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Interest in the study of employee loyalty is present in the literature on leadership and organizations. Most studies have been focused on subordinate loyalty to immediate superiors; in education, most studies have investigated principal-teacher relationships.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of university faculty loyalty and faculty perceptions of the department chairperson's leadership style. Loyalty was defined as faculty willingness to accept, like, trust, and respect their department chairperson as demonstrated by implementing or emulating professional skills or recommendations of the chairperson. Leadership style was operationalized using seven scales: authoritarianism, emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence, executive professional leadership, clinical leadership, and intrinsic rewards.

The instruments for gathering data had been used primarily in studies of secondary education. They were adapted for this study in higher education by editing referents to be appropriate for higher education. The same concepts were covered, but in another type of organization. The content validity and reliability of the instruments were assumed not to have been affected by the editing that was done.
A sample of 260 faculty members from 28 departments (n=28) at Western Michigan University participated in the study. In presenting the analysis of the data collected from the survey, Pearson product moment correlations were used to test the seven research hypotheses. Analysis of variance, t-test and Pearson product moment correlations were used to investigate relationships between selected respondent demographic variables and faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

Authoritarianism was found to be negatively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson. Emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence, executive professional leadership, clinical leadership, and intrinsic rewards were all positively related to faculty loyalty to the department chairperson. No demographic variables were found to be significantly related with the faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.
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Dubil (1983) observed that "during the past few decades an interest in the study of loyalty has been manifested in the literature on leadership and organizations" (p. 1). He found that the studies done have focused on subordinate loyalty to the immediate superior; in education, most studies have investigated principal-teacher relationships.

In higher education, the department chairperson's behavior and faculty loyalty relationships is one that is not well understood (Leslie, 1973). This does not imply that department chairpersons do not play an important role in higher education. A study by Topalis (1968) showed that college deans consider curriculum development as an important role of the department chairperson. In the development of curriculum, the department chairperson interacts frequently with faculty members for their input and support. The chairperson has to seek faculty support and involvement in initiating and implementing all plans at the departmental level. The degree to which a department fulfills its goals and plays an active role in the institutional program depends in part, on the chairperson's relationship to the faculty. This involves the interplay between the chairperson's behavior and how the faculty members respond to it.

Faculty loyalty to their department chairperson is a major factor in determining the success of a department in fulfilling the mission of
the institution (Christian, 1983). The chairperson alone cannot accomplish the departmental objectives without the support and loyalty of the faculty. Hoy, Tarter, and Forsyth (1978) expressed the significance of subordinate loyalty as follows:

Theoretically, subordinate loyalty to immediate superior is significant because it provides a mechanism for the expansion of authority. Practically, administrators ... must expand their authority beyond the power and influence of the office in order to tap the common values and sentiments of the work of the group, specifically those feelings that establish loyalty. (pp. 29-30)

What a chairperson does while interacting with the faculty in planning and decision making processes provides the basic elements that enhance subordinate loyalty. The faculty members have their own behavior pattern expectations for the department chairpersons. The portrayal of these behavior patterns by the chairperson determines the extent to which faculty members are willing to do more than is contractually required in their duties (Blau & Scott, 1962; Ouchi, 1981). The department chairperson should, therefore, gain a collective loyalty of faculty if they (faculty) are to comply with requests more readily. The chairperson-faculty cooperation in various institutional activities can make it possible for a department to effectively play its role in the mission of a university or college (Al-Thubaity, 1981).

On the basis of available literature, the department chairperson's leadership style that would enhance faculty loyalty has not been clearly defined. The question being addressed in this study is, "What aspects of department chairperson's leadership style are related to faculty loyalty in higher education?"
Significance of the Study

An academic department is an integral part of a college or university. Peterson (1970) observed:

The department is the setting in which faculty members pursue disciplinary and professional interests and, at the same time, perform most of the basic teaching, research, and service activities which are the functions that colleges and universities, to varying degrees, reward and encourage. (p. 1)

Departments are considered to be "the key to successful achievement of the school's primary mission" (Al-Thubaity, 1981, p. 3). To understand the environment in which a department functions, Henderson and Henderson (1975) stated:

A college or university is an educational institution composed of professionals whose mode of working together resembles that of a large legal firm or medical clinic rather than that of a government agency or a business enterprise. Its structure is horizontal, its activities are decentralized, and its aim is effective education and research. (p. 186)

In order to accomplish its mission, a college or university often looks to the department to do most of the service activities required. On this, Roach (1976) said that "an estimated 80 percent of all administrative decisions take place at the department level" (p. 13) in a college or university. For an academic department to function, like any other organization, it must have a leader to carry out the leadership role. At the departmental level, the chairperson is the leader. The chairperson serves in several roles such as "first among equals, leader, manager, and scholar" (Scott & Menak, 1981, p. 3). The chairperson is principally concerned with activities that relate to the mission of the department, the development and utilization of faculty and the design and implementation of the curriculum (Scott, 1981).
The department chairperson plays a significant role in a college or university setting. McKeachie (1968) stated that "the department chairperson in most colleges and universities are key individuals in determining the educational success of the institution" (p. 221). Al-Thubaity (1981) also stated that chairpersons are central to the achievement of the college or university mission. He said that chairpersons "represent the administration and faculty members and are first among equals" (p. 3). Featherstone (1972) talking about the department chairperson said:

1. He or she is a key figure in the increasing complexity and decentralization of college or university administration.

2. The importance of the chairperson's role is in the fact that he or she is the administrator closest to the instructional program.

3. He or she is the chief executive of the department and the channel of authority between faculty and the administration.

4. He or she is also a key figure in determining the educational success of the institution. (pp. 24-30)

The position of a department chairperson is a complex one. He or she coordinates various activities of faculty within the department and, as well, serves as a liaison between faculty and the higher administration. Buhl, Jeffries, Lindquist, and Malicky (1980) observed:

Chairpersons and division heads, whatever the formal job description that applies to each, carry out critical management functions in most colleges and universities. Academic institutions are, after all, essentially power-diffused professional organizations. Departments and divisions are their basic administrative units.... Success is largely a function of the sensitivity and sensibility with which academic opinion leaders and decision makers address an
interrelated series of issues in planning, implementing, and evaluating programmatic responses to the needs focused in service growth. (p. 1)

The department chairperson constantly makes decisions, and interacts and consults with faculty members. This kind of involvement simply indicates that the department chairperson may not be effective without loyalty and support from the faculty. As the chairperson performs duties, "faculty members hold expectations concerning how the chairperson should behave in the administrative role and when the faculty expectations do not match their perceptions, conflict is likely to emerge" (Christian, 1983, p. 1). When the chairperson fails to portray the faculty-expected behavior patterns, "the demands from inside and outside the department can make the management of the department very stressful" (Al-Thubaity, 1981, p. 42). On the other hand, Isaacson (1984) stated that loyalty, an index of the informal authority of the department chairperson, indicates successful leadership because loyal faculty members are more willing to comply with requests and to support actions taken beyond narrowly defined job descriptions.

Pascale and Athos (1981) described the superior-subordinate relations in the perceptual process as follows:

Style isn't really something one has. It is, rather, something other people attribute to a person. They observe that person and his behavior, and from many pieces of data, they get reactions to him. They search for patterns and clusters among the bits and pieces so they can account for both their reactions and the data they receive. Over time they organize the clusters so they get a sense of the whole, and their reaction to it. . . . At whatever level of abstraction, based on whatever variations in data, people are able to construct a picture of a senior executive which they can use in several ways. They can identify with him, seek to be like him, move closer to him, go where he wants them to go, do what he
wants them to do—in short, try to be more like him. Or they can compare him to others negatively, reject him as a "role model," move as far away from him as his power permits—in short, reject him as their kind of leader, even if they have to accept him in his role for the time being. (p. 172)

The way subordinates perceive the behavior of their superior influences their loyalty to him or her. The findings of this study may be helpful to practitioners who may become aware of behavior patterns which are related to increased authority through faculty loyalty.

The reasons why the study of department chairperson leadership style and faculty loyalty is important can be summarized with three statements. First, the academic department is the basic unit in a college or university where research, teaching, and service occurs. Second, the department chairperson acts as a representative of the faculty group, on the one hand, and acts on behalf of upper administration, on the other. Last, the department as a unit led by the chairperson is a basic organ through which a college or university accomplishes its mission. Effective work at the department level is essential to effective operation of the college or university. Thus, the focus of this study in determining the chairperson's leadership style patterns that are related to faculty loyalty may benefit practitioners in institutions of higher education.

Scope and Limitations to the Study

The focus of this study was limited to the chairpersons of the academic departments at one higher education institution. The intent was to expand the understanding of the department chairperson leadership
styles that relate to the loyalty of faculty members. Since the study investigated faculty perceptions of department chairperson leadership style patterns, it was limited to the leadership style interpretation of the respondents. The data were collected at a large state-supported university. It is assumed that the findings reported for this study may generalize to other similar institutions of higher education.

Definitions of Terms

**Academic Department**: A subdivision of an institution of higher education usually associated with a field of study or academic discipline, e.g., the Department of Educational Leadership.

**Chairperson**: Refers to the person who is responsible for administering the academic department and occupies the first administrative level superordinate to faculty.

**Faculty Member**: An individual who has a tenure track or term appointment within a department. In a specific department, a faculty member reports directly to the department chairperson.

**Loyalty**: Refers to faculty willingness to like, accept, respect and trust a department chairperson as demonstrated by implementing or emulating professional skills or recommendations of the chairperson. Loyalty was measured using a scale originally developed by Hoy and Williams (1971) but adapted for this study.

**Leadership Style**: Refers to chairperson's actions perceived by faculty as enhancing and maintaining their (faculty) loyalty. These include:
1. **Authoritarianism:** Refers to chairperson's actions perceived by faculty as being rigid and domineering characterized by: (a) Unfriendliness-emphasizing position over faculty rather than working with them as colleagues, (b) strictness-sticking closely to procedures and rules, and (c) giving vague directions.

2. **Emotional Detachment:** Refers to chairperson's ability as perceived by faculty to: (a) remain calm (not suffer losses of temper) in solving problems facing the department, and (b) maintain psychological distance from faculty (maintain impartiality).

3. **Hierarchical Independence:** Refers to chairperson's ability as perceived by faculty to act independently - without involving the position, name or influence of the dean.

4. **Hierarchical Influence:** Refers to chairperson's ability as perceived by faculty to exert influence on their behalf at higher levels of the organization as indicated by securing departmental resources, protecting the interests of the faculty, and winning support from the dean for decisions made at department level.

5. **Executive Professional Leadership (EPL):** Refers to chairperson's efforts as perceived by faculty to conform to a role definition which emphasize an obligation to department and faculty professional growth.

6. **Clinical Leadership:** Refers to chairperson's willingness, as perceived by faculty, to allow them to participate in curriculum improvement and in performance evaluation.

7. **Intrinsic Rewards:** Refers to chairperson's support and acknowledgement of psychic values emanating from daily work as perceived by faculty.
These leadership styles were assessed using a scale developed by Isaacson (1984) but adapted for this study.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the investigation of the leadership styles of department chairperson as perceived by faculty, that relate to their loyalty.

1. What leadership style is associated with faculty loyalty?
2. What is the relationship between selected demographic variables—sex, tenure, years of experience, years served under the current chairperson, level of course taught, and department size—and faculty loyalty?

Overview of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter I includes a statement of the problem, significance of the study, definitions of terms, scope and limitations of the study, and an outline of the organization of the dissertation.

Chapter II contains a review of literature based on sources relevant to superior-subordinate relations. The focus is on the topics of authority, history of leadership theory, subordinate loyalty and seven leadership styles: authoritarianism, emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence, executive professional leadership (EPL), clinical leadership, and support of intrinsic rewards.
Chapter III contains a description of the methodology used in the study, the population and sample of the study, the instruments for obtaining data, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures.

Chapter IV contains a presentation and discussion of the findings of this study.

Chapter V contains a summary of the study, conclusions, and a discussion of implications of the results.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The following topics are covered in the review: (1) The concept of authority; (2) the history of leadership theory; (3) leadership style: authoritarianism, emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence, executive professional leadership (EPL), clinical leadership, and support of intrinsic rewards; and (4) subordinate loyalty.

Concept of Authority

The concept of authority is important for this study because it provides power to exert influence over group members (Boles and Davenport, 1975). "Power is the basic energy needed to initiate and sustain action - the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 17). Hence the major operational quality of authority is the ability to exert influence. Hollander (1978) stated:

Authority depends upon legitimacy, which can be derived from a person's office, that is, an assigned status, or from a person's own qualities. In either case, when viewed from a transaction standpoint, legitimacy is related to the follower's perceptions of a leader. (p. 45)

Dubil (1983) stated that "although the source of authority may be a person, or an impersonal institution such as a system of laws, the group willingly obeys the directives because its members consider it legitimate for this source of control" (p. 10).
Authority arises from the group shared values in which the members support the idea that the orders of the superior be obeyed (Blau & Scott, 1962; Dubil, 1983; Hollander, 1978; and Isaacson, 1984). Blau and Scott (1962) stated that "group norms and sanctions enforce compliance" (p. 144). In groups, however, it is recognized that each member has the right to hold individual judgment in the process of obeying the directives of the superior. This voluntary compliance with what is required or done by the superior legitimizes authority invested in leadership. However, it is necessary to note that "the perception by followers of a leader's legitimate status is based upon the office held and their endorsement of the leader's personal qualities" (Hollander, 1978, p. 51). If, on the other hand, there is a low endorsement by the subordinates, a leader may resort to the use of force on the members of the group (Gamson, 1968). This kind of leadership style is what is referred to as authoritarianism. Hoy and Rees (1974) in discussing authoritarianism stated:

An authoritarian supervisor will attempt to increase control by resorting to formal sanctions or to the threats of using those sanctions. However, the continual use of such methods will tend to undermine authority in the long run. Subordinates, especially professionals, resent being continually reminded of their dependence on the superior by his threats and sanctions. Given a strategy of dominion, authoritarian supervisors might find it difficult to command loyalty and support from subordinates. (pp. 268-269)

Administrators should remember that authority can be an exercise of positive influence if the group members endorse their leader and the norms to be followed. On the other hand, if the leader uses force and personal decisions over the group members, authority can be a negative influence.
Studies on authority have identified two principal dimensions - formal and informal authority (Albenese, 1974; Corwin, 1965). While formal authority flows from legitimacy and organizational status, informal authority is based on professional competence and human relations skills (Hollander, 1978). The source of formal authority is found in policy manuals, job descriptions, organizational plans and structure, governments, educational institutions, social agencies, and various business enterprises. Formal authority provides the basis for legitimate control of employees. Leaders, for example, derive their authority from legal contracts signed when an employee joins the organization. However, a legal contract has its limits on the authority of the leader. Although it normally obligates employees to perform a set of duties in accordance with minimum standards, it does not ensure that employees will strive to achieve optimum performance. On the same issue, Blau and Scott (1963) stated:

Legal authority (contract) does not and cannot command the employee's willingness to devote his ingenuity and energy to performing his tasks to the best of his ability. Important as formal authority is for meeting the minimum requirements of operations in a complex organization, it is not sufficient for attaining efficiency. It promotes compliance with directives and discipline, but does not encourage employees to exert effort, to accept responsibilities or to exercise initiative. (p. 140)

The legal contract, as can be seen, does not motivate workers to employ the best of their ability in service. The leader who strictly adheres to the contract without applying certain human relations principles will soon face discipline problems with employees. On the other hand, a leader whose influence is beyond the formal limits will
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be in a position to motivate subordinates to render their services beyond the legal requirements. This may require a leader to operate within the realm of informal authority.

Informal authority "is based on the behavior and personality of the individual in leadership positions" (Isaacson, 1984, p. 14). This involves what a leader does in his or her capacity. Informal authority is expressed in the way an administrator expresses leadership, uses power and authority, arrives at decisions and interacts with others (Sergiovanni & Elliot, 1975). Dubil (1983) refers to informal authority as "executive leadership" and defines it as "the actions that go beyond the confines of the legal contract and which cannot be legitimated by contract" (p. 14-15).

The difference between formal authority and informal authority is in the nature of power a leader wields after applying their principles. Power as was defined earlier is the basic energy needed to initiate and sustain action. The power needed for solving routine problems has its source from formal authority (Boles & Davenport, 1975). Hollander stated: "An organizational leader who depends entirely on the authority of a legitimated office is relying on headship" (1946). What Hollander called "headship," Bennis and Nanus (1985) gave it a different name "management," while Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) called it "supervision." Power used by headmen, managers or supervisors has its source from formal authority (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

One of the disadvantages of power that has its source from formal authority is that it is not so helpful in overcoming subordinate
resistance to change (Jacobs, 1970). Bennis and Nanus (1985) recognized this problem and called upon leaders to stop managing people. They stated: "People don't want to be managed. They want to be led" (p. 22). Considering the fact that modern organizations operate in an unstable environment, it is reasonable for people to reject leaders who are managers—who only know how to handle the daily routines but cannot create new ideas (Visions) needed by those organizations to adapt in timely manner for change (Boulton, 1984). Bennis and Nanus (1985) studied ninety prosperous organizations both in the public and private sectors in the United States. In discussing what they found about the leaders of those organizations, the researchers stated: "These were people creating new ideas, new policies, new methodologies. They changed the basic metabolism of their organizations. These leaders were creating dangerously not mastering basic routines" (p. 23).

Mastering basic routines in an unstable environment simply plunges an organization in trouble hence rendering it ineffective.

What leaders need to do then is to expand their power by applying informal authority principles to their leadership styles. An example of leadership style embracing informal authority principles is called by Bogue (1985) "inspirational leadership." The style "involves the achievement of voluntary commitment to shared values" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 185). Indeed, the right response if forced is not the same as the right response when it comes out of conviction. Realizing the significance of acquiring response through conviction rather than force, Hollander (1978) stated: "Without exercising authority through persuasion
and influence to achieve a program, there is not authentic leadership" (p. 46). He also stated: "The real power of a leader lies in his ability to influence followers without resorting to threats" (p. 7). All leaders face the challenge of overcoming resistance to change. Some try to do it by use of force and control. However, it should be remembered that leaders are only as powerful as the ideas they can communicate to instill within employees the commitment to change.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) expanded on this point succinctly by stating:

A vision cannot be established by edict or coercion. It is more an act of persuasion, of creating an enthusiastic and dedicated commitment to a vision because it is right for the times, right for the organization and right for the people who are working on it. (p. 107)

The ideas which represent the context for shared beliefs in common organizational purpose define the requisite behaviors and orientation on the part of the leader that would result in command of informal authority.

The informal authority that is contrary to group shared values and needs often fails to "accomplish the task at hand, reach long-range organizational goals or maintain positive relationships with subordinates" (Mazzarella, 1981, p. 58). Informal authority legitimated by the group members often improves the utilization of human resources, prevents resistance to change, removes restrictions to output, and avoids labor disputes (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

A national study done by Gorton and McIntyre (1978) on the principalship found that principals using informal authority effectively have, as their strongest asset, an ability to work with different kinds of people having various needs, interests, and expectations. They noted
that such principals understand people, know how to motivate them, and how to effectively solve their problems. Gorton and McIntyre concluded in their study that it is primarily the effective use of informal authority, rather than technical expertise, that cause "significant others" to perceive such principals as accessible and effective administrators. One of the findings which emerges repeatedly in the studies of leaders is that effective leaders are people oriented. They are outgoing and successful in working with other people. They have excellent social and interpersonal skills (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Goldhammer et al., 1971; Stodgill, 1974).

Informal authority, therefore, serves as one of the factors that may determine the attitude of the employees toward their leader. A leader who commands subordinate loyalty is liked and accepted. The study of leadership history in the sections following may provide more light into how informal and formal authority have been used or viewed at different stages.

The History of Leadership Theory

The concept of leadership authority may be as old as the history of man's civilization. The most common approach to the study of leadership, until about the beginning of the 20th century, concentrated on leadership traits, per se. This suggested that there were certain characteristics like physical energy or friendliness, to mention two, which were considered essential for effective leadership. Others, like personal intelligence qualities, were thought to be transferable from
one situation to another in a person's life. The assumption was that only those who possessed these qualities should be considered potential leaders. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) commented on this kind of approach and said:

This approach seemed to question the value of training individuals to assume leadership position. It implied that if we could discover how to identify and measure these leadership qualities, we should be able to screen leaders from non-leaders. Leadership training would then be helpful only to those with inherent leadership traits. (p. 83)

A review of research literature using the trait approach to leadership neither provided any helpful principles nor showed consistent findings. Thus Jennings (1961) concluded that 50 years of study failed to produce any personality trait or a set of qualities that can be used to distinguish between leaders and non-leaders.

Studies indicated that leadership is a dynamic process which varies from situation to situation according to changes in leaders, followers and circumstances. Mazzarella (1981) stated:

New studies of effective leaders suggest that effective leadership results from an interaction of style and inherent traits. In other words, leadership ability is partly learned and partly inborn. (p. 58)

A closer study of leadership theory in the early part of this century showed that it evolved around two major concepts—scientific management and human relations. The former was invariably called structure or task-oriented, while the latter was considered people-oriented leadership style. A number of studies indicated that an effective leader must have balance between scientific management and human relations (Clarke, 1984; Knight, 1983; Mullins, 1983; Spivey, 1983).
Scientific management was championed by Fredrick Winslow Taylor in the mid 1900s. In his theory, Taylor (1947) stated that the best way to increase output was to improve the techniques or methods used by workers. This led to use and manipulation of people like machines by their leaders. Management tended to neglect human affairs and emotions. This meant that "workers had to adjust to the management and not management to the people" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 84). The function of a leader under scientific management was to set up and enforce performance criteria to meet organizational goals. The leader focused mainly on the needs of the organization over that of the individual worker.

Taylor's scientific management was challenged by the human relations movement initiated by Elton Mayo (1945) who contended that, in addition to using the best technological methods to improve output, it was beneficial to the management to look into human affairs as well. He emphasized that the strength of an organization lies in the interpersonal relations developed within the working unit. The organizational set-up was developed around the workers taking into account human feelings and attributes. Under the human relations system, the leader's function was to facilitate cooperative goal attainment among workers while providing opportunity for their personal growth and development. The main focus, contrary to that of scientific management theory, was on the individual worker's needs rather than on the needs of the organization. The recognition of these two concerns, the worker's and organizational needs, has characterized the writings on leadership ever since the
conflict between the scientific management and human relation schools of thought became apparent.

Weber (1947) studied theoretical analysis of authority. In his presentation, he tied structure-orientation to formal authority and human consideration to informal authority. Weber's aim was to provide structural arrangements which would assist in understanding specific patterns of behavior that would promote the effectiveness of leadership process. In his theory, Weber (1947) made the following assertions:

1. Authority can occur within groups and the distinguishing feature of a group is an internal differentiation of roles with respect to authority.

2. A group is composed of two types of members: ordinary members and members who carry responsibility and authority.

3. Although the source of authority could be a person, or an impersonal institution such as a system of laws, the group willingly obeys the orders issued since its members consider this source of authority to control as legitimate. This orientation can arise in a group context. (p. 324)

Weber's theoretical analysis of the principles of authority influenced much of the subsequent thinking and research in the field of leadership (Dubil, 1983). This fact is evidenced by the findings of the Michigan Leadership studies (Gellerman, 1963). Group Dynamics studies (Lewin, 1952), Ohio State Leadership studies (Stodgill & Slevin, 1951) Managerial Grid studies (Blake & Mouton, 1964) and a study of leaders by Bennis and Nanus (1985).
The Michigan Leadership studies conducted at the University of Michigan approached the study of leadership by locating clusters of characteristics that seemed to be related to each other and to various indicators of effectiveness (Gellerman, 1963). The studies identified two concepts, which they called employee orientation and production orientation.

The Group Dynamics studies carried out by Cartwright and Zander (1960) claimed that group objectives fall into one of two categories: (1) the achievement of some specific group goal or (2) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself. They specified the type of behavior involved in goal achievement as follows: The manager initiates action, keeps members' attention on the goal, clarifies the issue, and develops a procedural plan. For group maintenance, they specified characteristics behavior such as: the manager keeps interpersonal relations pleasant, arbitrates disputes, provides encouragement, gives the minority a chance to be heard, stimulates self-direction, and increases the interdependence among members.

The leadership studies initiated by the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University identified various dimensions of leadership style. The staff, in an attempt to define leadership as the behavior of an individual when directing the activities of a group toward goal attainment, eventually narrowed the description of leader style to two dimensions: initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure referred to the leader's style in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the group and endeavoring to establish
well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration, on the other hand referred to style indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his or her staff.

The Managerial Grid developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) popularized the concepts of task accomplishment and development of personal relationships. The Managerial Grid has five different types of leadership based on concern for production (task) and concern for people (relationship). The types of leadership were identified as country club, team, middle road, impoverished, and task.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) conducted a study of ninety organizations in the United States which were identified, prior to the commencement of the study, as effective and prosperous. The organizations were selected from both public and private sectors. The purpose of the study was to investigate factors which contribute to effectiveness of leaders. An effective leader was defined as one with power (ability) to initiate and sustain action—the capacity (power) to translate intention into reality and sustain it. The method used for collecting data was a combination of direct observation of the leaders while on the job, and interviewing both leaders and subordinates. The main conclusion the researchers arrived at was that the leaders used informal authority as a source of their power. This was summarized as follows:

They (leaders) viewed themselves as leaders, not managers ... they concerned themselves with their organizations' basic purposes and general direction. Their perspective was vision oriented. They did not spend their time on the "how tos," but rather with the paradigms of action, with "doing
the right thing."... These leaders were creating dangerously and not mastering basic routines. (pp. 22-23)

The researchers identified four variables which leaders use to expand their power base: attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning--deployment of self through positive self regard--and optimism. The researchers called the variables "strategies for taking charge." The variables were used by the leaders to organize new ideas and explain their meanings to the employees, to articulate and define what was previously known but remained implicit or unsaid, and to help leaders to invent images, metaphors, and models that provided focus for new attention. The researchers concluded that the four variables provided the leaders with the power needed to relate compelling image of desired state of affairs--the kind of image that induced enthusiasm and commitment in others.

This brief survey of leadership theories indicates that the subject is not a simple one. The theories are complex and varied and encompass such things as personalities, attitudes, decision-making techniques, risk taking, and orientation toward work and people. How can such diverse and conflicting theories be helpful to leaders? This question is addressed in the next section.

Leadership Style

As indicated in the previous sections, the earliest leadership studies tried to determine what makes a good leader by examining the inherent traits of leaders. After the collection of leadership traits
became too large to manage or make sense of, researchers began to focus on leadership style, and on what leaders do in their capacities as leaders. Concentration upon an analysis of the style of leaders, instead of the notion of leadership as a trait, has brought about an increased understanding of leadership phenomena. Dubil (1983) commented:

The shift of emphasis from leadership trait to the analysis of leader behavior produce methodological advantages. It permits dealing directly with observable phenomena without making a priori assumptions about the identity or structure of whatever capacities may or may not undergird these phenomena. (p. 33)

Researchers, however, do not agree on what the most important components should be for leadership style. One way of looking at and classifying the dimension of leadership style was proposed by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1968), who saw leadership style as a continuum stretching from "subordinate-centered" to "boss-centered." Subordinate-centered leadership involves giving subordinates freedom to make decisions within flexible limits. In boss-centered leadership, the manager alone makes decisions.

McGregor (1960) identified another aspect of leadership. His emphasis was on the way leaders view employees. This led to his theory X and Y. Theory X refers to a leader who may see workers as lacking in motivation, needing to be constantly pushed, and holding their interest above that of the organization. Theory Y refers to a leader who assumes that workers are motivated to improve the organization, self-starting and giving prime importance to the organizational needs. Thus, theory Y leaders are viewed as modern, enlightened, humanitarian, compassionate, and successful in motivating people.
Bonama and Slevin (1978) saw decision-making as an important component of leadership style. The authors identified three leadership styles based on where the authority for decisions is placed and where information about decisions originates. The styles are autocratic, consultative and shareholder leadership. The autocratic leader wrestles with decisions alone and then announces in the staff meeting what he or she already decided upon. The consultative leader asks for staff suggestions and then makes the decision alone. The shareholder leader elicits no information exchange from staff members but leaves it up to them to make the decisions.

The Ohio State University Leadership (1951) studies also identified a certain component of leadership style. The findings showed that effective leaders place importance on the initiating structure, at the same time showing behaviors indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth.

Although some of these mentioned leadership style components may appear to be overlapping, they are not identical. In fact, some directly conflict with each other. By and large, the identified components of leadership style could be categorized into task-oriented and people-oriented. One of the major problems which leadership studies cause to researchers is the difficulty of balancing the work-concerns with people-concerns. In fact, there are experts who claim that it is impossible for a leader to create this balance. Fiedler (1967) believed that leaders are able to focus on either work-concerns or people-concerns but not both. He saw task-orientation and people-orientation as two
ends of a continuum. While Sergiovanni (1979) supported Fiedler, Reddin (1970) and Halpin (1969) saw the point differently. Reddin, in particular, advocated four possible combinations of orientation that could be effective depending on the situation. He identified the combination as human relations and task-orientations separately, both of these orientations together, and neither of the orientations.

There seems to be agreement among researchers on leadership that there is no particular leadership style that would fit all situations. Rather, "the best view of leadership style is that it must vary to fit the particular situation at hand" (Mazzarella, 1981, p. 64). Fiedler indicated three elements in situational control as status of the leader, leader-subordinate relations, and the structure of the tasks. On the other hand, Reddin (1970) and Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1968) identified three situational elements that determine the exhibited leadership style: forces in the manager, forces in the situation, and forces in the subordinates. Managerial forces include value systems, confidence in subordinates, inclinations toward a particular behavior, and feelings of security in releasing control to subordinates. Forces in the subordinates include the need for independence, readiness to assume responsibility, and tolerance for ambiguity. Forces in the situation are type of the organization, group effectiveness, the problem itself and time pressure.

Gates (1976) and Hersey and Blanchard (1982) agreed that there is one element of the situation which is a significant determinant of appropriate leadership style. And this is "follower maturity." By
maturity, the authors meant a capacity for followers to set high but attainable goals, a willingness and ability to take responsibility, sound education, and positive experience.

Researchers on leadership arrive at different conclusions on significant elements that determine appropriate leadership style. Fiedler (1967) concluded that an influential leader should be task-oriented, while a leader who is just moderately influential would be effective if he or she is people-oriented. Reddin (1970) maintained that a leader who emphasizes tasks at the expense of people would fail to be effective. He, therefore, concluded that a leader must be people-oriented to be effective. Gates and Hersey and Blanchard (1982) concluded that leader style which is appropriate should change with time because leadership style is determined by subordinate maturity which also changes over time. The authors recommended that when subordinates have low maturity, leader style would be task-oriented. As subordinate maturity increases, leaders should shift their emphasis from task- to relationship-orientation.

Research on leadership also shows that appropriate leadership style not only depends on the situation but also on the personality of a leader. Fiedler (1976), Halpin (1969) and Hanson (1979) pointed out that situational factors and personality variables interact in determining leader effectiveness. Fiedler stated that task-oriented or relationship-oriented style is a function of personality. He saw personality traits as factors affecting successful leadership. Hollander (1978) described leader, follower, and situation interaction which he termed social-transaction as follows:
The transactional approach to leadership involved the relationship of three elements each complex within itself. These are the "leader" with his personality, perceptions and resources relevant to goal attainment; the "followers" with their personalities, perceptions and relevant resources; and the "situation" within which all these persons function. (p. 8)

In leadership activity, the foremost feature is solving problems that confront a group. Basically, the problems or tasks form the central element in complex pattern which defines the group's situation (Boles & Davenport, 1975). Both the leader and the follower usually have their views of the nature of the environment. Nonetheless, in group situations, it is the leader's responsibility to identify and define the problem. A leader is often looked upon for timely and appropriate actions which fit the context for shared beliefs in a common organizational purpose. He or she is expected to give directions about what is to be done and how to do it (Hollander & Julia, 1969). In performing these functions, a leader normally projects certain behavior patterns which enhance loyalty of subordinates. These behavior patterns are dealt with below.

Authoritarianism

Authoritarianism is generally defined as a "rigid and domineering pattern of close supervision" (Blau & Scott, 1962, p. 148). A leader who applies this style in leadership activities "is empty of any inspirational quality, whose complete attention is commanded by dollars, digits, and documents" (Bogue, 1985, p. 18). In describing some general characteristics of a leader with authoritarian leadership
style, Bogue (1985) gave an example of an academic vice president whose concept of "strong leadership" was the ability to make tough decisions. He described the leadership style of that vice president as follows:

In a "shoot-from-the hip" style, he mows down ideas from deans and directors and moves on to the next challenge. He is tough, but he lacks that inspirational quality that calls out the best in his deans and chairmen. The passiveness of his style dampens the spirit and enthusiasm of an entire faculty. (p. 18)

A leader with authoritarian style uses intimidation to gain subordinate compliance (Laird, 1986). The problem with such a leader is that his organization will take fewer risks (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Taking fewer risks results in less growth in that the group "becomes more vulnerable to bad decisions because it is deprived of the growth experiences that come from the friction of involvement" (Bogue, 1985, p. 9). A leader using intimidation to ensure subordinate compliance does not only create a climate in which few risks are taken but also creates a climate so filled with tension and mistrust which affect the physical and emotional health of colleagues (Al-Salem, 1982). In commenting on the price (cost) that an organization pays because of the problems caused by a leader using intimidation as a leadership style, Bogue (1985) stated: "These costs are not recorded in accounts payable, but the price is high" (p. 10).

There are certain theorists who think that this leadership style is most appropriate for making subordinates produce results which in turn enable an organization to achieve its goals (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955, McMurry, 1958). The assumptions about human nature categorizing the majority of employees as indolent, possessing little ambition,
having distaste for responsibility, resistant to change, gullible, and a nature which prefers to be led normally support the concept of authoritarian leadership. These assumptions generally embody the basic ideas summarized in McGregor's (1960) theory X concept of leadership. In support of authoritarian leadership McMurry (1958) stated:

Many members of lower, middle, and even top management are dependent, insecure, and ineffective and produce primarily because they are directed by one or two hard-driving strong autocrats. (p. 82)

The advocates of authoritarian leadership argue that people-oriented (human relations) leadership style is ineffective because it is merely concerned with making the subordinates happy and not concerned with production for the organization (Cavell, 1975). On the other hand, Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, and Floor, 1950) found that effective leaders are more supportive and do less close supervision than less effective leaders who supervise more closely. Gouldner (1954) showed that authoritarian leaders have less productive work groups. White and Lippitt (1960) in their experiment with varying leadership styles showed that autocratic leadership is associated with hostility, aggression, hidden discontent, dependence, and less group mindedness. Hoy and Rees (1974) and Isaacson (1984) indicated in their findings a strong inverse correlation between leader authoritarianism and subordinate loyalty. Despite the negative view of authoritarian leadership style, it is found that a coercive style may be an efficient compliance strategy only in an emergency (Fiedler, 1967; Katz et al., 1950).
An Illustration

As mentioned above, authoritarian leadership style may be an efficient compliance strategy only in an emergency. This point could be evidenced by what happened in various African nations during the days of independence eve. The independence for many African countries was overdue because of the colonialists unwillingness to relinquish power to indigenous people (Mazrui & Tidy, 1984). The sad thing, though, was that neither colonial government nor national political parties were concerned with educating people in readiness for governing themselves. Instead there was bitter war between the national political parties and the colonial government. Also the colonial government devised the method of divide and rule whereby it played each of the national political parties against the other, and there was a bitter fight in that area too (Mazrui, 1967). The situation could be compared to events in the Republic of South Africa during the mid 1980s.

When various African countries finally achieved their respective independence, it was so abrupt that people were ill-prepared for it. For example, there were acute shortages of skillful manpower, especially for public service and, even more so, in the private sector (Mazrui & Tidy, 1984). In order to meet this emergency, leaders wielded much power to the extent of banning opposition political parties. The result was that African people experienced a period of history which witnessed an emergence of new form of government with a one-party state political system. Also many heads of state in various African countries declared
themselves presidents for life--Presidents Banda and Mobutu of Malawi and Zaire respectively are examples (Mazrui & Tidy, 1984).

The authoritarian leadership style worked well for many African leaders in the first few years of independence--the period between 1960 and 1966--as indicated by economic growth rate in various countries (Lele, 1975; Stamp & Morgan, 1972). However, problems began to show in the period following the year 1967. For instance, the continent experienced en masse military coups--Algeria, 1965; Zaire, 1965; Nigeria, 1966; Ghana, 1966; Togo, 1967; Sudan, 1969; Libya, 1969; Uganda, 1971, just to mention a few (Mazrui & Tidy, 1984).

Authoritarian leadership style is not only inappropriate in countries where western democracy is available but it may not work in third world countries. The people's opposition to that style of leadership is expressed in military coups of autocratic and dictatorial regimes. The regimes of political leaders practicing authoritarian leadership style are characterized by massive human rights violation, deficient democratic principles in government activities, and an economy which is at the verge of collapsing (Puchala, 1984). There may be other variables contributing to these problems, but a statement made by Bennis and Nanus (1985) appropriately attribute such problems to authoritarian leadership style. They stated:

The problem with many organizations, and especially the ones that are failing, is that they tend to be overmanaged and underled. They may exceed in the ability to handle the daily routine, yet never question whether the routine should be done at all. (p. 21)
Although Bennis and Nanus (1985) did their study in a different environment—American—, the points stated above seem to apply to the third world countries too. In the first place, third world countries seem to manage well daily routines like systematic oppression of people in which human rights are violated, and a calculated elimination of democratic principles in government activities (Punchala, 1984). Leaders never question whether such routines are appropriate and practiceable. One of the things which many third world countries need but lack is effective leadership which could assume responsibilities for reshaping national practices to adapt to environmental changes, direct national changes that build confidence and empower people to seek new ways of doing things (Adediji, 1974).

Sometimes it is possible for some people from Western democratic nations to think that people in the third world countries favor authoritarian leadership style. While it could appear that they favor authoritarian leadership style, studies are lacking to support that view. On the contrary, Al-Salem (1982) conducted a study in various institutions of higher learning in selected Arab Gulf States—Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Bahrain. One of the study objectives investigated the attitude of University professors towards autocratic and dictatorial leadership style. The researcher found that the university professors rejected autocratic and dictatorial leadership style. He also found that in the university campuses where autocratic and dictatorial leadership style was prevalent, there existed distrust between the professors and the administrators.
Sergiovanni and Staratt (1983) observed that "any system can absorb short periods of alienation in subordinates, but over time, alienation results in a collapse of the system" (p. 115). This usually happens because a leader's power to create change in an institution is normally limited to a level that the group being led will permit. A study by Blau and Scott (1962), however, concluded that there is no correlation between authoritarian leadership style and subordinate loyalty to immediate superior.

Emotional Detachment

Administrators at all levels of an organization are confronted with problems of leadership in one way or another. However, a first-line leader is faced by some rather special problems created by the position occupied in the organization. The leader is often caught in the middle position between rank-and-file workers and higher administration. The question that often confronts first-line administrators is how to behave so as to render their position effective. Should they side with superiors or subordinates? Whichever side is taken, an administrator is confronted with certain issues. Too much involvement with subordinates may lead to difficulty in issuing orders to or disciplining certain members of the group. The administrator who tries to identify closely with some subordinates may even face the accusation of playing favorites, thus alienating other members. On the other hand, if the administrator identifies more with the superiors than the subordinates, there may result less support from the subordinates.
In order to help administrators cope with situations in which they often find themselves, research has shown certain styles such as emotional detachment to be relevant. Emotional detachment refers to the administrator's ability to remain calm and not suffer losses of temper in work situations (Hoy & Williams, 1971). It connotes certain psychological distance from subordinates (Fiedler, 1960). Researchers have discovered certain discrepancies which may result if an administrator tends to lean too much on the side of subordinates. Mostly, it is found to be detrimental to efficiency. Gouldner (1954) called such relationships the "indulgence pattern." To avoid this pattern, he suggested to administrators that emotional detachment is necessary to lead effectively. Fiedler (1960) found that leaders of more effective task groups maintained greater psychological distance from subordinates than leaders of less effective groups. The author's explanation of this phenomenon is that closer relations make it difficult for the administrator to discipline. Also, a tendency to become emotionally dependent on some members encourages rivalries and the charge of playing favoritism. In their study on public welfare agencies, Blau and Scott (1962) found a positive correlation between subordinate loyalty and superior's emotional detachment. Isaacson (1984) found that non-excitable principals had more loyal teachers than excitable ones. His explanation was that teachers respect more balanced judgment that accompanies the principal's emotional detachment in dealing with conflict generated by students, parents, teachers, supervisors, superintendents and boards of education.
Hierarchical Independence

Blau and Scott (1962) defined hierarchical independence in terms of an administrator's detachment from the superordinate evidenced by different administrative styles. They operationalized the concept by examining aspects of the leader's style. Where there were differences, the leader was deemed independent. The authors observed that independent leaders have more loyal subordinates. The explanation of this finding lies in social support terms. A leader with loyal subordinates receives their social support and, therefore, does not need the support of the superordinate. The result is supported by Murray and Corenblum (1966) who confirmed the lack of the superordinates' social support to leaders with loyal subordinates.

The results of studies done by Hoy and Williams (1971), and Hoy and Rees (1974), however, did not agree with the findings of Blau and Scott. These studies showed that the principal's superior does have an effect on the principal's supervisory style. Isaacson (1984) defined hierarchical independence in terms of how the leader uses the superordinate in dealing with subordinates and also the degree to which a leader can function without invoking the position, name, or influence of the superordinate. His findings confirmed that of Blau and Scott. However, further study on this subject is still needed with a different group like the department chairpersons and faculty members in higher education to further test this theory.
Hierarchical Influence

Hierarchical influence is the extent to which subordinates are led to believe that the leader exerts influence on their behalf at higher levels of the organization. Research indicates that a leader who gains loyalty of subordinates usually secures resources for the department, protects the interest of the work group, and wins support from the hierarchy for decisions that are made at the local level (Fiedler, 1960; Hills, 1963; Likert, 1961; Pelz, 1952).

Fielder (1960) studied 32 relatively small companies. He found that work groups are more effective when the managers are supported by the board of directors. Hills (1963) found that hierarchical influence is significantly related to subordinate morale, subordinate ratings of superior effectiveness, subordinate job satisfaction, and subordinate confidence in the superior.

Hoy and Rees (1974) found in their study of secondary school principals that hierarchical influence is positively related to teacher loyalty. Isaacson (1984) indicated in his study of hierarchical influence of school principals that it has a positive relationship to teacher loyalty. What still remains to be shown is the relationship of hierarchical influence of the college department chairperson to faculty loyalty.

Executive Professional Leadership

In organizations staffed by professionals, leaders are often confronted with contradictions inherent in bureaucracy (Welensky, 1963).
In colleges and universities there appears to be an increasing conflict which results from inconsistencies between institutional and professional goals (Bogue, 1985). The dilemma is arising from the need to give autonomy to faculty while, at the same time, giving department chairperson the authority to coordinate them.

Hall (1968) specifically predicted that there would be conflict in educational institutions if the equilibrium between the level of professionalization and that of bureaucratization needed to maintain status quo (social control) does not exist or is disrupted. As schools became more professionalized, later research studies confirmed Hall's prediction. Miskel and Gerhardt (1974) showed that teachers, as professionals, expect administration to coordinate rather than to direct. The authors suggested that conflict could be reduced if the administrator reduces authority distinctions by emphasizing maintenance and human relations rather than commanding and stressing supervisory functions.

In the event of the professional-supervisor conflict, Gross and Herriott (1965) identified a leadership style that would suit professionally staffed organizations, and called it "Executive Professional Leadership" (EPL). EPL is defined as the leader's effort to conform to a role definition that emphasizes an obligation to improve subordinate performance. The authors also defined professionally staffed organizations as those in which the core activities are carried out by people who have specialized training and "who have been judged to have at least minimum competence required to perform their organizational tasks in an essentially autonomous manner" (pp. 8-9).
The EPL score is derived from subordinate responses to items concerning leadership style such as making constructive suggestions, showing interest in program improvement, conducting valuable meetings, diagnosing sources of problems, motivating subordinates to upgrade performance, showing interest in subordinate professional development, treating subordinates as professionals, and recognizing the importance of subordinate impact on the organization (Isaacson, 1984). Bogue (1985) characterized leaders using these principles as "good helpers" because they are concerned with the growth and development of employees as well as their organizations. Bogue (1985) particularly described the characteristics of such leaders as:

1. They are concerned with people,
2. They believe that people are able instead of unable, dependable instead of undependable,
3. They have positive self-concept and feel wanted as well as accepted by subordinates,
4. They are not concerned with what methods are used to perform a job but whether the methods fit,
5. They concentrate on the exceptional decisions and leave the routine decisions to others,
6. They work to see that their institutions develop a philosophy that will guide decision and create institutional spirit and ethic.

(PPP. 24-25).

Another characteristic of leaders who are "good helpers" was described by Laird (1986). He stated that such leaders emphasize job-enrichment
for subordinates, that is, they remove unnecessary controls and add new authorities for decision making but raise accountability.

The traits of leaders who are "good helpers"--leaders who practice EPL style--are similar to those discussed by Bennis and Nanus (1985). The two researchers studied leaders of ninety prosperous organizations both in the public and private sectors. They made the following observations about those leaders:

They concerned themselves with their organizations' basic purposes and general direction. Their perspective was vision oriented. They did not spend their time on the "how tos" but rather with the paradigms of action, with "doing the right thing." (pp. 22-23)

While Bogue (1985) and Laird (1986) called leaders using EPL principles "good helpers," Bennis and Nanus (1985) called them "effective leaders." Leaders using EPL principles have cordial relationships with the subordinates (Isaacson, 1984). Bennis and Nanus (1985) observed three reasons which could account for such relationships: (1) that the effective leaders are the most result-oriented individuals in the world, "and results get attention" (p. 28); (2) that they have visions or intentions which are so compelling as to pull people toward them, and (3) that their intensity coupled with commitment to their visions are magnetic.

Subordinates prefer and like leaders who emphasize results and with vision, because the two elements--results and vision--provide the all important bridge from present to future status of their organization. Emphasis in results and visions empower individuals and confer status upon them "because they can see themselves as part of a worthwhile enterprise" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 91). "If workers find joy in the consequences of doing a good job, they will tend to repeat their good
performance" (Laird, 1986, p. 87). The main thrust of emphasis in results and vision then provide positive consequences which motivate employees to perform at the desired standards. Bennis and Nanus (1985) explained how the phenomenon operates. They stated:

When individuals feel that they can make a difference and that they can improve the society in which they are living through participation in an organization, then it is much more likely that they will bring vigor and enthusiasm to their tasks and that the results of their work will be mutually reinforcing. Under these conditions, the human energies of the organization are aligned toward a common end and a major precondition for success has been satisfied. (p. 91)

Studies conducted by Goldman and Heald (1968), Gross and Herriott (1965) and Isaacson (1984) indicated that EPL is associated positively with subordinate loyalty to the superior. It is theorized that this relationship exists because EPL behavior is professional in nature, supporting subordinate values of personal development, program improvement and the importance of environmental improvement. The EPL concept provides a helpful approach for considering the mixed form of organization that Hall (1968) predicted would emerge as an accommodation to the professional bureaucratic conflict. An exploration of the relationship of the academic department chairperson executive professional leadership (EPL) style to faculty loyalty would be illuminating.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision is a leadership style used in an educational setting with the goal of improving instruction (Mosher & Purpel, 1972). The role of the leader in clinical supervision is that of change agent (Sullivan, 1980). This style embraces newly developed concepts of
human relations and group processes in organizations. It is intended for implementing democratic ideals in an educational setting (Karier, 1982). It is a non-threatening approach characterized by a joint planning and collegiality. Reavis (1976) stated that clinical supervision rests on the convictions that instruction can be improved by direct feedback on aspects of teaching that are of concern to a faculty rather than items on an evaluation form or items that are a concern of the leader only. One of the features of the clinical leader model is that it focuses on behaviors and patterns agreed upon to be examined in advance (Mosher & Purpel, 1972). After systematic observations, an analysis should be made on the teaching and learning that took place to establish changes that would be desired in the observed pattern and identify the behavior to be reinforced.

In order for clinical leadership to succeed, three main conditions must exist: There must be need for help, there must be resources to provide the kind of help required or knowledge of where the resources may be found, and the interpersonal relationships between superior and subordinate must enable the two to give and receive in a mutually satisfactory way (Blumberg, 1974).

Isaacson (1984) found a strong statistical relationship between clinical leadership and subordinate loyalty. He attributed this result to factors such as the collegial nature of this style which overcomes the bureaucratic-professional role conflict and the increase of subordinates' feelings of autonomy and security. Since clinical leadership still needs more discovery, clarification, and modification,
further research is necessary to support generalizations concerning the model (Sullivan, 1980).

The Support of Intrinsic Rewards

In educational institutions, leaders have no positive impact on salary benefits, or other extrinsic rewards. These are meted out by contracts and state laws (Isaacson, 1984). Research has shown that the positive events that occur in classrooms on a daily basis are of major importance to teachers (Lortie, 1975; Sergiovanni, 1967). The relationships that develop, the growth that is evidenced, the difference that teachers make are what teachers mention as the meaningful aspects of their professional work.

The nature of rewards in teaching naturally limit the leader's power. Once teachers have achieved tenure, supervisory assessments have little impact on them. In addition, sanctions in general are not very effective. Skinner (1971) indicated that "the person who has been punished is not thereby less inclined to behave in a given way; at best, he learns to avoid punishment" (p. 81).

Since the responsibilities of educational leaders outrun their authority, Lortie (1975) suggested that the way to deal with their problems is for them to symbolize professional purpose and competence and potentially to "reassure teachers about the quality of their teaching" (p. 197). In harmony with Lortie's findings, Isaacson (1984) also indicated that intrinsic rewards are what teachers value most. Isaacson observed that the principal's recognition of the teacher's
work in the classroom demonstrates care about what is foremost to the
teacher. The teacher's self-esteem is enhanced because their superior
values what they value. This finally promotes positive feelings about
their own work. This study will investigate the relationship between
the department chairperson's acknowledgement and support of the
importance of the intrinsic rewards of teaching and faculty loyalty.

Loyalty

Loyalty refers to more than faithfulness to the immediate superior.
Loyalty can be defined in three dimensions:

1. the behavioral dimension which indicates the professional
   actions and behaviors of faculty members who implement or emulate pro-
   fessional skills or recommendations of the chairperson.

2. the cognitive dimension which indicates trust in the superior
   as a leader, and

3. the affective dimension which indicates a personal fondness
   for the superior.

The group loyalty legitimates the superior's exercise of control
thus having authority over subordinates with the understanding that it
is in harmony with group member's agreement that the requests from the
leader are to be followed voluntarily.

Research indicates that the exercise of informal authority as
evidenced by group loyalty to the immediate superior is an indicator of
successful leadership (Blau & Scott, 1962; Gouldner, 1954; Likert,
1961; Ouchi, 1981). In their study of Public Welfare Agencies, Blau
and Scott (1962) showed that groups whose supervisors command loyalty are more effective in various aspects of their jobs than groups led by supervisors commanding less loyalty. The authors also found that productivity is largely associated with factors related to loyalty. Another study by Likert (1961) indicated that productivity is not related to the employees' attitude toward the organization but to leadership qualities of the administrator. Ouchi (1981) noted that a high level of commitment, loyalty and productivity in Japanese firms and in similarly structured organizations (which he called type Z organizations) are due to a strong egalitarian atmosphere characterized by concern for subordinates and colleagues, consensual-participatory decision-making, and a pervasive feeling of trust. Also, Pascale and Athos (1981) in their study of Japanese firms found that managerial behavior is a powerful form of symbolic communication that motivates people to pursue company objectives. The studies cited above show that loyalty both to the organization and to the superior is associated with factors that promote informal authority and positive outcomes.

Blau and Scott (1962) stated that superiors with loyal subordinates are liked, accepted, respected, and subordinates prefer to work with them. Murray and Corenblum (1966) added that loyalty "may be used to mean a cognitive orientation to a supervisor in terms of holding a set of beliefs that embody an unquestioning faith and trust in him as a leader" (p. 79).
Hypotheses

The research hypotheses investigated in this study are:

H1: Authoritarianism is related negatively with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Hoy & Rees, 1974; White & Lippitt, 1980).

H2: Emotional detachment is related positively to faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Blau & Scott, 1962; Fiedler, 1960; Gouldner, 1954).

H3: Hierarchical independence is related positively with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Hoy & Williams, 1971; Isaacson, 1984).

H4: Hierarchical influence is related positively with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Fiedler, 1960; Hills, 1963).

H5: Executive professional leadership style is related positively with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Goldman & Heald, 1968; Gross & Herriott, 1965).

H6: The practice of clinical supervision is related positively with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Isaacson, 1984; Sullivan, 1980).

H7: The support of the intrinsic rewards of teaching are related positively with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson (Lortie, 1975; Sergiovanni, 1967).

In addition to the hypotheses stated above, answers will be sought to the following questions: What is the relationship between department size and faculty loyalty to department chairperson? What is the relationship between sex of faculty members and their loyalty to
department chairperson? What is the relationship between the years of experience of faculty members and their loyalty to department chairperson? How do the number of years that faculty members have taught under the current department chairperson influence their loyalty to the superior? How do the level of courses taught by faculty members influence their loyalty to the department chairperson? How does tenure influence faculty member's loyalty to their department chairperson?
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate department chairperson leadership style that is related to faculty loyalty in higher education. This chapter includes a description of the study participants, the questionnaire used for obtaining data, the procedure for collecting data, and methods for data analysis.

Study Participants

The participants in this study were academic faculty members at Western Michigan University. The criteria for selecting the final sample of participants for this study were: faculty members working with chairpersons in selected academic departments, and both the chairperson and faculty members must have served in their respective positions for a minimum of two years prior to the commencement of data collection.

The survey instruments were sent to 344 faculty members from twenty-eight academic departments (n=28). A return rate of 75.5 percent (260 respondents) was obtained and used in the data analysis.

Collection of Data

Research Instrument

The survey questionnaire used in this study was adapted from one
developed by Isaacson (1984). The first section was comprised of items for gathering demographic information. The second section contained sixty-nine items for the scales used for measuring the faculty loyalty and leadership style variables. The first eight items were for a loyalty scale—a rating of faculty loyalty to department chairperson. The remaining items belonged to seven scales of authoritarianism, emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence, executive professional leadership, clinical leadership, and intrinsic rewards for measuring the leadership style variables—ratings of the department chairperson's leadership style as perceived by the faculty members. Isaacson revised the leadership style scales from previous studies (Gross & Heriott, 1965; Hills, 1963; Lortie, 1975).

The loyalty scale was developed by Hoy and Williams (1971). Blau and Scott (1962) had researched subordinate loyalty to the immediate superior in greatest depth, and their effective-based definition of loyalty, along with a definition of loyalty added by Murray and Corenblum (1965), enabled Hoy and Williams to develop a scale to assess loyalty to an individual.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The questionnaire had been used in secondary education for a number of studies and had been content validated by expert reviews (Dubil, 1983; Gross & Heriott, 1965; Hills, 1963; Hoy & Rees, 1974; Hoy & Williams, 1971; Murray & Corenblum, 1966). It was adapted for this study in higher education by editing referents to be appropriate for that population, but the same content was covered, just in another kind of
organization. The content validity of the instrument was assumed not to have been affected by the editing that was done.

Isaacson (1984) provided evidence of internal consistency of the scales by the computation of coefficient alpha for each scale. The coefficient alpha for the scales were: Loyalty (.92), Authoritarianism (.90), Emotional Detachment (.93), Hierarchical Independence (.81), Hierarchical Influence (.93), Executive Professional Leadership (.95), Clinical Leadership (.96), and Intrinsic Rewards (.95). There was no additional check done on the reliability of the instrument when it was used in the higher education setting.

Data Collection

Permission to conduct the study at Western Michigan University was granted by the Office of Academic Affairs. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) also approved the study.

The questionnaire forms and a cover letter (Appendices A and B) were sent to the participants. The cover letter described the nature of the study and assured the participants that the information given would be kept confidential. The faculty members were requested to complete the questionnaires and return them in an enclosed self-addressed envelope to the researcher through the campus mailing system.

A coding system was devised on a master list to identify those who had not responded. This enabled further telephone contact which was made by the researcher. Those who could not be reached by telephone calls were contacted by the researcher in person. The faculty members
consented to participate in this study and a return rate of 75.5 percent was received and used for data analysis.

Data Analysis

In the analysis, the response of the faculty members were aggregated by department to develop results on each scale (Kerlinger, 1973). Hence, the scores from the faculty members in each department were averaged to yield an index of the department chairperson's leadership style and the department's loyalty level.

After calculating the department means for each scale, a set of data were created with twenty-eight department (n=28) level cases used for testing the study hypotheses (Isaacson, 1984). The testing was done by using Pearson product moment correlations.

Various statistical tests were used to determine the relationship between the selected demographics and faculty loyalty. The t-test was used to see if there were differences between loyalty scores of male and female faculty members and also to examine differences between loyalty scores of tenured and untenured faculty members. Pearson product moment correlations were used to investigate the relationship between faculty loyalty and years of experience, years of service in the department, years served under the current department chairperson, and the department size. The course levels taught by the faculty members were categorized into three groups: Undergraduate, graduate, and undergraduate or graduate. One-way anova was used to see if there were differences among the loyalty scores of faculty members who taught undergraduate, graduate, and undergraduate or graduate courses.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the findings of the analysis of data are presented. The chapter is organized in three sections. In the first section the scales used in this study are described in terms of the number of items and the potential range of scores for each scale. Means and standard deviations of each scale, and both the number and percentage of chairpersons rated above the mean for each scale are reported. Findings from the testing of the hypotheses of the study are reported in the second section of this chapter. The third section reports demographic data of importance in this study.

Scales for the Study

The survey instrument of this study had eight scales. In Tables 1-3 the scales are described in terms of number of items and potential range of scores, means, and standard deviations, and percentage of chairpersons rated above the mean respectively.

In Table 1 the number of items and the potential range of scores for each scale are shown. The loyalty variable had eight items which were scored on a scale of one to five thus yielding a potential range of scores 8-40. The variables were all scored on a scale of one to six for leadership style providing a potential range of scores as follows: 6-60 for authoritarianism (10 items); 6-36 for emotional detachment (6 items); 6-42 for hierarchical independence (7 items); 6-54 for
hierarchical influence (9 items); 6-72 for executive professional leadership (12 items); 6-60 for clinical leadership (10 items); 6-42 for intrinsic rewards (7 items).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Potential Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Detachment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Independence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Influence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Professional Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Rewards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departmental level (n=28) data were used to calculate the means and standard deviations of the scales (Table 2). The scale mean data was used to indicate, for each scale, the percentage of the department chairpersons who were rated above the mean by faculty as shown in Table 3.
Table 2
Scales: Means and Standard Deviations Based on Departmental Level Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Scale Mean</th>
<th>Standard Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Detachment</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Independence</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Influence</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Professional Leadership</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Leadership</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Rewards</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=28)

Table 3
Scales: Percent of Chairpersons Rated Above the Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Independence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Influence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Professional Leadership</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Leadership</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Rewards</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Detachment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=28)
Hypotheses Testing

The seven hypotheses of this study were tested by examining the correlations of the loyalty variable with each of the leadership style variables. Scores for each of the twenty-eight departments were used to calculate the correlations. The seven hypotheses tested were:

Table 4
Correlations of Loyalty with Leadership Style Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loyalty to the Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Detachment</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Independence</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Influence</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Professional Leadership</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Leadership</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Rewards</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n=28\)

\(H_1\): Authoritarianism is negatively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

\(H_2\): Emotional detachment is positively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

\(H_3\): Hierarchical independence is positively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.
H4: Hierarchical influence is positively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

H5: Executive professional leadership is positively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

H6: The practice of clinical leadership is positively associated with faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

H7: Intrinsic rewards of teaching are positively associated with loyalty to the department chairperson.

The data in Table 4 confirmed each of the seven hypotheses. There are strong correlations ranging from 0.55 to 0.82. All relationships were significant beyond the 0.01 level.

Demographic Variables

Findings related to demographic variables are reported in this section. The tables in this section are organized into headings: Sex, tenure, course levels taught and other demographic variables shown in Table 12.

"Sex" referred to whether the faculty member was male or female. The "course level taught" referred to whether the faculty member was teaching undergraduate, graduate, and undergraduate or graduate courses. "Tenure" referred to a permanent status granted to a faculty member. "Years of experience" indicated the number of years a faculty member had in the teaching profession. "Years served in the department" indicated the number of years the faculty member had served in the department. "Years of service with the chairperson" referred to the
number of years the faculty had served in the department with the current chairperson. Finally, "the department size" referred to the number of faculty members in the department.

**Sex**

The t-test was used to see if there is a significant difference between loyalty scores of male and female faculty members (Table 5).

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Loyalty Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 0.31; \text{Df.} 258; 2 \text{Tail Prob.} 0.76; P > .05 \]

In comparing the means, male (25.6) and female (25.2) the difference was not significant (P > .05).

**Tenure**

The t-test was used to see if there was a difference between loyalty scores of tenure and untenured faculty members (Table 6).
Table 6

t-test (tenure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Loyalty Scores</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Untenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.45; \text{Df. 257; 2 Tail Prob. 0.147; P>.05} \]

In comparing the group means, tenured faculty members (Mean 25.3), and untenured faculty members (Mean 27.4), the difference was not significant (P>.05).

Course Levels Taught

One-way anova was used to test differences among the mean scores of faculty members teaching undergraduate, graduate, and undergraduate or graduate course levels (Table 7). In comparing the mean scores for undergraduate (25.9), graduate (27.1), and undergraduate or graduate (24.9), the difference was not significant (P>.05).

Table 7

One-way Analysis of Variance (Course Levels Taught)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F. Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.3391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>16084.2</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16220.7</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P>.05
Department Size, Years of Experience, Years of Service, and Years Served

In Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 are shown the distributions of the following demographic variables: department size, years of experience, years of service with current chairperson, and years served in the department respectively. The correlation coefficients of loyalty with the above mentioned demographic variables are reported in Table 12.

Table 8
Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black American Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Resources and Technology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Professional Department</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, Physical Education and Recreation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Linguistics</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Science</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of faculty who received questionnaire (n = 344)

Table 8 is a listing of departments included in this study and the number of faculty in each department who completed a questionnaire.
Table 9

Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 +</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of faculty respondents 260 (n = 260)

The number of years of experience and the faculty percent within each interval are shown in Table 9.

Table 10

Years of Service with the Current Chairperson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 +</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 260

Table 10 shows the number of years served with the current chairperson and the faculty percent within each interval.
Table 11

Years Served in the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 19</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 +</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 260

The number of years served in the department and the percent of faculty within each interval are shown in Table 11.

A Person product moment correlation was used to investigate the relationship between department size, years of experience, years of service with the current chairperson, and years served in the department with the variable, loyalty.

Table 12

Correlation of Loyalty with the Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loyalty to the Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Size</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service with the Current Chairperson</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Served in the Department</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation coefficients shown in Table 12 are low. Therefore, little relationship between department size, years of experience, years of service with the current chairperson, and years served in the department with loyalty was found. None of the findings were significant at the P>.05 level.

Summary

In this chapter, the data gathered and analyzed to assess the leadership which is related to faculty loyalty to the department chairperson has been presented. The responses of faculty members were tabulated to show the relationship between the seven dimensions of leadership style and loyalty; all were significant.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present (a) a summary of the study, (b) conclusions drawn from the findings of this study, and (c) a discussion of the implications of this study.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership of the department chairperson that may be related to faculty loyalty. The relationship of selected demographic variables with faculty loyalty was also examined.

Leadership style was operationalized using seven scales: authoritarianism, emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence, executive professional leadership, clinical leadership, and intrinsic rewards. Loyalty was defined as faculty perceptions toward their respective department chairperson in three dimensions: affective, cognitive, and behavioral. The affective dimension includes liking, accepting and respecting the department chairperson. Cognitive loyalty is indicative of an unquestioning faith and trust in the department chairperson. Behavioral loyalty, on the other hand, indicates professional actions and behaviors of faculty members who implement or emulate professional skills or recommendations of the chairperson.

The participants of this study were two hundred and sixty faculty members from twenty-eight departments (n=28) at Western Michigan...
University. The academic departments whose chairpersons had served for a minimum of two years at the commencement of data collection were included in the study. The survey instrument and the cover letter were sent to 344 faculty; 260 (75.5%) responded.

In presenting the analysis of the data collected from the survey, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were used to test the seven hypotheses of the study. Also, various statistical tests—the t-test, One-way anova, and Pearson product moment correlation—were used to investigate the relationships between selected demographic variables and faculty loyalty to the department chairperson.

A summary of significant findings dealing with leadership style that are related to faculty loyalty were presented according to seven research hypotheses and selected demographic variables investigated in the study.

The Findings From This Study Related to the Literature Review

The results of this study generated a picture of department chairperson leadership style and its relationship to faculty loyalty. Faculty member loyalty to department chairpersons was negatively related to authoritarian leadership style (Table 4). As reported in the literature (Hoy & Rees, 1974), authoritarian behavior of department chairperson tend to alienate faculty members. The reason given for this is that faculty members resent domination and strict adherence to rules. Also, the authoritarian style of the department chairperson may infringe on the independence which faculty members expect as part of their professional orientation (Henderson & Henderson, 1975).
Faculty members tend to be loyal to even-tempered department chairpersons. The emotional detachment of a department chairperson can encourage faculty member loyalty because such chairpersons are able to handle conflicts generated by economic situations and increased work demands on faculty members as a result of hiring freezes and retrenchment (Wheeless, Wheeless & Howard, 1983). The ability to manage these conflicts, without succumbing to their emotional content is essential because faculty members respect more balanced judgement that accompanies emotional detachment (Christian, 1983).

Faculty members tend to be loyal to department chairpersons who are hierarchically independent. Such department chairpersons make decisions not because they are arbitrary demands by the superordinate but because they are essential for the development of the department. Dependence on higher authority in most circumstances may be perceived by faculty members as a weakness and a lack of self-confidence of the department chairperson (Al-Thubaity, 1981).

Faculty members tend to be loyal to department chairpersons with hierarchical influence who are able to represent faculty members' interests at higher levels and secure resources for the department (Scott & Menack, 1981).

Faculty members tend to respect department chairpersons who exhibit executive professional leadership (EPL). This may be because EPL is professional in nature and supports faculty values for professional development and involvement in program development and improvement. The importance of such values is that they enable faculty members to
feel more positive about the nature of their work and performance which in turn enhances better feelings about themselves and about the department chairpersons who nurture those positive feelings (Isaacson, 1984).

A strong statistical relationship between clinical leadership style and faculty loyalty was found (Table 4). Gross and Herriot (1965) suggested that clinical leadership style can overcome bureaucratic-professional role conflict that may exist between a department chairperson and faculty members. This leadership style creates an atmosphere which enhances feelings of trust thus enabling faculty members to do their work beyond contract requirements.

The conclusion of this study was that faculty members tend to be loyal to department chairpersons who support and recognize intrinsic rewards. This is consistent with studies in management (Pascale & Athos, 1981). Intrinsic motivation was found to be important to faculty members because it gives a feeling of control over the work environment (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

The Findings from Demographic Data Related to the Literature Review

In general the demographic characteristics were not found to have a significant relationship to the loyalty scores of faculty members to their respective department chairpersons. These demographic characteristics were: sex, department size, the level of courses taught, years of experience, years of service in the department, years served under the current chairperson, and tenure status of the faculty members.
The mean loyalty score of female respondents was not significantly different from that of their male counterparts. The analysis of variance F-ratio for course level taught: Undergraduate, graduate, and undergraduate or graduate was not significant at the P>.05 level. The mean loyalty score of tenured faculty was not significantly different from that of the untenured faculty. Pearson product moment correlations analysis showed that years of experience, years served in the department, years served under the current chairperson were not related to faculty loyalty. These findings were consistent with those of other studies (Dubil, 1983; Isaacson, 1984).

Implications of the Study

The findings of this study have led to certain implications for administrators in higher education. One of the implications is the finding that subordinates do not seem to favor authoritarian leadership. This may be due to the fact that authoritarianism tends to discourage faculty members from active involvement in the decision making process in the department. Consequently, the expertise of faculty members is not used so that the department and the institution at large would benefit the most. On the other hand, the leadership style variables like emotional detachment, hierarchical independence, hierarchical influence; intrinsic rewards, Executive Professional Leadership (EPL), and clinical leadership are positively related to faculty loyalty to the department chairperson. This is in harmony with the findings of other studies that loyalty comes from willing compliance rather than directives or mandates given by superiors (Isaacson, 1984).
Leadership style portrayed by a department chairperson can have a positive or negative impact not only on the department but on the institution as a whole. This is because a department chairperson acts as the channel of authority between the faculty and the administration (Al-Thubaity, 1981; Featherstone, 1972).

Since subordinate loyalty seems to have positive impact on academic department administration, its study at other levels of university administration is appropriate. This study will expand the relatively limited knowledge base concerning subordinate loyalty to the superior in the administration of higher education.

This study did not account for variability in loyalty ratings given by faculty to their department chairperson within departments. A question remaining for further research is what faculty characteristics can account for differences in loyalty within departments.
Dear Faculty Member:

We are writing to request that you take a few minutes to participate in a dissertation research study. Thomas Ongwela is a Doctoral Candidate in the Educational Leadership Department at Western Michigan University, on leave from the faculty of the University of Nairobi, Kenya.

The purpose of his study is to investigate the relationship between the department chairpersons' leadership behavior and the faculty loyalty. The results of this study may be helpful to faculty and chairs who could benefit from a better understanding of faculty-chairperson relationships, and are interested in creating a healthy work environment.

You have been selected to be an important part of this survey because you are in a department that has had the same chairperson in that position for over two years. Would you please take a few minutes of your valuable time to complete and return the attached survey instrument.

Dr. Mary Cain, President of AAUP, and Dr. Ernst Breisach, President of OCHAD (the chairpersons' organization) have been informed of this study and have approved distribution of the attached questionnaire. All data collected will be treated with confidentiality. The information received will be used for aggregated analyses only, and you will not be identified individually or by department. Please return the completed survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope, using the Western Michigan University internal mailing system. If you should have any questions about this study you could reach Mr. Ongwela at 345-9253.

Thank you for giving this matter your top priority and prompt professional assistance. Please return the information requested by November 5, 1985.

Yours Sincerely,

Thomas Ongwela
Ed. D. Candidate
Dept. of Ed. Leadership
WMU

James R. Sanders
Chairman of the Doctoral Advisory Committee
Dept. of Ed. Leadership
WMU
APPENDIX B

Faculty and Department Chair Relationships Survey
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This questionnaire has two parts; the first part covers background information. The second part consists of questions related to faculty and department chairperson relationships. Please answer all questions as frankly as possible. Your responses will be kept confidential and will not be released to anyone. No individual faculty, department chairperson, or department names will be associated with reported data. Please answer all questions. Thank you for your cooperation.

A. Check your gender: _______Male _______Female

B. Name your department: __________________________________________

C. Check the appropriate course levels you teach:
   ____________________Undergraduate ____________________Graduate

D. How many years of experience as a teacher do you have? ______

E. How many years have you taught in this department? ______

F. How many years have you taught when the department chairperson held that position? ______

G. Do you have tenure in your position? ______

SURVEY FORM

The following statements relate to the faculty and department chairperson relationship. For the first eight questions, please check the one answer that best describes your feeling about each question. For the remainder of the statements, please indicate how you feel about each statement by circling one number under each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Please make sure that you answer each statement. Do not hesitate to mark the first response that comes to mind. Generally, the "first impressions" are the most accurate. Please be frank.

1. Is your department chairperson the kind of person you really like working for?
   _______a. Yes, he or she really is that kind of person.
   _______b. Yes, he or she is in many ways.
   _______c. He or she in some ways and not in others.
   _______d. No, he or she is not in many ways.
   _______e. No, he or she really is not.

2. Generally speaking, how much confidence and trust do you have in your department chairperson?
   _______a. Almost none.
   _______b. Not much.
   _______c. Some.
   _______d. Quite a lot
   _______e. Complete.
3. About how often is your department chairperson responsible for the mistakes in your work units?
   a. Very often.
   b. Quite often.
   c. Occasionally.
   d. Very rarely.
   e. Never.

4. If you had a chance to teach for the same pay in another university under the direction of another department chair, how would you feel about moving?
   a. I would very much prefer to move.
   b. I would slightly prefer to move.
   c. It would make no difference to me.
   d. I would slightly prefer to stay where I am.
   e. I would very much prefer to stay where I am.

5. All in all, how satisfied are you with your department chairperson?
   a. Very dissatisfied with my department chairperson.
   b. A little dissatisfied.
   c. Fairly satisfied.
   d. Quite satisfied.
   e. Very satisfied with my department chairperson.

6. How much loyalty do you feel toward your department chairperson?
   a. Almost none at all.
   b. A little.
   c. Some.
   d. Quite a lot.
   e. Complete.

7. Department chairperson at times must make decisions which seem to be against the current interests of their faculty members. When this happens to you as a faculty member, how much trust do you have that your department chairperson's decision is in your interest in the long run?
   a. Complete.
   b. A considerable amount of trust.
   c. Some trust.
   d. Only a little trust.
   e. No trust at all.

8. If your department chairperson transferred and only you alone among the faculty were given a chance to move with him or her (doing the same work at the same pay) would you feel like making the move?
   a. I would feel very much like making the move.
   b. I would feel a little like making the move.
   c. I would not care one way or the other.
   d. I would feel a little like not making the move.
   e. I would feel very much like not moving with him or her.
Please indicate how you feel about each statement by circling the right number as indicated in the key below:

**KEY:**
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Slightly disagree
5. Disagree
6. Strongly disagree

9. My department chairperson makes exceptions to rules and procedures rather than adhering to them. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. My department chairperson gets what he or she asks for from his or her dean. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. My department chairperson is able to make decisions without checking with his or her dean. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. The department chairperson gets excited easily. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. My department chairperson gives faculty members the feeling that their work is an important activity. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. My department chairperson is aware of my performance with my students. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. My department chairperson gets the dean to act for the welfare of group members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. My department chairperson says that he or she has to enforce a regulation because his or her dean says it is essential. 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. My department chairperson gets faculty members to upgrade their teaching performance standards in their classes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. I feel comfortable in my interaction with the chairperson. 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. My department chairperson makes faculty members' views known to higher authorities. 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. My department chairperson is very formal with faculty members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. At faculty meetings, my department chairperson maintains balance in handling the issues at hand. 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. My department chairperson takes the time to compliment my teaching performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. My department chairperson gives faculty members the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving performance of their students. 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. My department chairperson and the faculty work together to constructively plan ways for improving instruction. 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. My department chairperson seems to strictly enforce any directives from the dean. 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. My department chairperson explains why he or she wants things done. 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. When there is a conflict of opinion with a faculty member, my department chairperson tends to over-react. 1 2 3 4 5 6
KEY: 1. Strongly agree  
2. Agree  
3. Slightly agree  
4. Slightly disagree  
5. Disagree  
6. Strongly disagree

28. My department chairperson considers in his or her decisions what is best for faculty members in carrying out teaching assignments. 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. My department chairperson encourages professional development for faculty members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. My department chairperson has a fair judgment of his or her faculty members' instructional performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6
31. My department chairperson has an influential voice in higher level decisions that affect faculty members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
32. My department chairperson explains the reasons for his or her decisions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
33. My department chairperson maintains a conducive working atmosphere despite pressures from the dean's office and central administration. 1 2 3 4 5 6
34. My department chairperson makes faculty meetings valuable educational activities. 1 2 3 4 5 6
35. When I have a question in connection with my work, I can count on my department chairperson to give a satisfactory answer. 1 2 3 4 5 6
36. My department chairperson is influential in getting concessions from higher authorities for faculty members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
37. My department chairperson tries to frustrate faculty members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
38. I get along very well with my department chairperson. 1 2 3 4 5 6
39. My department chairperson treats faculty members as colleagues rather than subordinates. 1 2 3 4 5 6
40. My department chairperson encourages faculty members to develop their own unique teaching styles. 1 2 3 4 5 6
41. My department chairperson sees that the grievances of faculty members get a fair hearing from higher authorities. 1 2 3 4 5 6
42. When new programs or policies are being implemented, my department chairperson explains them to the faculty members rather than depending on his or her dean to do it. 1 2 3 4 5 6
43. My department chairperson has constructive suggestions to offer faculty members in dealing with their major problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6
44. My department chairperson makes me feel satisfied with my profession. 1 2 3 4 5 6
45. My department chairperson works cooperatively with faculty members to improve academic performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6
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KEY:  1.  Strongly agree
2.  Agree
3.  Slightly agree
4.  Slightly disagree
5.  Disagree
6.  Strongly disagree

46.  My department chairperson is very authoritarian.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
47.  My department chairperson is a moody person.  1 2 3 4 5 6
48.  My department chairperson takes a strong interest in my
     professional development.  1 2 3 4 5 6
49.  My department chairperson is a colleague who can be
     trusted.  1 2 3 4 5 6
50.  My department chairperson supports faculty member requests
     for materials and supplies.  1 2 3 4 5 6
51.  When a faculty member requests an explanation regarding a
     decision or a rule, my department chairperson justifies it
     by involving the name and/or position of his or her dean
     rather than explaining the reason for it.  1 2 3 4 5 6
52.  My department chairperson is a friend.  1 2 3 4 5 6
53.  My department chairperson is fair in his or her dealings
     with the faculty members.  1 2 3 4 5 6
54.  My department chairperson lets higher authorities overrule
     his or her decisions.  1 2 3 4 5 6
55.  My department chairperson gets easily upset.  1 2 3 4 5 6
56.  My department chairperson treats faculty members as
     professional workers.  1 2 3 4 5 6
57.  My department chairperson shows interest in students
     learning.  1 2 3 4 5 6
58.  My department chairperson understands the faculty members
     better than his or her dean does.  1 2 3 4 5 6
59.  My department chairperson is more interested in faculty
     members than in rules.  1 2 3 4 5 6
60.  My department chairperson maximizes the different skills
     found in his or her faculty members.  1 2 3 4 5 6
61.  My department chairperson provides social support to most
     faculty members.  1 2 3 4 5 6
62.  My department chairperson influences higher authorities to
     change decisions that affect the department favorably.
     1 2 3 4 5 6
63.  My department chairperson faces difficult situations in
     a calm manner.  1 2 3 4 5 6
64.  My department chairperson brings to the attention of
     faculty members educational literature that is of value to
     them in their jobs.  1 2 3 4 5 6
65.  My department chairperson establishes and maintains an
     atmosphere that rewards successful teaching.  1 2 3 4 5 6
     1 2 3 4 5 6
67.  My department chairperson helps faculty members to
     understand the sources of problems they are facing.
     1 2 3 4 5 6
KEY: 1. Strongly agree  
2. Agree  
3. Slightly agree  
4. Slightly disagree  
5. Disagree  
6. Strongly disagree

68. My department chairperson attempts to create in faculty members a sense of inquiry and experimentation.  
1 2 3 4 5 6

69. My department chairperson displays a strong interest in improving instruction. 1 2 3 4 5 6

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
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