen from the other institutions, support a previous conclusion that the departments at UM tend to emphasize graduate education more than do the departments at the other institutions.

Selection and tenure

The department chairmen in the study were analyzed in terms of their selection and tenure. The analyses included the methods by which they were selected, how they discovered that the position was available, the membership of search committees, whether they were hired internally or externally, whether their highest degree was earned inside or outside the employing institution, their perception of certain selection criteria, and the lengths of their terms.

Table 16 portrays the methods by which the department chairmen were selected. The chairmen at WMU seem to have obtained their positions basically through the election method. This is demonstrated by the fact that when the first and third categories are combined, 64.7 percent of the chairmen are shown to have been essentially elected to their positions. By the same token, most of the chairmen at MSU have been appointed to their positions because a combination of the second and fourth categories of the selection methods

TABLE 16.--Method by which department chairmen are selected

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Election by departmental faculty	4 23.5%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 6.3%
Appointment by administration	0 0.0%	3 10.7%	3 21.4%	1 4.8%	7 8.8%
Election by faculty with administrative approval	7 41.2%	6 21.4%	3 21.4%	5 23.8%	21 26.2%
Appointment by administration with faculty approval	1 5.9%	15 53.6%	4 28.6%	9 42.9%	29 36.2%
Other	5 29.4%	3 10.7%	4 28.6%	6 28.6%	18 22.5%

includes 64.3 percent of the chairmen. The other methods consisted of combinations and variations of these methods such as administrative appointments following faculty elections, nominations, or recommendations and student or governing board involvement in the selection process.

Table 17 shows how department chairmen discovered that the chairmanship was available. Generally, they learned of it because they were employed in the department at the time of the vacancy. However, 21.4 percent of the MSU chairmen and 28.6 percent of the WSU chairmen as opposed to 5.9 percent of the WMU chairmen and 4.8 percent of the UM chairmen were contacted by search committees. This may indicate more of a tendency at MSU and WSU to hire from outside the institution.

TABLE 17.--How department chairmen discovered that chairmanship was available

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Internal or announced	14 82.4%	19 67.9%	9 64.3%	16 76.2%	58 72.5%
Search committee contact	1 5.9%	6 21.4%	4 28.6%	1 4.8%	12 15.0%
Dean	1 5.9%	2 7.1%	1 7.1%	2 9.5%	6 7.5%
Former chairman	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.8%	1 1.3%
Faculty	0 0.0%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.3%
Advertisements	1 5.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.3%
Word of mouth	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.8%	1 1.3%

The frequency of the existence of search committees and the frequencies of the various types of search committee members are presented in Table 18. A significant difference among chairmen from different universities is recorded in terms of whether or not search committees were involved in their appointments. While search committees were very important factors in the selection of chairmen at MSU and WSU, they were factors in only half of the appointments at WMU and in only one-third of the appointments at UM. Statistically significant differences among universities were evident in terms of some of the types of members who served on search committees. Students enjoyed much more participation in the

TABLE 18.--Frequency of existence of search committees which resulted in appointments of department chairmen and frequencies of types of members on those committees

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	16	26	14	21	77
<u>Existence of search committees</u>					
Yes	8 50.0%	22 84.6%	13 92.9%	7 33.3%	50 64.9%
No	8 50.0%	4 15.4%	1 7.1%	14 66.7%	27 35.1%
	$\chi^2 = 20.00$; <u>df</u> = 3; <u>p</u> < .01 (SIG.)				
Number of chairmen selected by search committees	8	22	13	7	50
<u>Types of members</u>					
Students					
Yes	2 25.0%	15 68.2%	4 30.8%	2 28.6%	23 46.0%
No	6 75.0%	7 31.8%	9 69.2%	5 71.4%	27 54.0%
	$\chi^2 = 7.85$; <u>df</u> = 3; <u>p</u> = .05 (SIG.)				
Faculty					
Yes	6 75.0%	21 95.5%	10 76.9%	6 85.7%	43 86.0%
No	2 25.0%	1 4.5%	3 23.1%	1 14.3%	7 14.0%
Former department chairman					
Yes	3 37.5%	1 4.5%	3 23.1%	2 28.6%	9 18.0%
No	5 62.5%	21 95.5%	10 76.9%	5 71.4%	41 82.0%
	$\chi^2 = 5.52$; <u>df</u> = 3; <u>p</u> = .14 (N.S.)				
Associate dean					
Yes	6 75.0%	3 13.6%	3 23.1%	0 0.0%	12 24.0%
No	2 25.0%	19 86.4%	10 76.9%	7 100.0%	38 76.0%
	$\chi^2 = 14.92$; <u>df</u> = 3; <u>p</u> < .01 (SIG.)				

TABLE 18--Continued

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Dean					
Yes	4 50.0%	4 18.2%	8 61.5%	1 14.3%	17 34.0%
No	4 50.0%	18 81.8%	5 38.5%	6 85.7%	33 66.0%
	$\chi^2 = 8.97$; $df = 3$; $p = .03$ (SIG.)				
Academic vice- president					
Yes	2 25.0%	2 9.1%	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	5 10.0%
No	6 75.0%	20 90.9%	12 91.7%	7 100.0%	45 90.0%
President					
Yes	1 12.5%	1 4.5%	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	3 6.0%
No	7 87.5%	21 95.5%	12 91.7%	7 100.0%	47 94.0%

search committees at MSU than at the other institutions. Associate deans were much more in evidence at WMU than elsewhere, and deans were much more in evidence at WSU than in the other universities. Neither presidents nor academic vice-presidents were often involved in the search committee aspect of the selection process.

Table 19 gives the percentages of the internal and external hiring of department chairmen. While most chairmen are hired from within the institution, this is particularly true at UM, where all but one chairmen were hired internally. A slightly greater percentage of WMU chairmen were hired

TABLE 19.--Frequency of internal and external hiring of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Hired from inside the institution	14 82.4%	22 78.6%	11 78.6%	20 95.2%	67 83.7%
Hired from outside the institution	3 17.6%	6 21.4%	3 21.4%	1 4.8%	13 16.3%
$\chi^2 = 2.89$; $df = 3$; $p = .41$ (N.S.)					

internally than were the chairmen from either MSU or WSU. These findings are consistent with the previous findings that most of the chairmen learned of the vacancies internally, and that very few of the WMU and UM chairmen were contacted by search committees. The fact that most chairmen were hired internally suggests that either budget considerations did not permit the luxury of external recruitment or that the required talent was already present in the organization. Both factors could also have been of influence.

One indication of the value that an institution places on its own academic training is the extent to which it will employ its own graduates. Table 20, recording a statistically significant difference, shows that while only 20 percent of all chairmen received their highest degree from the institutions in which they are employed, 38.1 percent of the chairmen at UM received their highest degree from that institution. Although no WMU chairmen received their highest degree from

TABLE 20.--Frequency of hiring of department chairmen whose highest degree was earned inside or outside employing institution

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Highest degree was earned inside the employing institution	0 0.0%	6 21.4%	2 14.3%	8 38.1%	16 20.0%
Highest degree was earned outside the employing institution	17 100.0%	22 78.6%	12 85.7%	13 61.9%	64 80.0%
$\chi^2 = 8.87$; $df = 3$; $p = .03$ (SIG.)					

the institution in which they are employed, it should be noted that only four liberal arts departments offer doctoral degrees and that these programs are relatively recent in origin.

The research instrument asked the chairmen to rate the importance of certain personal qualifications that may have been considered by those responsible for their appointments. The four qualifications were: (1) administrative talent, (2) outstanding teaching ability, (3) previous teaching experience, and (4) research and scholarship. Each of the four qualifications was marked on the following scale: 1 = of some importance; 2 = important; and 3 = very important. The results are presented in Table 21. No significant differences among chairmen from different universities were recorded for any of the qualifications. However, on three

TABLE 21.--Degree of importance of certain selection criteria as rated by department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	13	20	78
Mean score on administrative talent	2.41	2.46	2.62	2.05	2.37
Standard deviation	0.80	0.74	0.51	0.69	0.72
	$F(3, 74) = 2.07; p = .11$ (N.S.)				
Number of chairmen	15	28	12	18	73
Mean score on outstanding teaching ability	1.60	1.79	1.92	1.61	1.73
Standard deviation	0.63	0.74	0.51	0.50	0.63
	$F(3, 69) = .85; p = .47$ (N.S.)				
Number of chairmen	15	28	12	18	73
Mean score on previous teaching experience	1.93	1.93	2.17	1.56	1.88
Standard deviation	0.70	0.77	0.58	0.62	0.71
	$F(3, 69) = 2.09; p = .11$ (N.S.)				
Number of chairmen	15	28	12	21	76
Mean score on research and scholarship	2.07	2.07	2.17	1.81	2.01
Standard deviation	0.70	0.72	0.72	0.68	0.70
	$F(3, 72) = .87; p = .46$ (N.S.)				

out of the four items the chairmen at UM recorded the lowest mean scores on the degree of importance scale, and on the fourth, outstanding teaching ability, their score was quite close to the lowest (WMU's). This suggests that other criteria, such as having been a member of the department

and having earned one's highest degree within the institution, are more important in the selection of the UM chairmen. Also of interest is the overall ranking of the four qualifications. Of the four, the qualification viewed as the most important for the chairmanship is administrative talent. This is followed by research and scholarship, previous teaching experience, and outstanding teaching ability in that order. This rank order suggests that the chairman is expected to lead his department primarily through his administrative skills and secondarily by example as a researcher.

Department chairmen were asked to indicate whether or not their terms of office were specified and, if they were specified, to indicate the length in years. Table 22, recording a significant difference, shows that all of the chairmen at WMU and UM indicated definite term lengths as did most of the chairmen from the other two institutions. Also, a statistically significant difference among the chairmen from different universities who reported definite term lengths was recorded. The chairmen at MSU and to some extent those at WSU apparently have more job security as evidenced by their longer terms and the fact that some of them have indefinite terms.

In conclusion, a study of the selection and tenure of liberal arts department chairmen suggests some differences among chairmen from different institutions. The chairmen at WMU were basically elected to their positions while the MSU

TABLE 22.--Lengths of terms of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Term length indefinite	0 0.0%	4 14.3%	4 28.6%	0 0.0%	8 10.0%
Term length definite	17 100.0%	24 85.7%	10 71.4%	21 100.0%	72 90.0%
	$\chi^2 = 10.16$; $df = 3$; $p = .02$ (SIG.)				
Number of chairmen	17	24	10	21	72
Mean length in years of those specifying a definite term	3.4	4.6	3.9	3.7	4.0
Standard deviation	0.9	0.8	1.4	1.1	1.1
	$F(3, 68) = 5.92$; $p < .01$ (SIG.)				

chairmen were basically appointed. Although most chairmen learned of the vacancies in the position by virtue of having been in the department, more MSU and WSU chairmen were contacted by search committees to be informed of the vacancies than were chairmen from the other institutions. Search committees were much more instrumental in the selection of chairmen at MSU and WSU than at WMU and UM. Students were more in evidence on search committees at MSU than at the other institutions. Associate deans participated more often at WMU than elsewhere. Deans were more involved at WSU than in the other universities. Although it was discovered that most chairmen were hired internally, this was particularly true at UM, where all but one of the respondents were hired

from inside the institution. Also, a much higher percentage of the chairmen at UM had received their highest degree from their own institution than was true of the chairmen from the other universities. All chairmen ranked the selection criteria in the following order: (1) administrative talent, (2) research and scholarship, (3) previous teaching experience, and (4) outstanding teaching ability. The chairmen at UM marked three of these items as being of lower importance than did the chairmen from the other institutions and nearly matched the lowest rating on the fourth, outstanding teaching ability. MSU chairmen and to some extent WSU chairmen appear to have more job security than the chairmen from the other institutions because their terms of office are longer, and because some of them indicated terms of indefinite duration. These findings suggest that of the chairmen from the four institutions, the UM chairmen seem to have been selected more often than the other chairmen because of their close organizational relationships as evidenced by being employed by the institution and having earned their highest degree in the institution.

Functions

The functions of department chairmen were analyzed in terms of the number of hours spent in the various activities usually ascribed to the chairmanship, a degree of importance rating of the various activities, the extent of their

participation on university committees, and the extent of their current supervision of theses and dissertations.

From a review of the literature, 10 activities were identified as common aspects of the department chairman's job. The respondents were asked to record the number of hours spent per week in each activity. The results are presented in Table 23. No significant differences among chairmen from different universities were indicated in any of the areas of responsibility. Department chairmen average 54.2 hours per week on their jobs. Of the three major aspects of the chairman's job--administration, teaching, and scholarly activity--administrative activities require the most time. When faculty personnel administration, budget preparation and administration, and general office administration and correspondence are grouped, a total of 24.2 hours per week are spent in administration. Teaching and class preparation require 10.3 hours per week, while only 6.7 hours per week are spent in research and scholarly activity. Other areas of activity include undergraduate and graduate student advising, requiring a total of 5.3 hours per week; curriculum and program development, requiring 3.9 hours per week; local, state, and national professional activities, requiring 2 hours per week; and public and alumni relations, requiring 1.6 hours per week.

The respondents were also asked to rate the importance of each of the 10 activities according to the following

TABLE 23.--Activities of department chairmen in hours per week

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	13	25	12	20	70
Mean number of hours in teaching and class preparation	11.9	8.0	13.8	9.9	10.3
Standard deviation	6.6	5.5	19.8	5.0	9.6
	$\underline{F} (3, 66) = 1.14; \underline{p} = .34 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in curriculum and program development	3.5	4.3	3.7	4.0	3.9
Standard deviation	2.3	2.5	2.6	3.1	2.6
	$\underline{F} (3, 66) = .32; \underline{p} = .81 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in undergraduate student advising	3.1	2.7	2.0	1.7	2.3
Standard deviation	3.0	2.8	1.7	1.2	2.3
	$\underline{F} (3, 66) = 1.28; \underline{p} = .29 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in graduate student advising	2.5	3.0	2.7	3.5	3.0
Standard deviation	2.8	3.0	2.0	2.2	2.6
	$\underline{F} (3, 66) = .45; \underline{p} = .72 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in faculty personnel administration	7.2	10.0	6.1	7.3	8.1
Standard deviation	4.1	6.1	2.9	3.2	4.7
	$\underline{F} (3, 66) = 2.53; \underline{p} = .06 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in budget preparation and administration	5.2	4.6	4.4	5.1	4.8
Standard deviation	4.6	3.0	2.8	3.8	3.5
	$\underline{F} (3, 66) = .18; \underline{p} = .91 (N.S.)$				

TABLE 23--Continued

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Mean number of hours in general office administration and correspondence	14.1	10.0	11.7	10.8	11.3
Standard deviation	7.8	5.1	5.4	6.4	6.2
	$F(3, 66) = 1.35; p = .26 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in research and scholarly activity	5.2	6.6	7.4	7.3	6.7
Standard deviation	6.4	6.0	5.2	4.6	5.5
	$F(3, 66) = .48; p = .70 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in public and alumni relations	2.1	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6
Standard deviation	2.6	1.6	0.9	2.5	2.0
	$F(3, 66) = .25; p = .86 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in local, state, and national professional activities	1.4	2.6	1.6	2.0	2.0
Standard deviation	1.5	2.9	0.9	1.6	2.1
	$F(3, 66) = 1.33; p = .27 (N.S.)$				
Mean number of hours in other activities	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2
Standard deviation	1.7	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Mean number of total hours per week	56.5	53.7	54.7	53.1	54.2
Standard deviation	9.7	12.7	15.5	7.1	11.2
	$F(3, 66) = .27; p = .85 (N.S.)$				

scale: 1 = of some importance; 2 = important; and 3 = very important. Table 24 presents the results. A statistically significant difference among chairmen from different

TABLE 24.--Degree of importance of their activities as rated by department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	26	13	20	76
Mean score on teaching and class preparation	2.65	2.23	2.54	2.65	2.49
Standard deviation	0.49	0.71	0.66	0.59	0.64
	$\underline{F} (3, 72) = 2.30; \underline{p} = .08 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	17	25	13	21	76
Mean score on curriculum and program development	2.65	2.52	2.77	2.43	2.57
Standard deviation	0.49	0.51	0.44	0.75	0.57
	$\underline{F} (3, 72) = 1.19; \underline{p} = .35 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	14	25	11	19	69
Mean score on undergraduate student advising	2.29	2.08	1.91	1.58	1.96
Standard deviation	0.83	0.81	0.54	0.69	0.78
	$\underline{F} (3, 65) = 2.77; \underline{p} = .05 \text{ (SIG.)}$				
Number of chairmen	13	20	11	21	65
Mean score on graduate student advising	2.39	2.35	1.91	2.05	2.18
Standard deviation	0.87	0.67	0.30	0.74	0.70
	$\underline{F} (3, 61) = 1.58; \underline{p} = .20 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	17	26	13	21	77
Mean score on faculty personnel administration	2.71	2.77	2.92	2.81	2.79
Standard deviation	0.47	0.43	0.28	0.40	0.41
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = .73; \underline{p} = .54 \text{ (N.S.)}$				

TABLE 24--Continued

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	26	13	21	77
Mean score on budget preparation and administration	2.82	2.81	2.54	2.57	2.70
Standard deviation	0.53	0.49	0.66	0.60	0.56
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = 1.33; \underline{p} = .27 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	17	26	13	20	76
Mean score on general office administration and correspondence	2.59	2.27	2.23	2.10	2.29
Standard deviation	0.51	0.67	0.70	0.79	0.68
	$\underline{F} (3, 72) = 1.67; \underline{p} = .18 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	17	26	13	21	77
Mean score on research and scholarly activity	2.00	2.31	2.46	2.33	2.27
Standard deviation	0.79	0.74	0.52	0.73	0.72
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = 1.19; \underline{p} = .32 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	17	25	12	19	73
Mean score on public and alumni relations	1.71	1.80	1.83	1.37	1.67
Standard deviation	0.85	0.76	0.72	0.60	0.75
	$\underline{F} (3, 69) = 1.52; \underline{p} = .22 \text{ (N.S.)}$				
Number of chairmen	17	23	12	20	72
Mean score on local, state, and national professional activities	1.79	1.87	1.83	1.65	1.78
Standard deviation	0.69	0.76	0.72	0.67	0.70
	$\underline{F} (3, 68) = .37; \underline{p} = .78 \text{ (N.S.)}$				

institutions was found only in the area of undergraduate student advising. The UM chairmen do not place as much importance in this area as do the chairmen from the other institutions. They do, however, place more importance, by comparison, on graduate student advising. These findings support the conclusion that the emphasis at UM is on graduate education. Overall, the department chairmen ranked faculty personnel administration as the most important of their activities. This was followed closely by budget preparation and administration. Third in the order of importance was curriculum and program development. Fourth was teaching and class preparation. Fifth was general office administration and correspondence. Sixth was research and scholarly activity. Seventh was graduate student advising. Eighth was undergraduate student advising. Ninth was local, state, and national professional activities, and tenth was public and alumni relations.

The committee participation of department chairmen is presented in Table 25. No significant differences among chairmen from different institutions were found either in the number of committees chaired or in the number of committee memberships. Chairmen do not appear to be extensively involved in university committees probably because of their heavy workloads.

Table 26 shows the mean numbers of theses and dissertations that department chairmen are currently directing.

TABLE 25.--University committee participation of department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	28	14	21	80
Mean number of university committees chaired	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.4
Standard deviation	0.3	1.0	0.6	0.9	0.8
	$F(3, 76) = 1.53; p = .21$ (N.S.)				
Mean number of university committees a member of	2.4	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.9
Standard deviation	2.4	2.1	1.8	1.6	2.0
	$F(3, 76) = .34; p = .79$ (N.S.)				

TABLE 26.--Numbers of theses and dissertations department chairmen are currently directing

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean number of theses currently directing	0.8	0.5	1.1	0.5	0.7
Standard deviation	1.7	1.2	1.8	1.1	1.4
	$F(3, 75) = .75; p = .53$ (N.S.)				
Mean number of dissertations currently directing	0.4	0.9	1.3	2.5	1.3
Standard deviation	1.0	1.1	1.7	2.0	1.7
	$F(3, 75) = 7.87; p < .01$ (SIG.)				
Mean number of theses plus dissertations currently directing	1.2	1.4	2.4	3.0	2.0
Standard deviation	2.4	2.0	2.8	2.1	2.4
	$F(3, 75) = 3.12; p = .03$ (SIG.)				

There is no significant difference among chairmen from different institutions in the area of thesis supervision. However, a significant difference is indicated with regard to directing dissertations. The UM chairmen are much more involved in this activity than are the chairmen from the other institutions. This finding is consistent with previous findings which revealed that the UM chairmen on the average have directed more dissertations to completion than the chairmen from the other institutions. When theses and dissertations are added together, another significant difference is recorded. The UM chairmen and to a lesser extent the WSU chairmen are more involved in directing graduate research than are the chairmen from the other institutions. In both instances, this may be attributed to the comparatively larger graduate enrollments in these institutions.

In summary, a study of the functions of department chairmen reveals few differences among chairmen from different universities. The UM chairmen rate the importance of advising undergraduate students lower than the other chairmen. On the other hand, they are more involved in directing graduate research, particularly dissertations, than are the other chairmen. These findings are in accordance with a previous conclusion that the emphasis at UM is on graduate education.

Job attitudes

The job attitudes of department chairmen were examined in terms of their attitudes toward the chairmanship on certain job-related concepts, their perceptions as to the ideal length of the term of office and the ideal method of selection, and their attitudes toward each of the three major functions of the chairmanship: teaching, scholarly and creative work, and administration.

The research instrument asked the respondents to express their attitudes toward the chairmanship on a number of pairs of job-related concepts. Each pair of concepts was placed on a continuum with values between them ranging from 5 to 1. The results are found in Table 27. A significant difference among chairmen from different institutions was found on only 1 of the 11 pairs of concepts, the a lifetime career vs. a temporary role continuum. While chairmen from all the institutions viewed the chairmanship as a temporary role, the UM chairmen felt much more strongly about this than the others. This suggests that the UM chairmen are basically performing a duty expected of them before returning to their professional duties. The WSU chairmen, on the other hand, felt much less strongly about this than the others. This may confirm the WSU chairmanship as more satisfying and as more a position of leadership than the other chairmanships, as suggested by the higher mean scores of the WSU chairmen in

TABLE 27.--Attitudes of department chairmen toward chairmanship on certain job-related concepts

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>enjoyable</u> vs. 1 = <u>dull and routine</u>	3.88	3.78	3.79	3.24	3.66
Standard deviation	1.11	0.93	0.89	0.93	0.98
	$F(3, 75) = 1.85; p = .15 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>satisfying</u> vs. 1 = <u>frustrating</u>	3.32	3.37	3.43	3.17	3.32
Standard deviation	1.42	1.11	1.22	0.97	1.15
	$F(3, 75) = .18; p = .91 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	24	14	20	75
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>stepping stone up administrative ladder</u> vs. 1 = <u>goal in itself</u>	1.77	2.17	1.79	1.40	1.80
Standard deviation	0.83	1.37	1.05	0.75	1.08
	$F(3, 71) = 1.92; p = .13 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	26	12	21	76
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>lifetime career</u> vs. 1 = <u>temporary role</u>	1.94	1.77	2.50	1.21	1.77
Standard deviation	0.97	0.95	1.38	0.51	1.01
	$F(3, 72) = 5.03; p < .01 (SIG.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>position of leadership</u> vs. 1 = <u>bureaucratic role</u>	3.82	3.93	4.21	4.10	4.00

TABLE 27--Continued

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Standard deviation	1.24	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.04
	$\underline{F} (3, 75) = .46; p = .71 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	26	14	20	77
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>public relations role vs. 1 = internal departmental role</u>	2.65	2.69	2.64	2.00	2.49
Standard deviation	0.93	1.16	0.93	1.12	1.08
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = 1.95; p = .13 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	26	14	21	78
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>model of academic/scholarly behavior vs. 1 = has no impact as a model</u>	3.12	3.54	3.50	3.10	3.32
Standard deviation	1.17	1.17	1.16	1.45	1.24
	$\underline{F} (3, 74) = .74; p = .53 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	25	14	21	77
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>model of administrative efficiency vs. 1 = no impact as model</u>	3.24	3.32	3.50	2.91	3.22
Standard deviation	1.48	1.18	0.85	1.09	1.18
	$\underline{F} (3, 73) = .82; p = .49 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	16	26	14	20	76
Mean score on continuum of 5 = <u>talent recruiter vs. 1 = finds jobs for talent recruited by faculty</u>	3.75	3.92	4.07	3.95	3.92
Standard deviation	1.24	1.20	0.92	1.10	1.11
	$\underline{F} (3, 72) = .21; p = .89 (N.S.)$				

TABLE 27--Continued

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean score on con- tinuum of 5 = <u>leader</u> <u>of faculty</u> vs. 1 = <u>servant of faculty</u>	3.44	3.78	4.07	3.71	3.74
Standard deviation	1.14	1.05	1.07	0.72	1.00
	$F(3, 75) = 1.04; p = .38 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Mean score on con- tinuum of 5 = <u>iden-</u> <u>tifies with adminis-</u> <u>tration</u> vs. 1 = <u>iden-</u> <u>tifies with faculty</u>	2.29	2.59	2.61	2.10	2.40
Standard deviation	0.85	1.01	0.92	0.94	0.95
	$F(3, 75) = 1.40; p = .25 (N.S.)$				

these two areas. Generally, the chairmen viewed the job as being more enjoyable than dull and routine. They viewed the job as being more satisfying than frustrating. They saw the chairmanship as a goal in itself as opposed to a stepping stone up the administrative ladder. The chairmen viewed the chairmanship as more a position of leadership than a bureaucratic role. They viewed the position more as an internal departmental role than a public relations role. The chairmen tended to view the chairmanship as a model of academic and scholarly behavior as opposed to having no impact as a model. They also saw the position as a model of administrative efficiency as opposed to having no impact as a model. The

chairmen considered themselves to be the recruiters of talent as opposed to those who find jobs for talent recruited by the faculty. They viewed themselves as leaders of the faculty rather than as servants of the faculty. Finally, the chairmen viewed themselves as identifying with the faculty rather than identifying with the administration.

The respondents were asked to indicate the ideal length of the chairman's term of office. The results are found in Table 28. Most chairmen specified definite term lengths in years. When ranges of years were given, the means of the ranges were used for computation purposes. A significant difference among chairmen from different institutions was

TABLE 28.--Ideal length of department chairman's term as perceived by department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	26	14	21	78
<u>Ideal term length</u>					
Indefinite	4 23.5%	5 19.2%	1 7.1%	2 10.5%	12 15.4%
Definite	13 76.5%	21 80.8%	13 92.9%	19 89.5%	66 84.6%
$\chi^2 = 2.45; df = 3; p = .49$ (N.S.)					
Number of chairmen	13	21	13	19	66
Mean ideal length in years of those specifying a definite term	6.3	7.5	8.2	5.1	6.7
Standard deviation	2.4	3.8	4.6	2.1	3.5
$F(3, 62) = 2.87; p = .04$ (SIG.)					

found with respect to the ideal length of the term of office. The WSU and MSU chairmen recommended terms of greater length than the others while the UM chairmen recommended a term of much shorter duration. This finding confirms a previous conclusion that the UM chairmen see the chairmanship more as a temporary role than do the other chairmen and, as a result, do not wish to have as much security in the position. The chairmen from each of the four institutions preferred longer terms than they were serving (see Table 22). This suggests that they would like to be able to realize more of their goals and objectives for their departments.

The department chairmen were also asked to indicate the ideal method of selecting chairmen. The results are found in Table 29. The WMU chairmen were highly in favor of election. The WSU and UM chairmen also favored election, but not to the extent of the WMU chairmen. The MSU chairmen preferred the method of appointment. In general, the results are the reverse of the method by which the chairmen were actually selected (see Table 16). Essentially, 32.5 percent of them were actually elected (when the first and third categories are combined) and 45 percent of them were actually appointed (when the second and fourth categories are combined). However, 53.1 percent preferred the method of election, while only 30.3 percent preferred the method of appointment. The greatest changes in this respect involved the WSU and UM chairmen. Apparently, chairmen feel that they will

TABLE 29.--Ideal method of selecting department chairmen as perceived by department chairmen

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	17	27	14	21	79
Election by departmental faculty	3 17.6%	3 11.1%	1 7.1%	1 4.7%	8 10.1%
Appointment by administration	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	1 4.7%	2 2.5%
Election by faculty with administrative approval	11 64.7%	7 25.9%	7 50.0%	9 42.9%	34 43.0%
Appointment by administration with faculty approval	0 0.0%	11 40.7%	4 28.6%	7 33.3%	22 27.8%
Other	3 17.6%	5 18.5%	2 14.3%	3 14.3%	13 16.5%

be more effective leaders if their selection to the position is basically governed by the faculty.

The chairmen were asked to indicate their attitudes toward the three major functions of the chairmanship by responding to the following statements: "I enjoy teaching," "I enjoy scholarly and creative work," and "I enjoy administrative work." Each statement was followed by five options which were later assigned values for computational purposes as follows: 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = undecided; 2 = disagree; and 1 = strongly disagree. The results are presented in Table 30. No statistically significant differences among chairmen from different institutions were recorded with respect to their responses to any of the three

TABLE 30.--Attitudes of department chairmen toward teaching, scholarly and creative work, and administrative work

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	16	27	14	21	78
Mean score on "enjoy teaching"	4.69	4.63	4.64	4.67	4.65
Standard deviation	0.79	0.56	0.50	0.48	0.58
	$F(3, 74) = .04; p = .99$ (N.S.)				
Mean score on "enjoy scholarly and creative work"	4.50	4.59	4.71	4.67	4.62
Standard deviation	0.52	0.57	0.47	0.58	0.54
	$F(3, 74) = .47; p = .70$ (N.S.)				
Mean score on "enjoy adminis- trative work"	3.94	3.85	3.86	3.29	3.72
Standard deviation	0.85	1.10	1.23	1.19	1.12
	$F(3, 74) = 1.49; p = .22$ (N.S.)				

statements. It is apparent, however, that the UM chairmen like administrative work much less than the other chairmen. This finding is consistent with their desire for shorter terms than the other chairmen. The chairmen from all four universities enjoy teaching and scholarly and creative work much more than they do administrative work.

In summary, the evidence suggests that there are some differences among chairmen from different institutions with respect to their job attitudes. The UM chairmen view the chairmanship as a much more temporary experience than do the other chairmen, while the WSU chairmen view it as much less

temporary than the others. The UM chairmen perceived the ideal length of the term of office to be much shorter than the other chairmen perceived it. The chairmen generally preferred to be elected to the position, with the exception of the MSU chairmen, who preferred to be appointed. The chairmen indicated much more enjoyment with teaching and scholarly and creative work than with administration. The UM chairmen indicated much less enjoyment with administration than the others. These findings suggest that the UM chairmen see the chairmanship as a temporary experience in the life of a professor and as a duty to be performed to a somewhat greater extent than do the other chairmen.

Career goals

The career goals of department chairmen were examined in terms of how long they expected to continue as chairmen of their departments and what they hoped to do upon leaving the chairmanship.

The research instrument asked the respondents to indicate how long they expected to continue as chairmen of their departments. The results are presented in Table 31. Most chairmen expected to continue as chairmen for definite periods of time. None of the UM chairmen expect to continue indefinitely as chairmen. When ranges of years were given, the means of the ranges were used for computation purposes. While a statistically significant difference was not found

TABLE 31.--Length of time department chairmen expect to continue as chairmen of their departments

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	16	26	14	21	77
<u>Expected time to con-</u> <u>tinue as chairman</u>					
Indefinite	2 12.5%	6 23.1%	3 21.4%	0 0.0%	11 14.3%
Definite	14 87.5%	20 76.9%	11 78.6%	21 100.0%	66 85.7%
	$\chi^2 = 5.77; df = 3; p = .12 (N.S.)$				
Number of chairmen	14	20	11	21	66
Mean time in years of those specifying a definite period	2.8	4.2	3.8	3.4	3.6
Standard deviation	1.7	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.4
	$F (3, 62) = 1.04; p = .38 (N.S.)$				

among chairmen from different institutions with respect to the specific lengths of time that they expected to continue in their positions, the WMU chairmen evidently do not plan to continue as long as the other chairmen. It is recognized that the lengths of terms are often governed by departmental policies and that, as a result, chairmen may not be able to continue as long as they might like to in the position.

The department chairmen were asked to indicate what they planned to do after leaving the chairmanship. Table 32 presents the results. Only four chairmen, and all of them were from MSU, planned to "move up the administrative ladder."

TABLE 32.--What department chairmen hope to do upon leaving chairmanship

	Institution				Total Sample
	WMU	MSU	WSU	UM	
Number of chairmen	16	27	14	21	78
Move up administrative ladder	0 0.0%	4 14.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.1%
Return to professorial duties	13 81.2%	17 63.0%	9 64.3%	20 95.2%	59 75.6%
Other	1 6.3%	1 3.7%	1 7.1%	0 0.0%	3 3.8%
Don't know	2 12.5%	5 18.5%	4 28.6%	1 4.8%	12 15.4%

Most of the others planned to return to their teaching responsibilities. This is particularly true of the UM chairmen, of whom only one was uncertain about the future. Thus, the evidence would suggest that chairmen are basically academicians and assume administrative responsibilities only temporarily.

In summary, a study of the career goals of liberal arts department chairmen leads to the conclusions that they hold their positions temporarily, and that they expect to return to their professorial duties upon leaving the chairmanship. This is particularly true of the UM chairmen, who recorded the highest degrees of certainty both with regard to the temporary nature of the position and with regard to the resumption of teaching duties following the termination of their chairmanship responsibilities.

Summary

This section compared liberal arts department chairmen across four institutions: Western Michigan University (WMU), Michigan State University (MSU), Wayne State University (WSU), and the University of Michigan (UM). The chairmen were compared according to the characteristics of the departments which they administer, their personal characteristics, their selection and tenure, their functions, their job attitudes, and their career goals. The results of the investigation revealed that the UM chairmen tend to differ from the chairmen from the other institutions in a number of respects. It was demonstrated that the UM liberal arts departments enroll a greater proportion of graduate students and grant more graduate degrees, particularly doctorates, than do the liberal arts departments in the other institutions. It was shown that the UM chairmen had much less administrative experience than the chairmen from the other universities. On the other hand, they have had much more experience in directing graduate research, particularly doctoral research, than the other chairmen. Search committees were seldom utilized at UM to select chairmen. The UM chairmen were hired internally more often than the chairmen from the other institutions. In addition, a much greater proportion of the UM chairmen received their highest degree from their own institution than was true of the chairmen from the other

institutions. The UM chairmen in relation to the other chairmen minimized the importance that administrative talent, outstanding teaching ability, previous teaching experience, and research and scholarship played as selection criteria in their appointments to the chairmanship. In relation to the other chairmen, they also minimized the importance of advising undergraduate students. The UM chairmen are currently directing the research of graduate students, particularly doctoral students, to a greater extent than the other chairmen. They feel more strongly than the other chairmen that the job is a temporary role rather than a lifetime career. They perceive the ideal length of the term of office to be much shorter than the others perceive it. The UM chairmen enjoy administrative work much less than do the other chairmen. In no instance did they indicate that they would continue indefinitely as chairmen. This could not be said of the chairmen from the other institutions. Finally, the UM chairmen are more certain than the others about returning to teaching upon leaving the chairmanship. Therefore, the evidence generated in this study leads to the conclusion that the UM chairmen have more academic and fewer administrative interests than the chairmen from the other institutions. This may be attributed to the fact that UM is more oriented toward graduate education than are the other universities, therefore requiring a higher level of involvement in research and scholarly activities.

Responses to the Open-Ended Questions on Job Attitudes and Career Goals

This section summarizes the responses to the eight open-ended questions on the job attitudes and career goals of the liberal arts department chairmen. The nature of the responses made it impractical to analyze the results across institutions. All of the individual responses to each question are found in Appendix C.

Job attitudes

The open-ended item, "What do you feel is the most important qualification of a department chairman?" was answered by 73 of the chairmen in a variety of ways. In many instances, more than one qualification was listed. Representative responses of those which appeared most frequently were: (1) the ability to get along with people, (2) the ability to communicate, (3) leadership ability, (4) honesty and integrity, and (5) patience. In general, therefore, personal integrity and skills in human relations were considered to be the most important qualifications of a department chairman. Other illustrative responses were: (1) persistence and a sense of humor; (2) a demonstrated scholarliness as evidenced by research and teaching accomplishments; and (3) a professional and objective dedication to the welfare of the department, its faculty, and its students.

The open-ended item, "What do you like best about your

job?" was answered by 75 out of the 80 chairmen. The chairmen seemed to enjoy most the opportunity to work with people, particularly faculty members and students. Typical comments involved: (1) working out problems for people, (2) helping develop faculty and graduate student talent, and (3) promoting the professional development of faculty and students. Chairmen also appreciated the opportunity to guide the development of the departmental programs. One chairman enjoyed "seeing people progress and programs grow and serve a useful purpose." Another enjoyed "seeing a program develop as I would like to see it develop with some degree of organization and progress." Still another enjoyed the "opportunity to set the policy and direction of the department and to initiate courses, programs, and ideas--all with a mind to making a first-rate department." A unique response came from one chairman who said the best thing about the job as far as he is concerned is "that it is temporary and I can return to teaching and research."

The open-ended item, "What do you like least about your job?" drew responses from 74 of the chairmen. They most often reacted negatively toward paper work and routine administrative duties. One chairman likes least the "excessive and unnecessary paper work--much of this brought about by affirmative action and a more legalistic approach to many dimensions of university governance." Another dislikes the "administrative trivia which keeps one from concentrating

on program development." Still another dislikes "responding to the insatiable appetites of bureaucrats for information they cannot assimilate." Other negative job reactions were: (1) functioning as a policeman, caretaker, keeper of public morals, and glorified bookkeeper/bureaucrat; (2) coping with budget problems; (3) acting as a referee between feuding faculty; and (4) having to fire people.

The open-ended item, "What changes would you like to see in your role as Chairman?" was answered by 67 out of the 80 chairmen. Of these, 19 replied that they would not care to see any changes. A popular recommendation was for administrative assistance to handle routine problems and clerical work. This would enable the chairman to have more time for program development and scholarly pursuits. This is illustrated by one chairman who recommended the "development of an administrative structure which permits the chairman to devote himself to program development"; and by another who wanted "less administrative bureaucratic nonsense imposed from outside the department so that I would have more time for my own scholarly work." The chairmen also desired more liberty and influence in decision-making. This is illustrated by one chairman who wanted "more freedom to make decisions based on merit and more choices to build programs and employ faculty and staff"; and by another who wanted "more power over personnel and budget decisions." Other desired changes were: (1) more central administrative awareness that

programs are developed in departments; (2) an influx of funding to support good things, and a genuine appreciation for the discipline from higher support sources; and (3) somewhat less participatory democracy. Finally, one chairman said of the job, "I would like to see someone else do it."

The open-ended item, "In what ways do you exercise leadership as Department Chairman?" was answered by 75 of the chairmen in a variety of ways. In general, leadership is exercised through decision-making and personal persuasion. Specifically, leadership is exercised "I suppose by setting an example as a dedicated scholar and teacher (hopefully), and by resolving problems in a professional way"; "by encouraging progress in research and teaching"; "in recruiting, program development, and as a spokesman for the department to the administration"; in "budgetary work, planning, and the orientation of new faculty"; "mostly, by encouraging colleagues to think innovatively"; by "arbitrating different points of view"; and "by the appointment and definition of tasks for departmental standing committees, and by the definition of departmental goals and priorities."

In summary, liberal arts chairmen considered personal integrity and skills in human relations to be the most important qualifications of a department chairman. The best part of the job was considered to be the opportunity to work with people, particularly faculty and students. The part of the job liked least involved the paper work and routine

administrative duties. The change that was recommended most often was for administrative assistance to handle the paper work and routine duties. This would provide the chairman with more time for program development and scholarly activities. While the chairmen indicated a number of specific ways in which they exercise leadership, basically they do it through decision-making and personal persuasion. Therefore, this evidence on job attitudes suggests that while department chairmen may be teachers and scholars, they are also keenly aware of the importance of integrity and interpersonal relations in the administration of higher education.

Career goals

The open-ended item, "What do you believe to be the most important thing you have done in your career?" drew responses from 74 of the chairmen. They took particular pride in their teaching, research, and publications. Other important accomplishments included: "accepted a position on this faculty"; "assisted in developing an outstanding department"; "constructed and sold to the department a new Ph.D. program"; and "guided a few students to high achievement." There were several atypical responses. One chairman indicated that the most important thing he had done was to "stay alive." Another said, "Leave NYC. Show that you can do it all and survive." Still another said, "No single thing; just being good at everything."

The open-ended item, "When you retire what do you hope people will say was your most important contribution to society?" was answered by 70 of the chairmen in a variety of ways. Many chairmen wanted to be remembered for their teaching and research contributions. Others wanted to be remembered for helping to build strong departments and good programs. Still others wanted to be remembered as follows: that "he could think"; "that the department will be worse off"; "that I was honest and competent"; "that I cared what happened to society and people in it"; "that I helped us to understand how to hold it together"; for "what I was as a person"; "that I always put love before power"; and for "the work I do when I'm over 70." Finally, one chairman said, "They will not notice," in an apparent attempt to say that retirement brings oblivion.

The final open-ended item, "If you could change jobs right now, what type of work would you select?" was answered by 71 chairmen in a variety of ways. Of these, 20 chairmen indicated that they had no intention of changing jobs; 17 others said that they would return to teaching. Still others would select a position which involved full-time research. Several would be interested in full-time administration. Responses which did not fit any of these categories included: "ministry"; "law"; "real estate sales or a construction adviser in solar building"; "racing car driver"; "Supreme Court Justice"; "news interpretation in broadcasting"; and

"janitor work or farming or animal training or flour milling."

In summary, liberal arts department chairmen feel that their teaching and research contributions and their publications are the most important accomplishments of their careers. When they retire, they hope to be remembered for their teaching and research contributions as well as for their work in developing their departmental programs. Finally, most chairmen indicated that either they would not change jobs or would return to full-time teaching if they were given the opportunity to change jobs immediately. From this evidence on career goals, it is concluded that chairmen are basically academicians and are satisfied to be such and that they value highly the contributions that they have made in teaching, scholarly activity, and program development.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Included in this chapter are the summary of the results of the investigation, the conclusions, and the recommendations.

Summary

This study was designed to describe liberal arts department chairmen and to compare them across four universities within the State of Michigan in terms of the characteristics of the departments which they administer, their personal characteristics, their selection and tenure, their functions, their job attitudes, and their career goals. A six-page questionnaire was designed and pretested, and personally distributed to 121 department chairmen or their secretaries. Eighty usable questionnaires (66.1 percent of the total) were returned. The one-way analysis of variance with unequal N's was used to analyze most of the data. The chi-square technique was employed to analyze the frequency data. Statistically significant differences were considered to be those that were equal to or less than the .05 level of confidence.

Department characteristics

The 80 liberal arts department chairmen in this study

represented disciplines traditionally classified as arts and letters as well as physical and social sciences. The departments have a mean of 27.4 full-time equated faculty members, a mean of 248.7 undergraduate majors, and a mean of 84.0 graduate majors. In the last full academic year, an average of 65.2 bachelor's, 14.5 master's, 6.1 doctor's, and 0.1 other degrees were granted per department for a total average of 85.9 degrees.

Personal characteristics

The department chairmen in this study are, on the average, 47.3 years old. Of the total sample, 95 percent are men. Bachelor's degrees are held by 98.7 percent of the chairmen, master's degrees by 81.2 percent, and doctor's degrees by 92.5 percent. There are 17.5 percent who have other degrees or training. The mean years in which the various degrees were received are: bachelor's, 1950.9; master's, 1954.1; and doctor's, 1959.4.

The academic rank of Professor is held by 80 percent of the chairmen, Associate Professor by 18.7 percent, and Assistant Professor by 1.3 percent (one chairman). Chairmen have worked an average of 13.6 years continuously in their institutions and have held their positions as chairmen for an average of 4.4 years. They have an average of 18.3 years of college and university teaching experience and an average of 6.8 years of administrative experience. Twenty percent of

them have had prior experience as a chairman or an acting chairman, while another 25 percent have had prior experience as an assistant or associate chairman. Chairmen belong to an average of 4.1 professional organizations and hold an average of 0.7 offices in them. They belong to an average of 0.3 civic organizations and hold an average of 0.2 positions in them.

In the area of directing completed theses and dissertations, chairmen averaged 0.7 per year before becoming department chairmen and 0.8 since becoming chairmen for an annual net gain of 0.1. In the area of publications, chairmen averaged 2.2 per year before becoming chairmen and 1.6 since becoming chairmen for an annual net loss of 0.6.

Selection and tenure

More liberal arts department chairmen obtained their positions through an administrative appointment (45 percent) than through a faculty election (32.5 percent). Most of the chairmen (72.5 percent) discovered that the position was available by having been in or close to the department. Another 15 percent learned of the vacancy through a search committee contact. Search committees have been instrumental in the appointments of 64.9 percent of the chairmen. Where committees existed, faculty members were involved in 86 percent of the selections, students in 46 percent, deans in 34 percent, associate deans in 24 percent, former department

chairmen in 18 percent, academic vice-presidents in 10 percent, and presidents in 6 percent. Most of the department chairmen (83.7 percent) were hired from inside the institution. However, only 20 percent had earned their highest degree within the employing institution.

The chairmen ranked administrative talent as the most important criterion in their selection, followed by research and scholarship, previous teaching experience, and outstanding teaching ability in that order. Ninety percent of the chairmen have terms of specific lengths which average 4.0 years.

Functions

Department chairmen work an average of 54.2 hours per week. Their time is spent as follows: general office administration and correspondence, 11.3 hours; teaching and class preparation, 10.3 hours; faculty personnel administration, 8.1 hours; research and scholarly activity, 6.7 hours; budget preparation and administration, 4.8 hours; curriculum and program development, 3.9 hours; graduate student advising, 3.0 hours; undergraduate student advising, 2.3 hours; local, state, and national professional activities, 2.0 hours; public and alumni relations, 1.6 hours; and other activities, 0.2 hours.

They rank the importance of these activities in the following order: (1) faculty personnel administration;

(2) budget preparation and administration; (3) curriculum and program development; (4) teaching and class preparation; (5) general office administration and correspondence; (6) research and scholarly activity; (7) graduate student advising; (8) undergraduate student advising; (9) local, state, and national professional activities; and (10) public and alumni relations.

Department chairmen serve on an average of 1.9 university committees and chair an average of 0.4 of them. They currently direct more dissertations, an average of 1.3, than theses, an average of 0.7.

Job attitudes

Department chairmen view their job as being more enjoyable than dull and routine, and more satisfying than frustrating. They see their position as serving less as a stepping stone up the administrative ladder than as a goal in itself, and less as a lifetime career than a temporary role. They view the chairmanship as being more a position of leadership than a bureaucratic role. They see it less as a public relations role than an internal departmental role. They see the chairmanship more as a model of academic and scholarly behavior than having no impact as a model. Likewise, they consider it more as a model of administrative efficiency than having no impact as a model. Chairmen consider themselves more often to function as recruiters of

talent rather than as those who find jobs for talent recruited by the faculty. They consider themselves to be leaders of the faculty rather than servants of the faculty. Chairmen see themselves as identifying with the faculty rather than identifying with the administration.

Most of the chairmen (84.6 percent) prefer specific terms of office with lengths averaging 6.7 years. They prefer to obtain their positions through a faculty election (53.1 percent) as opposed to an administrative appointment (30.3 percent).

Chairmen indicated that they enjoy scholarly and creative work almost as much as they enjoy teaching. Administrative work was not enjoyed nearly as much as the other major aspects of the job.

Chairmen considered personal integrity and skills in human relations to be the most important qualifications of a department chairman. The best part of the job was considered to be the opportunity to work with people, particularly faculty and students. The part of the job liked least involves the paper work and routine administrative duties. They expressed a need for administrative assistance to handle the paper work and routine duties. This would provide the chairman with more time for program development and scholarly activities. The chairmen exercise leadership basically through decision-making and personal persuasion.

Career goals

Most of the chairmen (85.7 percent) expect to continue in their positions for definite periods of time averaging 3.6 years. Upon leaving the chairmanship, 75.6 percent of the chairmen hope to return to their professorial duties. Only 5.1 percent hope to move up the administrative ladder. Another 3.8 percent have other ambitions, while 15.4 percent do not know what they would do after leaving the chairmanship.

Chairmen considered their teaching and research contributions and their publications to be the most important accomplishments of their careers. They hope to be remembered for these when they retire as well as for their work in developing their departmental programs. Finally, most chairmen indicated that either they would not change jobs or would return to full-time teaching if they were given the opportunity to change jobs immediately.

Conclusions

The results of this investigation demonstrated that liberal arts department chairmen are basically academicians who assume administrative responsibilities for a relatively short period of time and who plan to return to their professorial duties upon leaving the chairmanship. While serving as chairmen, they would appreciate administrative assistance to handle the routine work. This would provide them with

more time for program development and their scholarly interests. They prefer longer terms of office than those they have. This would enable them to realize more of their goals and objectives for their departments. They also prefer to be elected to their positions by the faculty rather than appointed by the administration. This would provide them with a base of support among those with whom they would be working most closely. In general, the findings of this study lead to the conclusion that liberal arts department chairmen are essentially teachers and scholars who enjoy working with their colleagues and students in the pursuit of academic excellence.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

(1) Department chairmen should be provided with administrative assistance to handle the paper work and routine duties. This would give them more time for program development and scholarly work.

(2) The term of office should be lengthened. This would enable the chairmen to realize more of their goals and objectives for their departments.

(3) The basic method of selection should be changed from administrative appointment to faculty election. This would provide the chairmen with a base of support among those with whom they would be working most closely.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Cover Letter and Questionnaire to University Department Chairmen

June 1, 1976

The department chairmanship is a key position in academic governance. The demands of the position have made it essential that a chairman devote an increasing amount of his time to the duties of administration. As a result he may find it rather difficult to pursue his academic and scholarly interests, factors which were primarily responsible for bringing him to the position originally.

Research is needed on the role of the department chairman particularly with respect to the place that the chairmanship plays in the career history of the incumbents and the manner in which their career goals influence their interpretation of the job requirements of the position. The attached questionnaire is designed to accomplish this purpose and is being distributed to the chairmen of liberal arts departments in selected Michigan universities. I would appreciate it very much if you would complete the entire instrument and return it to me as soon as possible in the self-addressed envelope that is provided. Your cooperation will help me bring this study to a successful conclusion. A summary of the data will be sent to all respondents.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Nicholson

THE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

A. Departmental characteristics

1. Institution _____
2. College or school _____
3. Department _____
4. Approximate number of full-time equated faculty in the department of which you are Chairman? _____
5. Approximate number of majors in the department of which you are Chairman?
_____ Undergraduates _____ Graduates
6. Approximate number of degrees granted with majors in the department of which you are Chairman during the last full academic year?
_____ Bachelor's
_____ Master's
_____ Doctor's
_____ Other (please specify) _____

B. Personal characteristics

1. Age _____
2. Sex: _____ Male _____ Female
3. Please fill in the following regarding your formal education at the university level:

INSTITUTION	MAJOR SUBJECT	DEGREE	YEAR RECEIVED
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

4. What is your academic rank?
____ Professor
____ Associate professor
____ Assistant professor
____ Other (please specify) _____
5. How long have you worked continuously in this institution? _____ years
6. How long have you been Chairman of this department?
____ years
7. What was the last position you held prior to becoming Chairman of this department?
Institution _____
Job title and/or rank _____
From/to _____
8. How many years of college and university teaching experience do you have? _____ years
9. How many years of administrative experience do you have? _____ years
10. Have you been a department chairman before?
____ Yes ____ No
11. Have you been an assistant department chairman before?
____ Yes ____ No
12. How many theses and dissertations have been completed successfully under your direction?
a. Prior to becoming department chairman
____ Theses ____ Dissertations
b. Since becoming department chairman
____ Theses ____ Dissertations

13. Enter the number of publications you have authored or coauthored. Please attach a list of them.

a. Prior to becoming department chairman

_____ Books

_____ Professional articles

_____ Other (please specify) _____

b. Since becoming department chairman

_____ Books

_____ Professional articles

_____ Other (please specify) _____

14. List the professional organizations to which you currently belong and any positions currently held.

ORGANIZATION

POSITION CURRENTLY HELD

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. List the civic organizations to which you currently belong and any positions currently held.

ORGANIZATION

POSITION CURRENTLY HELD

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

C. Selection and tenure

1. The primary method of selecting the chairman in your department is:
 - ☐ Election by the departmental faculty
 - ☐ Appointment by the administration
 - ☐ Election by the faculty with administrative approval
 - ☐ Appointment by the administration with faculty approval
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____
2. How did you discover that the department was seeking applicants for the chairmanship you now hold?
3. What was the composition of the search committee, if there was one, that resulted in your appointment? (Check as many as apply.)
 - ☐ Students
 - ☐ Faculty
 - ☐ Former department chairman
 - ☐ Associate dean
 - ☐ Dean
 - ☐ Academic vice-president
 - ☐ President
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____
 - ☐ No such committee

4. Please scale the following according to what you believe was considered important in your selection as Chairman:

a. Administrative talent

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

b. Outstanding teaching ability

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

c. Previous teaching experience

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

d. Research and scholarship

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

5. Your term as Chairman is for:

_____ An indefinite period of time

_____ A period of _____ years

D. Functions

1. Approximately how many hours per week do you typically spend on each of the following activities usually ascribed to the department chairmanship?

_____ Teaching and class preparation

_____ Curriculum and program development

_____ Undergraduate student advising

_____ Graduate student advising

_____ Faculty personnel administration

_____ Budget preparation and administration

_____ General office administration and correspondence

_____ Research and scholarly activity

_____ Public and alumni relations

_____ Local, state, and national professional activities

2. Please scale these activities according to their importance:

a. Teaching and class preparation

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

b. Curriculum and program development

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

c. Undergraduate student advising

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

d. Graduate student advising

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

e. Faculty personnel administration

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

f. Budget preparation and administration

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

g. General office administration and correspondence

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

h. Research and scholarly activity

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

i. Public and alumni relations

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

j. Local, state, and national professional activities

1 Some importance 2 Important 3 Very important

3. How many university committees do you chair? _____

4. How many university committees are you a member of?

5. How many theses and dissertations do you currently direct?

_____ Theses _____ Dissertations

E. Attitudes

1. Please indicate your attitude toward the chairmanship by placing an "x" on the continuum for each of the following job-related concepts:

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| a. Enjoyable | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | Dull and routine |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| b. Satisfying | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | Frustrating |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| c. A stepping stone up the administrative ladder | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | A goal in itself |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| d. A lifetime career | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | A temporary role |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| e. A position of leadership | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | A bureaucratic role |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| f. A public relations role | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | An internal departmental role |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| g. A model of academic and scholarly behavior | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | Has no impact as a model |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| h. A model of administrative efficiency | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | Has no impact as a model |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| i. Recruiter of talent | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | Finds jobs for talent recruited by the faculty |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |
| j. Leader of the faculty | : _ : _ : _ : _ : _ : | Servant of the faculty |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 | |

- k. Identifies with the administration :__:_:_:_:_: Identifies with the faculty
- 5 4 3 2 1
2. About how long should a person serve continuously as department chairman? _____ years
 3. What do you believe to be the best method of selecting a chairman?
 - _____ Election by the departmental faculty
 - _____ Appointment by the administration
 - _____ Election by the faculty with administrative approval
 - _____ Appointment by the administration with faculty approval
 - _____ Other (please specify) _____
 4. What do you feel is the most important qualification of a department chairman?
 5. What do you like best about your job?
 6. What do you like least about your job?
 7. What changes would you like to see in your role as Chairman?
 8. In what ways do you exercise leadership as Department Chairman?

9. Please circle the phrase below each of the following statements which best describes how you feel about that particular aspect of your job.

a. I enjoy teaching.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

b. I enjoy scholarly and creative work.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

c. I enjoy administrative work.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

F. Career goals

1. How long do you expect to continue as Chairman of your department? _____ years

2. Upon leaving the department chairmanship, what do you hope to do next?

_____ Move up the administrative ladder

_____ Return to professorial duties

_____ Retire

_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____ Don't know

3. What do you believe to be the most important thing you have done in your career?

4. When you retire, what do you hope people will say was your most important contribution to society?

5. If you could change jobs right now, what type of work would you select?

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter to Respondents

100 Western, Apt. E-12
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
April 1, 1977

You and other department chairmen in your institution were selected in an attempt to determine the profile of liberal arts department chairmen in Michigan universities. Out of 121 questionnaires originally delivered during the first two weeks of June, 1976, 80 usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 66.1 percent.

Attached you will find a summary of the data which formed the basis of the study. Should a need for additional data arise, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you very much for your participation. Your cooperation enabled me to increase my knowledge of the departmental chairmanship and to bring this doctoral dissertation to a successful conclusion.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Nicholson

APPENDIX C

Responses to the Open-Ended Questions on Job Attitudes and Career Goals

QUESTION E-4: What do you feel is the most important qualification of a department chairman?

RESPONSES:

1. "Integrity and lots of energy."
2. "Organization, efficiency, positive attitude, visionary."
3. "Ability to hold people's trust."
4. "Patience, flexibility, ability to de-dramatize events."
5. "Good judgment and a sense of humor."
6. "Determination to achieve excellence."
7. "A capacity to hold the trust and confidence of colleagues."
8. "Leadership."
9. "Honesty."
10. "Trustworthiness, energy, imagination."
11. "Leadership."
12. "Openness, flexibility, tolerance."
13. "That he keep the best interests of the department in mind at all times."
14. "Personality; liking people; intelligence; perception; sensitivity; know-how; knowledge."
15. "Ability to communicate with faculty and administration."
16. "The ability to deal on a one-to-one basis with faculty, students and administrators, and to elicit cooperation and participation in meeting departmental goals."
17. "Wisdom and temperamental balance."
18. "To have enough knowledge of departmental and university programs to give direction to their development."

19. "Patience and perseverance."
20. "Ability to unite faculty and work with Dean."
21. "Talent in working with people."
22. "Leadership and capacity to appreciate the talents of the faculty."
23. "Soft-sell leadership and cooperative, enthusiastic, positive approach."
24. "Concern for academic excellence and understanding of people."
25. "Patience and good health!"
26. "Competency and patience."
27. "Broad sense of mission, leader and facilitator of teacher/scholar activities."
28. "Ability to say no."
29. "An open, equable disposition."
30. "Honesty with faculty."
31. "A person who has his own life put together and does not need the position for ego fulfillment or power."
32. "Scholarly competence and administrative ability."
33. "Administrative skill coupled with experience as a faculty member."
34. "Administrative ability."
35. "Human relations."
36. "Leadership."
37. "Good, democratic administrator."
38. "I don't see any one qualification as most important--takes a combination."
39. "The ability to be objective."
40. "Must like people and be able to make decisions."
41. "Candor."

42. "A professional and objective dedication to the welfare of the department, its faculty and its students."
43. "Patience and a sense of humor."
44. "Integrity."
45. "Tact and balance; experience."
46. "Patience and tenacity."
47. "Scientific leadership, and a tough hide."
48. "Ability to relate to faculty, administration and students."
49. "Integrity and honesty with colleagues."
50. "Ability to gain the trust and confidence of the faculty and administration, and judicious toughness."
51. "Knowledge of subject; strong, dynamic leadership; must be a leader."
52. "The ability to help a faculty adjust to new conditions."
53. "Leadership, a good academic background and an ability to communicate with both faculty and administration."
54. "Good teaching ability and administrative experience."
55. "Patience."
56. "To like and respect faculty colleagues."
57. "Competence that is recognized by faculty and administrators."
58. "Patience and experience."
59. "Have the confidence of the faculty and ideas of where to go next."
60. "Managing people and providing a proper climate for scholarly activities."
61. "A demonstrated scholarliness as evidenced by research and teaching accomplishments."
62. "Open communication."
63. "Concern for students."

- 64. "Ability to mediate."
- 65. "Integrity."
- 66. "Hard worker and a nice person."
- 67. "Ability to communicate with people."
- 68. "Broad, horse sensical intelligence and a genuinely humanitarian feeling for people."
- 69. "Ability to deal with people."
- 70. "Gets satisfaction out of the job."
- 71. "Leadership."
- 72. "Persistence and a sense of humor."
- 73. "Ability to get along with people, make decisions fairly, have a goal and direction for department."

QUESTION E-5: What do you like best about your job?

RESPONSES:

1. "Intimate contact with dedicated students and faculty who are tops."
2. "Hiring talented people and helping bring quality to the program."
3. "Moving the department to try new things."
4. "Ability to initiate and promote programs."
5. "Helping young scholars."
6. "My administrative assistant--without her this first year would have been a complete disaster. This may not be the sort of answer you have in mind. Probably I most enjoy talking with people."
7. "Facilitating the teaching and scholarship of colleagues."
8. "Opportunity to develop a program."
9. "Learning about my colleagues as people."
10. "Promoting the professional development of faculty and students."
11. "Opportunities to innovate."
12. "Ability to build a department and program."
13. "The chance to help keep the department moving forward in difficult financial times."
14. "The students."
15. "Working with such a diverse and intelligent group of individuals."
16. "Planning for the future: curriculum and staff."
17. "Being a key person during a period of growth in national research reputation, and increased recognition as the top department in the university."

18. "Contact with colleagues."
19. "Interpersonal relations with others."
20. "Solving problems for people."
21. "Working with colleagues."
22. "Getting things done."
23. "Program development; quality improvement."
24. "Working with creative people."
25. "Helping people express themselves scientifically."
26. "The opportunity to guide the future of an outstanding department."
27. "Interaction with faculty and students."
28. "Working with students."
29. "Control of resources."
30. "Working with faculty."
31. "Interactions with faculty and students."
32. "Everything."
33. "The opportunity to develop excellent ideas and facilitate intelligent human growth."
34. "Interacting with students."
35. "Advising students."
36. "Challenge."
37. "Coordinating the power of the staff."
38. "That it is temporary and I can return to teaching and research."
39. "Interaction with people."
40. "The opportunity for leadership it provides."
41. "Leadership possibilities, opportunity to build department."

42. "Having influence on the course of the department."
43. "Solving problems effectively."
44. "Finishing difficult tasks."
45. "Chance to improve department."
46. "Long range planning activities."
47. "Ability to help faculty and students."
48. "Opportunity to help young people get started."
49. "Opportunity to develop programs and help faculty grow."
50. "Helping develop faculty and graduate student talent."
51. "Meeting visiting professors, planning academic events, interviewing candidates."
52. "Opportunity to set the policy and direction of the department and to initiate courses, programs, and ideas--all with a mind to making a first-rate department."
53. "Keeping the department effective."
54. "Working out problems for people."
55. "Challenges."
56. "See activities completed and successfully implemented."
57. "An opportunity to have a stronger impact on program development."
58. "Reviewing favorable comments from students on our curriculum."
59. "In this period of declining budgets, saving department strengths and efficiencies."
60. "Seeing people progress and programs grow and serve a useful purpose."
61. "Providing leadership."
62. "Involvement with a dynamic faculty and research, extension and instructional programs."

63. "Helping young faculty members develop."
64. "Variety."
65. "Varied activities throughout the day."
66. "Opportunity for leadership--impact on society and economy."
67. "Opportunity to take lead in setting educational direction of the department."
68. "The occasional opportunity to be genuinely helpful."
69. "Working with individual faculty members to facilitate their teaching, self-improvement and enhancement of the program."
70. "The feeling of warmth whenever I talk about the department to students and faculty alike."
71. "Overseeing the intellectual life of the department."
72. "Untangling administrative knots--streamlining procedures."
73. "Working with faculty."
74. "Dealing with faculty colleagues."
75. "Seeing a program develop as I would like to see it develop with some degree of organization and progress."

QUESTION E-6: What do you like least about your job?

RESPONSES:

1. "Imposing discipline; endless stupid forms and reports; time schedule making."
2. "Reports, mechanical tasks, budget--takes me away from teaching."
3. "Performing routine services."
4. "Having to deal with student and faculty shortcomings in the fulfillment of their duties."
5. "Running the office."
6. "Writing reports."
7. "Cutting the budget and terminating members of the department."
8. "Time spent on trivial issues."
9. "Paper work."
10. "Responding to requests for information from central administration."
11. "Responding to the insatiable appetites of bureaucrats for information they cannot assimilate."
12. "Commuting to it."
13. "Seemingly endless paper work."
14. "Malcontent faculty and students."
15. "Small detailed reports and the many time-consuming insignificant (to the department) details."
16. "Delivering negative tenure and promotion information to individuals."
17. "The 'sometimes' limbo position caught between the faculty and the administration and belonging to neither instead of both."

18. "Balancing the vested interests of all involved."
19. "Routine reporting and checking on the performance of faculty in their fulfillment of routine activities."
20. "Explaining to faculty why they have not been promoted."
21. "Paper work."
22. "Meaningless paper work."
23. "Routine work."
24. "Numerous reports required by several administration offices to which the department must report."
25. "Paper work."
26. "Lack of time to do things as well as they can be done."
27. "Paper work."
28. "Small-minded bureaucrats in university service functions, e.g., registrar, student affairs, etc."
29. "Making critical judgments on dismissing faculty."
30. "The preparation of routine reports."
31. "Writing reports."
32. "Functioning as a policeman, caretaker, keeper of public morals, and glorified bookkeeper/bureaucrat."
33. "Having to fire people."
34. "Personnel problems."
35. "Routine office work."
36. "Excessive and unnecessary paper work--much of this brought about by affirmative action and a more legalistic approach to many dimensions of university governance."
37. "Arbitrating problems between students and faculty and faculty and faculty; routine budget matters."
38. "Paper work."

39. "Day-to-day administrative routine."
40. "Administrative bureaucratic nonsense imposed from outside the department."
41. "Budgeting."
42. "Correspondence."
43. "Coping with budget problems."
44. "Filling out forms and questionnaires."
45. "Handling niggling complaints."
46. "Constant stream of trivial administrative problems."
47. "Directing dead wood."
48. "Dealing with difficult budgetary times."
49. "Paper work."
50. "Dealing with bureaucratic impediments to effective department functioning."
51. "Paper work; hassles with the administration on money."
52. "Administrative duties; dealing with third-rate minds in the Dean's office."
53. "Asking for a larger budget."
54. "Bureaucratic routines and constraints."
55. "Paper work."
56. "Following bureaucratic administrative edicts."
57. "Budget, time scheduling--clerical details."
58. "Not getting things done."
59. "Lack of time for research and teaching."
60. "Acting as referee between feuding faculty."
61. "Budget."
62. "Administrative trivia which keeps one from concentrating on program development."

63. "Budget planning."
64. "Mundane mail; pettiness of faculty."
65. "Paper work and university forms."
66. "Statistical reports."
67. "Dividing resources which are usually inadequate."
68. "When I must carry out a dictum from the upper administration which is against our philosophy."
69. "Bureaucratic red tape."
70. "Having to live with some 'untanglible??' knots."
71. "Teaching."
72. "Unnecessary paper work."
73. "Correspondence."
74. "Having to meet idiotic, bureaucratic demands of non-teaching, research units of campus."

QUESTION E-7: What changes would you like to see in your role as Chairman?

RESPONSES:

1. "Fewer forms."
2. "Possibly the appointment of an administrative assistant to take over major routine duties."
3. "Less administrative bureaucratic nonsense imposed from outside the department so that I would have more time for my own scholarly work."
4. "None."
5. "Fewer questionnaires."
6. "More secretarial help."
7. "None."
8. "More support personnel to relieve me of myriad of 'clerical' details."
9. "None."
10. "I would like to see someone else do it."
11. "None."
12. "Not sure."
13. "Independence from Dean's office."
14. "Nothing significant."
15. "More time for planning and developing new programs."
16. "More freedom to exercise leadership role."
17. "None at present."
18. "More power over personnel and budget decisions."
19. "None."

20. "Better communication with central administration."
21. "Fewer budget crises."
22. "Somewhat less participatory democracy."
23. "Development of an administrative structure which permits the chairman to devote himself to program development."
24. "Administrative assistant to handle budget."
25. "More faculty support."
26. "More input to college Dean's office."
27. "None, particularly."
28. "A longer term of office than two years; a clearer definition of whether one is administrative or faculty."
29. "That I not be separated by union goals."
30. "More freedom and responsibility."
31. "More authority over budget."
32. "None."
33. "More central administrative awareness that programs are developed in departments."
34. "Shorten to three years; greater assistance and responsibility assumed by senior faculty."
35. "Have an assistant to do the mechanical, busywork and correspondence."
36. "None."
37. "Actually, very little--the organization of the department fits well my conception of the role of the chairman."
38. "None."
39. "Bigger budget for hiring; more power for chairman as long as I am chairman but not afterwards!"
40. "Can't answer yet."

41. "More autonomy."
42. "Addition of assistant chairman to free chairman to concentrate on more important matters."
43. "Ability to inspire people to work and be productive."
44. "Less concern with routine paper work."
45. "Less paper shuffling."
46. "Having more influence in debating budget requests."
47. "If money were available, an assistant to relieve the detailed research for the facts and figures required."
48. "None."
49. "More freedom to make decisions based on merit and more choices to build programs and employ faculty and staff."
50. "None."
51. "Administrative assistance to handle routine reporting and ordinary student questions and problems."
52. "None."
53. "In the role--better convergent definition by higher administrators."
54. "None."
55. "More time for scholarly pursuits."
56. "Responses from the administration when problems arise."
57. "More creative opportunities."
58. "None."
59. "More power over budget."
60. "More professional work time."
61. "None."
62. "Would like to return to a situation where some voice in merit salary distribution was possible."

63. "An influx of funding to support good things, and a genuine appreciation for the discipline from higher support sources."
64. "I wish we could provide more input into decision-making at higher levels."
65. "I don't think I would change anything."
66. "None."
67. "Recognition as the most experienced group relating faculty to administration and vice versa."

QUESTION E-8: In what ways do you exercise leadership as Department Chairman?

RESPONSES:

1. "Inter- and intra-faculty and student relations; curricular planning."
2. "Lots of ways--influencing decision-making; thrusting the department forward artistically."
3. "I'm constantly generating proposals of one sort or another."
4. "Mostly through individual action, that is, conversations on a personal level."
5. "Selling the agenda."
6. "Persuasion and by being in a central position."
7. "Indirectly through the recruiting of able faculty, rewarding the ablest members of the department and encouraging all others."
8. "Making decisions that are necessary for a successful operation."
9. "Arbitrating different points of view."
10. "By the appointment and definition of tasks for departmental standing committees, and by the definition of departmental goals and priorities."
11. "Persuasion."
12. "Ask department members."
13. "By suggesting projects, speakers, grant applications and policies, and by the control of the agenda."
14. "By setting the policy and direction of the department, and by initiating courses, programs and ideas--all with a mind to making a first-rate department."
15. "Who knows?"

16. "Keeping the department affairs organized and the process moving."
17. "Communicate with faculty, and bring them in on major decisions--works very well."
18. "Through assignment and subtle promotion of ideas with key faculty."
19. "Through proposals (curriculum and personnel policy) presented to the department and the university."
20. "Charges to committees to undertake specific activities."
21. "By helping the faculty find its own strengths and its own position on issues."
22. "In recruiting good people, stimulating the development of programs, and working positively with other units."
23. "In providing policies of long range and helping develop spectrum in teaching and research."
24. "Encourage faculty to work together within the department and between departments."
25. "Example, and by making the faculty aware of the needs of the department, the college, and the university."
26. "Budgetary work, planning, and the orientation of new faculty."
27. "Budget and hiring."
28. "Curriculum development ideas, guiding graduate students, and rewarding faculty on a merit basis (salaries and promotions)."
29. "Chair department meetings, introduce new programs for discussion, and determine salary increases."
30. "Mostly, by encouraging colleagues to think innovatively."
31. "Facilitate creativity through suggestion of ideas and encouragement of ideas expressed by individuals."
32. "To make their day-by-day jobs as easy for them to use their talents as possible."
33. "By proposing."

34. "Powers of persuasion via the personal approach."
35. "I set examples."
36. "Program development, and research and educational planning."
37. "By arousing the powers of other persons."
38. "Setting agenda for discussion and guiding discussion."
39. "Curriculum development, and developing positive interaction among individuals."
40. "Recruitment and evaluation of faculty; curriculum development and evaluation."
41. "Consultation and persuasion."
42. "Program balance, recruiting, work assignments."
43. "I suppose by setting an example as a dedicated scholar and teacher (hopefully), and by resolving problems in a professional way."
44. "Too many to count."
45. "I chair all department committees and formulate policy."
46. "Many. Basically, though, it is a serious and frank approach to problems."
47. "As chairman of executive and policy committees by taking initiative on matters of importance."
48. "Finding good prospective faculty; remaining active as a scientist (research) and teaching--some rubs off."
49. "In recruiting, program development, and as a spokesman for the department to the administration."
50. "By encouraging progress in research and teaching."
51. "Being philosophical; practical; thinking in the long range; supporting the program."
52. "All final departmental decisions are in the long run the chairman's. I therefore try to influence the staff to cooperate and support my point of view."

53. "Gentle suasion."
54. "Primarily in challenging faculty to strive for ever higher quality in teaching, in research, in new appointments, in tenure decisions, etc."
55. "Persuasive control."
56. "Through individual meetings with faculty members and staff meetings."
57. "Facilitate implementation of ideas arrived at jointly with faculty."
58. "Encouraging young faculty in career development; encouraging curriculum and teaching improvement; providing model for scholarship."
59. "Every way I can; every chance I get."
60. "Curriculum; research; faculty hiring and promotion."
61. "Friendly persuasion."
62. "Question is meaningless."
63. "Recruiting new faculty; developing faculty; guiding curriculum development; attracting necessary resources."
64. "Chair meetings and encourage new ideas."
65. "Trying to inform and consult with faculty."
66. "Initiator of new programs."
67. "Decision making."
68. "Every possible way."
69. "Persuasion, imagination, coordination."
70. "By offering convincing arguments, assembling objective facts to support judgments, by giving talented people support."
71. "In the conduct of faculty meetings."
72. "Organize meetings; arrange conferences with outside participants; invite guest speakers; encourage scholarly activities."

73. "Building solid faculty; initiating meaningful change whenever possible."
74. "Encourage research; encourage faculty improvement."
75. "Suggesting ways of improving program and developing an organization."

QUESTION F-3: What do you believe to be the most important thing you have done in your career?

RESPONSES:

1. "Teaching."
2. "Leave NYC. Show that you can do it all and survive."
3. "Writing things that have had an impact on the work of colleagues and students, and helping students to learn."
4. "Introduction of full faculty participation in the affairs of the department."
5. "Coauthored a good book; taught some good students."
6. "Teach, train Ph.D. candidates."
7. "Publications; exciting students in the history of Japan (my speciality) and training graduate students."
8. "My work with the A.A.G. Commission."
9. "Research contributions."
10. "Supervised and assisted in the professional development of talented graduate students; contributed to the development of knowledge in my field of research."
11. "Certain writings."
12. "Assist others (students, faculty) to achieve goals."
13. "Some of my research."
14. "Bring a unified department toward a high professional goal from a diverse, two-college structure."
15. "Publish a lab manual."
16. "Constructed and sold to the department a new Ph.D. program."
17. "My research and teaching."

18. "The contributions I have made in research and evaluation of educational programs will prove to be the most useful."
19. "Development of a major program of undergraduate, general education in Social Science."
20. "Teaching."
21. "I really don't worry about this."
22. "Bring a department from 'scratch' to a major Ph.D. department."
23. "Research and guidance to students."
24. "Discovery of mechanisms by which plant viruses are transmitted from plant to plant by insects."
25. "'Train' four good students to the Ph.D. level."
26. "International program development and teaching."
27. "Written persuasive communication."
28. "Curriculum development."
29. "Classroom teaching."
30. "To have helped a number of young professionals get their academic bearings."
31. "Good teaching."
32. "To maintain faith in the human qualities of faculty, being those strengths which ultimately build a great department."
33. "Scholarly research; development of an academic program in the study of religion."
34. "I have been (still am) a good teacher."
35. "Set up the department."
36. "Research and writing."
37. "Stir the growth processes of other people."
38. "To help young people achieve their goals."

39. "Perhaps the books I've written which are used for instruction nation-wide."
40. "Some major articles; Chairmanship."
41. "Research contribution."
42. "Co-authorship of teaching materials for Arabic, and a semantic analysis of the Arabic verb (a recent article)."
43. "Teach undergraduates."
44. "There is no one most important thing. Equal are: education of students; research and publication; administration."
45. "Revive work on the Early Modern English Dictionary."
46. "Teach."
47. "It would probably be my research before coming here."
48. "Hard to specify a 'most important.'"
49. "Presumptuous to answer this early."
50. "It isn't done yet--a book in progress."
51. "Inculcated the highest professional standards through excellent teaching."
52. "Stay alive."
53. "Stimulated and facilitated the development of young chemists as teachers and researchers."
54. "Assisted in developing an outstanding department."
55. "Help build the University of Nigeria; teach at current institution."
56. "Teach."
57. "Scholarship and faculty leadership."
58. "Written a textbook; been an A.C.E. fellow."
59. "Teaching, research."
60. "I have not been in the job very long."

61. "Stimulated interdisciplinary curriculum."
62. "Attracted and contributed to the development of outstanding young faculty."
63. "Recruited three outstanding faculty."
64. "Working with students."
65. "Guided a few students to high achievement."
66. "Build excellent faculty."
67. "No single thing; just being good at everything."
68. "Accepted a position on this faculty."
69. "Developed my mind and learned to deal frankly and fairly with others."
70. "Establish the Ph.D. program."
71. "Don't like this question."
72. "Bring in good personnel."
73. "Can't single out any one thing."
74. "Motivated and informed students, and pursued creative research."

QUESTION F-4: When you retire what do you hope people will say was your most important contribution to society?

RESPONSES:

1. "Led an honest and worthwhile life, and taught his children and students to do the same."
2. "I don't really worry (or think) about this--impresses me as a pretentious concern."
3. "Helped to establish an effective foreign language staff."
4. "Don't like this question."
5. "Reputation as a teacher and scholar."
6. "That I helped things and people to grow and do things with integrity."
7. "Helped build the department and effected students positively as a teacher."
8. "No special hope."
9. "That I cared what happened to society and people in it."
10. "Educated young people for successful careers and to perform efficiently in our economy and society."
11. "That the department will be worse off."
12. "Creative teaching."
13. "As a teacher."
14. "Development of truly interdisciplinary programs in crop protection that provide abundant crops at minimal damage to the environment."
15. "Knowledge and distribution of ideas."
16. "Developed a strong department."
17. "I really don't worry about this."

18. "Successful teaching and fairly good writing."
19. "Development of a major program of undergraduate, general education in Social Science."
20. "Assisted in developing an outstanding department."
21. "That I was a true professional--as a teacher, scholar and administrator."
22. "No hopes."
23. "He demanded excellence while preparing students for careers."
24. "An improved system or concept in logic."
25. "This is not something I think about."
26. "Certain ideas."
27. "Education of young people."
28. "They will not notice."
29. "That I was honest and competent."
30. "A modest contribution to scholarship and the training of others who will make major contributions to the study of History."
31. "Helped some students achieve their potential; helped build a stronger department."
32. "Helped build a better world."
33. "As an administrator, that I improved materially the department and its functions. As a teacher, that I taught students a tolerance for the diversity of man."
34. "The work I do when I'm over 70."
35. "Generated interest in Dance; gave pleasure to others through dance."
36. "That I helped us to understand how to hold it together."
37. "Writing of educational materials."
38. "Producing excellent graduates."

39. "I was a good, effective teacher."
40. "He could think."
41. "That I always put love before power."
42. "Was an excellent teacher in terms of all this implies."
43. "To have made the study of History an eminently worthwhile form of intellectual activity."
44. "Good teacher."
45. "That I had a concern for people."
46. "He encouraged scholarship."
47. "The education of young men and women."
48. "Too far away."
49. "I have given no consideration to retirement and would want to wait until then to specify."
50. "Teaching, research."
51. "He did not hurt anyone, and he helped some people grow."
52. "Scholarship and faculty leadership."
53. "Great teacher."
54. "Research contributions."
55. "My research and teaching."
56. "He helped mold the department to new educational needs."
57. "Helped students to better understand their environment and the earth."
58. "That he helped develop the program into one of the best."
59. "Research results."
60. "What I was as a person."

61. "Research, discovery, and teaching."
62. "Good teaching."
63. "A long career of effective teaching; some contribution to scholarship; some contribution to the health of the institutions I enjoy working in."
64. "Maintained and improved scholarly and educational standards."
65. "Teaching."
66. "Contributions to Arabic linguistics."
67. "Research contribution."
68. "Scholarship, leadership."
69. "That I was always interested in teaching as well as I could."
70. "That concerns me not at all. I shall continue to deal with each day as best I can. I do little to alter the pattern anyway, for each person will think of me as he found me in daily contact."

QUESTION F-5: If you could change jobs right now, what type of work would you select?

RESPONSES:

1. "Open up a plant nursery in Florida, while at the same time continuing to write up the results of several years of unpublished field research results."
2. "I am in my right role."
3. "Upper level manager in a corporation for one year."
4. "Something in research or editing."
5. "Chairmanship or dean or professor at a school in a different part of the country--wilder country, mountains, etc. The job would have to be some sort of challenging situation--not 'retirement.'"
6. "None."
7. "Real estate sales or a construction adviser in solar building."
8. "Teaching as it was before collective bargaining and the administrative-faculty encounters which resulted."
9. "Editorial work for an academic publisher."
10. "Racing car driver."
11. "I would teach or administer in another related department."
12. "Village work."
13. "Professor."
14. "Research administration in a land grant university."
15. "Probably administration."
16. "Same type--administration, teaching, and some scholarly activity (writing)."
17. "Similar."

18. "I don't intend nor want to change jobs although I could. If I were to, I would go into legal practice since I am a member of the Michigan Bar."
19. "Direct a major research and development center or institute."
20. "I'm happy being Chairman and Professor, but would consider a position with more challenges."
21. "Professor."
22. "Perhaps Law."
23. "All things being equal--Air Force electronic research and development."
24. "Full-time research."
25. "Management position in business."
26. "Planning policy."
27. "Research."
28. "Would not change."
29. "I would not change jobs."
30. "I would not want to change my profession."
31. "Professor (not Chairman)."
32. "Would not change."
33. "I have discovered that I have two basic talents as an administrator: (1) to bring people together, and (2) to think of new ways of doing things. Another ideal job would necessarily have to include these two aspects."
34. "Supreme Court Justice."
35. "Teaching."
36. "Janitor work or farming or animal training or flour milling."
37. "I cannot see myself in a position outside of the University. I am very happy with my chosen profession."

38. "I have no desire to change jobs 'right now.' I am relatively satisfied as a department chairman. If I had to make a change, my preferred choice would be to return to a professorial position."
39. "Teaching and research."
40. "About the same."
41. "I wouldn't change."
42. "I would be either a stock clerk at a major grocery chain or a grocery store manager. Then I would build a ceramics facility and begin making and marketing ceramics. The first has priority; the second is a possibility I would develop with caution. I would read a lot!"
43. "Would not want to change jobs."
44. "Teaching and writing."
45. "Ministry."
46. "Same type of work, perhaps at another university, perhaps higher administrative position."
47. "Teaching at university level."
48. "A similar type of position but one in a smaller department which would permit one to devote more time to teaching."
49. "I don't want to change right now."
50. "I am not interested in changing jobs."
51. "Full professor in Department or higher administration job in right situation."
52. "I really don't worry about this."
53. "I'd stay in the academic profession: teaching and writing."
54. "I would stay in teaching or university work."
55. "No other preference."
56. "Do not choose to change."

57. "Don't want a change."
58. "Editorial writing and column writing for a large, major metropolitan newspaper."
59. "A professor--teaching one course per quarter--writing the rest of the time."
60. "Professor."
61. "Don't know--probably in an entrepreneurial."
62. "Very uncertain."
63. "Systems programming."
64. "I'm quite happy where I am."
65. "Wouldn't change."
66. "Teaching in a small college."
67. "I wouldn't want to change jobs."
68. "Return to teaching."
69. "Outside academe--international business or diplomacy."
70. "News interpretation in broadcasting."
71. "What I am doing is fine."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andersen, Kay J. "The Ambivalent Department." Educational Record, XLIX (Spring, 1968), 206-213.
- Backstrom, Charles H., and Hursh, Gerald D. Survey Research. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Brann, James, and Emmet, Thomas A. The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role. Detroit: Balamp Publishing, 1972.
- Bruening, Joseph Herbert. "Midsouth Department Chairmen: A Study of Backgrounds and Interest Patterns through the Use of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts International (November, 1967) 28:5:1908-A.
- 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." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1969. Dissertation Abstracts International (February, 1970) 30:8:3213-A.
- Carey, Thomas A. "A Trend and Discipline Analysis of College Deans in Selected North Central State Institutions." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975. Dissertation Abstracts International (January 1976) 36:7:4283-A.
- Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Corson, John J. The Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1975.
- Davidson, Robert Clement. "The Administrative Role of Department Chairmen in Public Four-Year Colleges." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts International (February, 1968) 28:8:2935-A.
- Dodds, Harold W. The Academic President: Educator or Care-taker? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

- Doyle, Edward A. The Status and Functions of the Departmental Chairman. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953.
- Dressel, Paul L., Johnson, F. Craig, and Marcus, Philip M. The Confidence Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.
- Edelson, Paul Jay. "A Descriptive Study of the Congruence Between Department Chairmen and Faculty Perceptions of the Role of Department Chairman in Selected Collective Bargaining and Non-Collective Bargaining Private Higher Education Institutions." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International (June, 1968) 28:12:4846-A.
- Glass, Gene V., and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Heimler, Charles H. "The College Departmental Chairman." Educational Record, XLVIII (Spring, 1967), 158-163.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kinder, J. The Internal Administration of the Liberal Arts College. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934. Cited by Doyle, Edward A., in The Status and Functions of the Departmental Chairman.
- Kingsbury, Laura M. "Democracy Within Teaching Departments of Some Leading American Universities." The Educational Forum, XVII (March, 1953), 305-311.
- Macleod, Robert B. "Confession of an Ex-Chairman." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, XL (1954), 424-431.
- Marjany, Fatollah. "Accountability System and the Competencies of the Six Department Chairpersons at the University of Utah." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1974. Dissertation Abstracts International (May, 1975) 31:11:6988-A.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. "Memo to New Department Chairmen." Educational Record, XLIX (Spring, 1968), 221-227.

- Minelli, Ernest L. "The Role of the Departmental Chairman in Industrial Teacher Education: A Survey of the Requirements of the Job and an Analysis and Evaluation of the Activities of the Chairman." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1958. Dissertation Abstracts International (August, 1958) 19:2:276.
- Quarles, Benjamin. "Functions of Department Chairmen." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVI (January, 1950), 100-106.
- Quick, Wendle Randolph. "The University Departmental Chairman: His Role in Patterns of Faculty Selection, Promotion and Termination." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1966. Dissertation Abstracts International (April, 1967) 27:10:3273-A.
- Reeves, Floyd W., and Russell, John D. College Organization and Administration. Indianapolis: Board of Education, Disciples of Christ, 1929. Cited by Doyle, Edward A., in The Status and Functions of the Departmental Chairman.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Siever, Richard G., Loomis, Ross J., and Neidt, Charles O. "Role Perceptions of Department Chairmen in Two Land Grant Universities." The Journal of Educational Research, LXV (May-June, 1972), 405-410.
- Travers, Robert M. W. An Introduction to Educational Research. 3rd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969.
- Walmsley, Harry Alfred. "A Comparative Survey of Selected Duties and Responsibilities of Collegiate Chairmen in Physical Education Departments in Selected Institutions in the United States." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1970. Dissertation Abstracts International (February, 1971) 31:8:3944-A.
- Young, Elizabeth Thompson. "A Study of the Opinions of Deans and Faculty Members toward the Effectiveness of Women Department Chairmen in Higher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1974. Dissertation Abstracts International (April, 1975) 35:10:6421-A.