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The purpose of this study was to answer the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between demographic factors; namely, age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, siblings, career path, professional memberships and publications and leader behavior (measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration)?

2. Can one predict leader effectiveness of department chairpersons prior to their selection?

3. To what extent is there congruence between self-ratings of chairpersons and ratings of their observers?

4. How are chairpersons selected in some public colleges in Michigan?

The research population consisted of 18 chairpersons and 108 randomly selected faculty members from four universities in Michigan. Of the questionnaires distributed, 93% were returned. Two instruments, which were adopted and developed by the researcher, were used to gather data: the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) and the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ).
Using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, the investigator found
no significant relationship between age and leader behavior. The same
was true of gender, educational background, marital status, social
status, career path, professional memberships and publications.
However, a significant positive relationship existed between leadership
experience and leader behavior. It was also apparent that those from
small families and those who are first born become leaders. There is
some indication that those who come from smaller family units may
become better leaders, in terms of accomplishing organizational goals.

Using the t test, the investigator found a congruence between
chairpersons' ratings and ratings of the faculty members of "task
orientation." There was no congruence on "Consideration."

Using the stepwise regression analysis, the investigator found
that leadership experience, siblings and publications were predictive
of leader performance.

The study showed that most department chairpersons were selected
by fellow faculty members and approved by the dean.

In some instances, the data supported previous research; in other
instances, they did not. Based on the findings of the study, recom-
mendations for future research were given.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

What does it take to be a leader? A great deal of effort has been invested in trying to identify the characteristics that make an effective leader. In an effort to do this, many tests and personal history variables have been explored, often with very little success. Such efforts have been geared toward identifying background variables which can account for leadership behavior (Rosen, 1969, p. 40). Kirkpatrick (1968, p. 10) used a series of personal histories in an effort to predict with precision effective leadership.

In recent years, there has been an increasing consideration of group members' perceptions about leadership (Jennings, 1950; Sanford, in H. Guetzkow, 1951, pp. 158-176; Scott, 1956; Van Dusen, 1948, pp. 69-79; Wilk, 1957, p. 17; and Williams, Leavitt, 1947, pp. 382-292). This is evident both in research oriented around leader behavior, per se, and in trait-oriented studies.

The question, therefore, is why are we concerned with leader behavior? Reasons are varied:

1. Taylor (1962, p. 1) said that the company might spoil a good workman by making a supervisor out of him (in some instances this may be true) but granted the imperfection of the human judgment, devices or procedures that might permit such errors, we cannot rest content merely to shrug off such occurrences as being "normal" or "inevitable"
or "natural" or "unavoidable." Taylor maintains that their toll
(in damaged morale, in human disheartenment, and in wasted resources,
energy, time and money) is intolerable. In order to choose the right
leader, that is, one who will maximize production by building employee
morale, that employer must become involved; because there are very few
people capable of leadership.

2. Taylor (1962, pp. 2-3) wrote:

Repeated studies have shown that in the primary
abilities required for leadership, about 70% of
the people are average, 15% are below, and the
remaining 15% are above average. About 10% of
the jobs in America are essentially leadership
jobs. When organizations must continually be
filling 10% of their jobs from a population of
which 15% or less is potentially capable --
that is why bother.

3. Finally, Taylor (1962, p. 3) indicated that if through some
strange happenstance, Leonardo da Vinci and Abraham Lincoln were
employees today of almost any typical fair-size American business/
industrial organization, the chances are great that they would be
put down in company records in about this fashion:

Clock number: 1807               Name: Lincoln, A.
Job: Laborer
Remarks: Shop keeper

Clock number: 951                Name: da Vinci, L.
Job: Painter, second class
Remarks: Always tinkering instead of keeping his
mind on the job. Turns in crackpot
suggestions.
That is why the employer who must select leaders must recognize leadership qualities; that is why the employer must bother about leadership behavior.

4. Fiedler (1967, 1977, p. 2) stated that the quality of leadership determines the success and effective performance of an organization -- that is why bother about leadership behavior.

The Problem

What does it take to become a leader? Is there any relationship between personal background characteristics of department chairpersons and their leadership behavior? Are the ratings of the relationship great enough to influence the selection of educational leaders?

Basically, there are two problems:

1. What does it take for a person to become an educational leader?
2. What determines the effectiveness of an educational leader?

Both questions present a "bugging" problem in two ways:

1. How to select educational leaders.
2. When they are selected, how can one predict their performance in order to retain them?

At present, there is available no entirely and clearly defined satisfactory criterion for selection and placement of chairpersons of departments in colleges of education in the State of Michigan. According to Murray (in Brann and Emmet, 1972, pp. 18-19), there are four ways by which a chairperson is selected:

1. Selection by the dean, or the president, or someone in the central administration.
2. Selection by the dean in consultation with the faculty members.

3. Selection by fellow faculty.

4. Selection based on rotation of chairpersonship in which the senior faculty members take turns for a specific term.

Up to this moment it is not clear what criteria are used for selection. It is the intention of this study to look at the relationship between demographical factors (age, gender, educational background, social status, marital status, siblings, career path, publications, experience, and organizational/professional membership) suspected to be related to leadership behavior. The findings will provide an insight into the process of selection and replacement of chairpersons in colleges of education in the State of Michigan.

The issue of leader selection is becoming increasingly intense due to competition for those with intellectual and leadership talent. Culbertson (1964, pp. 311-312) states four reasons for the increased competition:

First, the proportionate number of managers and leaders needed in the various administrative organizations of society is increasing. This increase stems partly from the growth of government and other large-scale organizations and from the increased demand placed upon those who head and manage complex organizations in modern society.

Second, the age group from which society's leaders will come during the next twenty years will remain constant in number while our total population will increase by one-third.

Third, and somewhat paradoxically, the developing science of administration itself has helped bring about a more rigorous and intellectually demanding content in preparatory programs which, in return, has resulted in the need to recruit a higher caliber of students.
Fourth, great incentives to attract talented people into scientific and research careers and into medicine and engineering have developed during the last decade. Since these incentives are likely to prevail and even be enhanced in the foreseeable future, special challenges confront those engaged in the recruitment of administrators. No one has greater challenges than those recruiting candidates for government administration; this also includes school administration.

Herein lies the justification of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is fourfold:

1. To determine the relationship between demographic factors (age, gender, educational background, experience, marital status, career path, sibling, publication, social status and professional membership) and leader behavior (measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration) of chairpersons of departments in some colleges of education in the State of Michigan.

2. To determine the leader effectiveness of the chairpersons as rated by themselves and their faculty members.

3. To determine if there are ways to predict the performance of chairpersons prior to their selection.

4. To determine how chairpersons in some colleges of education are selected in the State of Michigan.
One does not have to look far to understand the rationale for the choice of these demographic variables. The investigator believes that: (1) The variables describe the sample and indicate the limit of generality. (2) Some of these variables have indicated non-conclusive results in some past research work. (3) These variables are believed to affect the leader behavior of administrators in industrial settings, and the investigator would like to see if this relationship can be established in educational institutions. (4) There is some reason to believe that limited range of leaders' personal attributes (demographical factors) has been investigated that can account for the discoveries of apparently common attributes.

The investigator will determine leader effectiveness of the chairpersons by using the congruence of leader behavior measured on two dimensions (Initiating Structure and Consideration) as criteria of effectiveness. The two dimensions are viewed as constituting styles of leadership (Carson, J. O. Jr., 1964, p. 355). Effective leadership requires that they (Initiating Structure and Consideration) be blended in the behavior of the leaders, and the way in which they need to be blended seems to be governed by the situations of those affected by the leaders' behavior and actions. Carson, Jr. (1964) states that the task of a leader is to serve the needs of the institution "organizationally and individually fulfilling."

Therefore this study is undertaken to answer two basic questions:

1. What is the relationship between demographical factors: age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, siblings, career path, publications and organizational membership, and leader behavior (measured by two dimensions:
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Initiating Structure and Consideration) of the chairpersons of colleges of education in the State of Michigan?

2. Can we predict leader effectiveness prior to the selection of these chairpersons using congruence of leader behavior (Initiating Structure and Consideration) measured by the ratings of the chairpersons and their observers?

Answers to these questions may provide some insight into the process of selection and replacement of chairpersons.

Significance of the Study

Although an increase in the percentage of leaders with leadership background would not necessarily prove the ascendancy and acceptance of the leadership concept, the absence of an increase would not disprove it. Yet, the gathering and analysis of such data might provide useful information on a subject that has generated a lot of interest and research in the past decades. The analysis of the relationship between personal background characteristics and leadership behavior will certainly shed light on ways to provide i) leader selection; ii) leader effectiveness.

If the findings indicate results different from the ones in literature, the study might prove of significance to leadership theorists because they would want to find out why changes occurred, and therefore, seek the implications these changes might have for colleges of education. For this reason, this study could provide useful background data for further analysis.
Halpin and Croft (1962) stressed that the review of demographic factors will give great merit to the use of the demographic approach. Moreover, many industrial leaders believe that the failure or success of any organization depends primarily on its leaders. It is understandable that the knowledge of whom to select as educational leaders for effective management becomes a crucial issue. Mott (1966, p. 62) indicated that there exists a large accumulation of research which indicates that biographical data can be selected to indicate the effectiveness of behavior in various occupational areas. Mott concluded that, although this biographical approach has not been used extensively in school administrator selection, "... it appears likely that further research in education will benefit from the utilization of the biographical approach" (p. 62).

The investigator believes that the significance of biographical factors lies in the promise of improved leadership effectiveness and selection in educational setting.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of understanding this study, the following terms are defined:

**Consideration** refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group (Halpin, 1959, p. 2).

**Initiating Structure** refers to the leaders' behaviors in delineating the relationship between themselves and the members of
the group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done (Halpin, 1959, p. 2).

Educational Leader refers to department chairpersons in colleges in the State of Michigan.

Observers refer to faculty members.

Effectiveness was defined by Barnard (1938, pp. 19-20) as the "attainment of specific aims and objectives." But the criteria for attaining objectives vary. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, effectiveness is operationally defined as the extent to which the composite scores of the chairpersons agree with the composite scores of the observers on both "real" and "ideal" dimensions.

Effectiveness - Ratio Score - LBQ (Leader Behavior Questionnaire) consists of twenty criteria (10 for the Initiating Structure and 10 for the Consideration) measured on a five-point rating scale for both "real" and "ideal" performance. Effectiveness - Ratio Score is a composite score of the "real" performance of the chairpersons divided by the composite score for "ideal" expectation performance (Anderson, 1973).

Congruence is compatibility of relationships; that is, the compatibility of scores of the chairpersons' self-ratings and those of the faculty members: The higher the agreement on both "real" and "ideal" dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure, the higher the effectiveness.
Demographical Inventory (DI) consists of multiple-choice questions seeking information from the respondents; that is, age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, professional membership, siblings, career path and publication.

Criterion Instrument refers to an LBQ designed to assess various degrees of leader effectiveness and relationship between demographical factors and leader behavior measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Chairperson is a full-time leader of a department in the colleges of education in the universities in the State of Michigan.

Leader Behavior is measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Dichotomized item is an item that has a distinct and recognizable trait such as gender (male, female).

Category refers to values of a variable that can yield more than two discrete, noncontinuous scores. A variable can be an artificial or true dichotomy.

Delimitations of the Study

1. This study is limited to the following populations: Chairpersons and faculty members (male and female) of all colleges of education in the State of Michigan and should be applied with caution across cultural, political, and geographical areas.
2. Effective leadership is defined in terms of the criteria used by the LBQ instrument.

3. The ratings were confined only to full-time faculty members designated observers.

4. The study assumes the homogeneity of the sample through elimination of the instructional chairpersons.

5. Generalization of results is limited to public universities for this study. The study is appropriate to public universities in the State of Michigan. These schools are typical to other schools in and around the State of Michigan in terms of teachers and students. There is no reason to believe that these schools are/will be different.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this review is to summarize the literature as it relates demographic factors to leadership behavior and determine the extent of congruence of leadership behavior as measured by the self-ratings of the department chairpersons and the perceived ratings of the faculty (faculty members are designated "observers" for the purpose of this study). This review of related literature is divided into six sections.

Section one deals with the position of chairperson (its role and functions). Section two deals with selection of chairpersons, while sections three and four deal with leadership behavior and leadership effectiveness, respectively. Section five and six deal with perceptions of observers and demographic variables (factors as they relate to leadership behavior), respectively.

The Chairperson

Brann and Emmet (1972, p. 5) defined department chairperson as the head or the foreman in higher education, the person who sees that the work gets done, the person who makes sure the institution runs. Brann asserted that some departments do not have any job description for the chairperson. He added that where a chairperson's duties are
defined in writing, the resulting "hodgepodge" looks like a "laundry list of undone duties and responsibilities pulled together from throughout the institution."

History of the Department Chairperson

Role of the Department Chairperson

Expectations held for a department chairperson are quoted in Brann and Emmet (1972, pp. 7-10). These expectations were summarized as:

1. Administrative functions: To organize the department and be responsible for programs of residency, education, research and continuing education; to administer the budget; to supervise programs, secretarial and service staff; to manage physical facilities under the jurisdiction of the department.

2. Faculty: To recruit capable staff; to encourage excellent teaching; to recommend staff to the dean for promotions, salary adjustments, tenure, and leaves of absence for department members, encouragement of research, writing, and

3. Students: To make appropriate arrangements for the approval of graduate theses and dissertations; to encourage appropriate student seminars, convocations, clubs and student groups in the department.

4. Promotions and liaison: To assist the dean/associate dean in formulation and staffing programs, to develop and maintain contacts with research organizations on and off campus and to liaise between the department and other academic departments in the graduate school.
5. Committees: To be an *ex officio* member of the university senate and to serve on the executive committee of the college.

6. Professional standing: To take part in teaching and research whenever feasible and to cooperate with various fields: technical, scientific, and scholarly (p. 10).

Murray (in Brann and Emmett, 1972, p. 18), commenting on a paper presented by Brann entitled "The Chairman: An Impossible Job About to Become Tougher," brought to light the origin of chairpersonship. He said:

Departments, as we know them, did not really develop in American higher education until late nineteenth century at Harvard University. Medieval universities usually had four groupings: Law, Medicine, Theology and Arts. The early American colleges and universities were usually too small to have more than one man in a subject and operated somewhat like the many small four-year colleges that today have broad divisions encompassing several disciplines.

**Selection of the Chairperson**

Murray of Pennsylvania, in Brann and Emmett (1972, pp. 18-19), provided four different methods of selecting a chairperson:

1. S/he is appointed by the dean or president or someone in the central administration (those who come to their position this way are often, but not always, known as heads rather than chairpersons.

2. The dean chooses a chairperson in consultation with faculty (observers).

3. S/he is elected by his fellow faculty members.
4. A rotating chairpersonship is the process in which the senior faculty or all tenured faculty of a department take turns for a specified term.

Chancellor, in Brann and Emmet (1972, p. 35), explicitly stated that the role of the chairperson varies not only "with the discipline, the size of the department and its curricular importance, but with the situation." He added that "there is a need for the right man for the right job at the right time, because the chairman occupies an important position. This becomes clear when Mahoney, in Brann and Emmet (1972, p. i82), says "The chairpersons are a ring of faculty power -- its conscience, its blood, its bones, its vitality." They need energy to do the work. Heimler (1972) says 80% of the administrative decisions take place at department levels rather than at the higher levels of responsibility (p. 198).

Answering the question, "Who is the ideal chairperson?" Heimler of San Fernando Valley State College (in Brann and Emmet, 1972, p. 203) elicited five qualifications of a successful college departmental chairperson:

1. Character: Chairpersons use discretion and control their emotions. Apart from being committed to human values, they are capable of independent thought and make good judgments. They have the courage of their convictions and gain satisfaction through other people's achievements.
2. Administrative frame of reference: They promote the goals of the college by accepting administrative authority and responsibility. This is demonstrated by their positive attitudes toward college policies and programs.

3. Job skills: They are capable of heading meetings, writing letters, making semester schedules, directing secretaries' work, preparing agenda, reviewing research proposals, and maintaining departmental records.

4. Human relations: They have skills in counseling, advising, and compromising.

5. Professional ability: They have skills in teaching, research, scholarship, and consultation. They have an informed vision of departmental discipline and what they can contribute to students' education.

Chancellor, in Brann and Emmet (1972, p. 57), identified the tasks of the chairpersons to include: identification of department needs, personnel considerations, governance and development of curriculum. Dilley, in Brann and Emmet (1972, p. 29), commented on the inadequacy of the literature on chairpersonship, and said:

The department chairperson is the key to the successful operation of the university's primary mission -- but who provides an orientation program on chairmanship? Who sees that the new chairman receives literature on the chairmanship? One difficulty is that there is so very little good literature on the chairmanship available.

It was as a result of scanty literature on chairpersonship that Heimler, in Brann and Emmet (1972, p. 206), called for more data on chairpersonship.
He wrote:

In recent years qualitative studies have progressed. Some have ingeniously employed the records of individual and organizational data kept by the organizations themselves to provide quantitative evidence of relationships, processes and trends. Unfortunately, up to this point, very little research has been done on chairperson's place in management and administration. We need more data on the institutional role of chairpersons to answer questions such as -- How is the chairperson's administrative or leader role perceived by the department faculty?

In an effort to take up this challenge, the investigator intends to look into the demographic factors (age, gender, educational background, experience, marital status, career path, siblings, publications, social status, and professional memberships) as they relate to the leader behavior of the department chairs in some colleges of education in the State of Michigan.

The Leader

The term "leader" has many possible definitions. Several definitions quoted by Andrews (1955) are here reproduced:

Leadership is the exercise of authority and the making of decisions (Dubin, 1951).

Leadership is the initiation of acts which result in a consistent pattern of group interaction directed toward the solution of a mutual program (Hemphill, 1954).

Leadership is an ability to persuade or direct people without use of the prestige or power of formal office or external circumstance (Cowley, 1928). Leaders are those who succeed in getting others to
follow them (Cowley, in Hemphill, 1954). They are those who initiate and facilitate member interaction (Boles and Strodtbeck, 1951).

Leadership, in group discussion, is the assumption of the tasks of initiating, organizing, clarifying, questioning, motivating, summarizing, and formulating conclusions; hence, the leader is the person who spends the most time talking to the group, since the leader carries out more of these verbal tasks (Bass, 1949).

Leadership is the process of influencing group activities toward goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill, 1951).

Stogdill (pp. 1-14) cited ten types of definitions of leadership as:

1. a focus of group processes,
2. personality and its effects,
3. the art of inducing compliance,
4. the existence of influence,
5. the act of behavior,
6. a form of persuasion,
7. an instrument of goal achievement,
8. an effect of interaction,
9. a differentiated role, and
10. initiation of structure.

But Boles and Davenport (1983, p. 106) criticized Stogdill's definition because it failed to note that "leadership often has been and is used as a collective noun describing a group of individuals who hold top positions in an organization." Boles and Davenport (1983, p. 468),
therefore, defined leadership as:

A process tending toward accomplishment of a social system's goals through the use of some persons' or groups' influence, authority, and/or power under the conditions of social exchange then prevailing in the system.

Boles and Davenport indicated that there are three types of leaders. Individuals may gain positions in which they lead because of being selected by others. Selection can be through birthright, appointment, election, or default (status leaders). Boles and Davenport (1983, p. 224) indicated that others may lead through emerging from the crowd in already functioning groups (emergent leader). In contrast to status or emergent leaders, there may be an exceptional individual who may have a unique personal power that secures the allegiance of a large number of people (charismatic leader) (p. 226).

But the type of leader on whom this study focuses is appointed leadership: those characteristics in a person that can predict that a person is qualified to be a leader (departmental chairperson). Can demographic factors (age, gender, education, experience, social status, marital status, siblings, career path, publications, and organizational or professional memberships) help to predict those to be selected as chairpersons?

A considerable amount of attention has focused on identification of commonalities in the personalities of executives, supervisors, and managers in leadership positions. But no single characteristic could be found common to all leaders (Campbell, 1956; Fiedler, 1967;
Fleishman, 1969; Gibb, 1969; Hemphill, 1961; Meyers, 1954; and Stogdill, 1948). As a result, these researchers have suggested that leadership characteristics be studied in the context of their situations; that is, in terms of their different types of involvement and settings. Hence, leadership behavior of chairpersons in colleges of education in the State of Michigan can also be studied in their own setting and involvements.

Theory formulation and early research in the study of leadership were directed toward a unitary trait theory of leadership. The outstanding postulates in this theory were: (1) that there exists a leadership trait which is innate or inherent (Evenson, 1959, p. 98); (2) that only leaders possess these traits; (3) that individuals vary in the degree to which they possess it; and (4) that the trait, when possessed, functions with equal force in varying situations (Evenson, 1959, p. 98). The implication of the trait theory is that it is possible that traits can be identified and measured. But up to this time, no such traits have been identified.

Recent efforts at research have been concentrating on "leadership behavior" (Evenson, 1959, p. 98). The emphasis here is on the "behavior" rather than on the presumed underlying capacity (Carson, Jr., 1963); that is, the emphasis is on the "how" as opposed to the "what" administrative behavior. The "how question" involves assessing the behavior, which also involves obtaining evidence on the perceptions and the expectations that associates have of the leader.
Recently, Guba and Bidwell (1957, p. 1) considered leadership based on two aspects when they stated: "Role occupancy then, whether in the school or in any other institution or group, has at least two aspects: (1) behavior which attains institutional or group goals, and (2) behavior which satisfies individual needs."

Many other studies can be categorized into people-focused or performance-focused, or a combination of these. Bowers and Seashore (1966, p. 248) provided an impressive summary of the correspondence of leadership concepts of different investigators from 1950 to 1964. They identified four dimensions of leadership:

1. support;
2. interaction facilitation;
3. goal emphasis, and
4. work facilitation.

Getzels and Guba (1957, p. 429) identified the terms nomothetic (Initiating Structure) and idiographic (Consideration) dimensions to describe the leader behavior of administrators. Brown (1967), in his reaction to the leadership studies, identified systems' and persons' orientations as leader behavior factors. If all of these illustrations of leadership theories are brought to light, it becomes clear that there is a congruence of opinion about the two dimensions of leadership with which the leader must concern himself or herself. These two dimensions center about the needs, goals and performance of organizations.
One of the most useful series of studies for school administrators is known as the Ohio State Leadership studies, commencing in 1945, initiated and directed by Carroll L. Shantle and reported in Andrew Halpin (1966). One of the major contributions of these studies is the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which abandoned the notion of trait theory and concentrated on the analysis of the behavior of leaders (Hemphill and Coons, 1949). LBDQ has been used by many investigators to analyze the leadership behavior of school administrators (Halpin, 1957, p. 1; Evenson, 1959, p. 78). The two major dimensions which have consistently emerged are Initiating Structure and Consideration.

For example, Evenson (1959, p. 98) reported that each of the 40 school teachers agreed in describing the behavior of their principal on both dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration. These two dimensions are then viewed as constituting leadership styles of educational leaders (chairpersons for the purpose of this investigation). Effective administrative leadership appears to require that they be blended in the behavior of the administrator (Carson, Jr. and Schultz, 1964, p. 356).

Carson and Schultz stressed that the way in which the two dimensions need to be blended seems to be governed by the situation and perceptions of those who are affected by the administrators' actions. The administrators' task is to serve, at the same time, the needs of the institution and of individuals in such a manner as to render both organizationally productive and individually fulfilling.
Other investigators also reported the study of leadership behavior based on two dimensions. Blake and Moutton (1964, p. 55) proposed two basic styles of leadership similar to Initiating Structure and Consideration. They were called "production centered" and "people centered" styles.

Reddin (1967, pp. 8-17) investigated various typologies based on "Task and Relationship Orientations." He reported six typology classifications based on six different bases of classifications proposed by various investigators (see Appendix A). He observed that these classifications had in common two fundamental personality variables called Task Orientation and Relationship Orientation.

The review of the literature on leadership behavior of educational leaders affords a means of viewing these two dimensions of leader behavior (Initiating Structure and Consideration) as two variables in which leadership behavior of the chairpersons in the State of Michigan colleges of education can be described. Halpin (1956, p. 4) defined these two dimensions: Initiating Structure refers to a leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of his work group and in trying to establish a well-defined pattern or organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure. Consideration, on the other hand, refers to behavior indicative of mutual trust, friendship, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his work group. These two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration, were determined by factorial analysis that they
account for approximately 50 and 34 percent of the common variance, respectively (Halpin, 1957).

This study compared the chairpersons' self-perceptions with the perceptions held of them by the faculty (observers). It was assumed that the more chairpersons meet the faculty expectations on both Initiating Structure and Consideration, the more likely they will be effective in terms of achievements measured on both dimensions (Initiating Structure and Consideration). In an effort to obtain an accurate picture of the chairpersons' leader behavior, it was necessary to secure the information from the group with whom they associate, as supported by Carson and Schultz (1964, pp. 354-360). Hence, the perceptive ratings of the observers were sought in this study.

The congruence between the self-rating scores of the chairpersons regarding their leader behavior and the perceptual ratings of the observers were indicative of the effectiveness of the chairpersons. Hence, it was hypothesized that the higher the degree of congruence between chairpersons' self-rating scores and those of the observers regarding the chairpersons' leader effectiveness, the more effective the chairpersons were perceived.
Leader Effectiveness

Barnard (1938) defined effectiveness as the "attainment of specific aims and objectives" (pp. 19-20). Effectiveness varies with individual evaluators because it is a conceptual image (Anderson, 1973), "often a value judgment of one's ability and performance in a position." Hemphill (1961) classified three groups of leadership acts: (1) attempted leadership acts which can influence the behavior of others to accomplish common goals; (2) successful leadership acts which can effect behavior change in group members; and (3) effective leadership acts which can promote desirable goal achievement.

This classification of leadership acts is an indication that leader effectiveness is a recognizable act of leader behavior. Inherent in the image of leader effectiveness are two variables: (1) the "ideal expectation" one holds for a person in the role of department chair of colleges of education, and (2) how the department chairperson performs in that role. Anderson (1973) called this variable "real effectiveness" which involves value judgment.

There are various criteria which can be used to judge effectiveness. Hunt, Osborn, and Schriesheim (1977) noted in a review of 89 studies published between 1970 and 1975 that 61% used only a single criterion, with some emphasis on performance (43%). However, several field studies have made greater use of multiple criteria. Hunt, Osborn, and Schriesheim (1977) noted that 81% of most studies used criteria obtained from a different information source than the predictors.
Many other studies have been conducted with varying criteria to judge leader effectiveness. Drucker (1976) stressed the behavioral aspect of situational leadership theory by listing five managerial habits that constitute effectiveness: (1) management of time; (2) focus on contribution and results; (3) capitalization on strengths of self, personnel, situation, and institution; (4) concentration on major areas; and (5) analysis of decision-making steps.

McGregor (1966) used the criterion of successful completion of the task as a good measure of effectiveness. He stressed that success was dependent upon the type of relationship existing between the superordinate and the subordinate; that is, effectiveness was viewed as a consequence of relationships. Katz (1955), using leader behavior as a core of effective administration, defined this behavior by using three skill dimensions: (1) technical skills involving proficiency in methods, procedures, and processes of the leader's role; (2) human skills which concern dealing with people, this aspect including perceptions of superordinates and subordinates; and (3) conceptual skills which involve the leader's ability to understand the entire organizational structure in both theory and practice.

According to Katz, effective leadership is a function of the proper blend of these three skill dimensions. Hemphill (1958), on the other hand, used a different approach. He stressed initiation of structure dimension as a measure of effectiveness. According to him, leadership was primarily concerned with problem solving.
But Getzels, Lipham and Campbell (1968) had a different approach. They perceived leadership as a blend of two dimensions: (1) institutional role expectation, and (2) personal role behavior. They then defined leader effectiveness as the "concordance or functional agreement of the individual's role behavior and institutional role expectation" for that individual.

The review of studies regarding leader effectiveness seems to suggest that there are many criteria for measuring leader effectiveness. To provide uniform criteria for judging effectiveness, 20 specific criteria (10 for Initiating Structure and 10 for Consideration) were selected and incorporated in the instrument. Both chairpersons and observers were requested for both "Real" and "Ideal" expectations of the chairpersons' performance. The value judgments were made on a five-point rating scale.

Using Anderson's operational definition of effectiveness (1973), effectiveness is seen as an agreement between the observer's score of the chairperson's "Real" performance and the score for "Ideal" performance expectations according to established criteria.

Perception

Since the study involves the perceptual ratings of the observers, it seems advisable to include a section devoted to perceptual concept. Hochberg (1964, p. 3) defined perception as "the power exercised in reacting to sense presentations, and modifying them further by attention, interests, and previous experience." Each person sees
through his/her eyes and interprets what s/he sees in terms of his/her personal experience. Events going on inside the individuals include, but are not limited to, intentions, attitudes, emotions, ideas, purposes, and traits. But little is known about people from the shapes of their faces and the color of their hair. One clue to learning about the inside of individuals is through their behavior. Observers then rate this behavior as they perceive it.

Research studies have been done in various aspects of leadership that show self-perception to be different from that of subordinates, superiors, and peers. For example, Carson, Jr. and Shultz (1964, pp. 355-361) used LBQ to do a comparative analysis of leadership behavior of junior college deans as seen by students, presidents, and department heads. Evidence obtained was that discrepancies, perceptions and expectations existed between the students, leaders and other referent groups, implying existence of role conflict for deans. There were other misconceptions of perceptions when similar studies were done in industry, education and the military. But Gibb (1954, p. 914) acknowledged the dimension of perception in leadership theory:

"Theory must recognize that it will not be these variables per se which enter into the leadership relation, but that it is the perception of the leader by himself and others, the leader's perception of those others, and the shared perception by the leaders of the group with which we have to deal."

Boles (1971, p. 57) readily agreed with what Gibb asserted regarding the importance of perception in leadership studies:

"The present writer agrees that what the leader does, what the followers do, and what the situation is are all less..."
important (in a democracy) than what the leader is perceived as doing.

Pfeffer (1977) stated that "we want to understand a leader's behavior, we must begin by going inside the leader's head to find out what he is thinking about." Calder (1977) agreed with Pfeffer, and said: "We observe the behavior of leaders and infer the causes of these behaviors." He added that leadership has changed from a scientific concept to a study of social reality of observers.

Scott (1956, p. 7) indicated that studies of perception have included laboratory experiments involving various optical illusions and observations of human behavior. Hence, this study intended to determine the leadership behavior of the chairpersons by including the perceptions of observers who are affected by their administrative action.

The leaders' behavior toward subordinates appears to be strongly determined by the leaders' ability or motivation to increase the subordinates' performance. Therefore, conscious perceptions of subordinates can determine the leaders' subsequent efforts.

Mott (1966) stressed that in order to obtain a theoretical framework in which to study leader behavior and selection, we need to know about the type of work, the community and the person. These facts lend a lot of weight to the use of a demographic approach.
Demographic Factors

It is the intention of the investigator to search for answers to:

a. What does it take to be an educational leader?
b. Can we predict leadership effectiveness prior to selection?

The purpose of this review is to summarize the literature as it relates demographic variables (age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, professional membership, siblings, career path, and publications) to leader behavior and determine the criteria to predict leadership effectiveness with regard to chairpersons in the selected universities in the State of Michigan.

Topics covered under review include: a) definition of leadership, b) demographic factors, c) chairpersons, d) selection of chairpersons, e) leader behavior, f) observers' perceptions of leaders, and g) leadership effectiveness.

The use of demographic history in determining success in any setting is not new. Many organizations use personal records during the screening exercise of candidates for selection. Mott (1966) quoted a plethora of studies that dealt with selection of personnel in various institutions which included the following: Goldsmith (1922) studied the possibilities of the selection of life insurance salesmen. He believed that the personal history inventory was productive as a prediction of success. Meyers (1964) developed a numerically weighted application blank to be used for the proper selection of applicants.
for loans. Twenty-two biographical items were scaled according to their credit desirability. These 22 variables were related to 1200 applications for credit in a nationwide finance company. Fiske (1947) reported that a biographical inventory was developed in 1940-41 for the selection and training of aircraft pilots or the rejection of a student for entry into a teacher education program and eventually entry into teaching. Kimbrell and Blanchard (1964) found that data collected from a biographical reference sheet, as well as the California F scale, Form 45, and the Revised Beta Examination were invaluable in the selection procedure for differentiating between employed and discharged attendants in an institution for mental defectives. This research suggests that the employed attendant is characterized by average intelligence with high scores on the California F scale, rural background with few changes in residence, and a history of work and "duty" orientation marked by a scarcity of outside interests. The discharged attendant, on the other hand, rates relatively high on the IQ scale, reveals quite a diversity of interests beyond his field, and therefore displays a history of mobility from one geographical area to another in search of other jobs.

In school administration, relatively less study has been done in administrator selection (Mott, 1966, p. 90). It was Guildford (1948, p. 104), encouraged by the success achieved in his Air Force study which predicted success in pilot training, who first attempted to develop a personal history inventory for the selection of school administrators. Halpin and Croft (1962), commenting on the validity...
of the biographical inventory as a method, concluded that their reviews and their elementary school principals' study gave great merit to the use of a biographical approach. Their research indicated that biographical information was a potential predictor of administrative effectiveness. According to Halpin and Croft, a survey of literature on elementary principals showed that only a major empirical study had been reported which contained data comparable to theirs.

Although there exists a large body of literature utilizing a biographical approach, rarely has the approach been used to understand the relationship between these biographical variables and leader behavior, especially that of the chairpersons who are viewed as the "live wire, the bone, the flesh, and the success of the institution." The investigator suspects that there is a relationship between certain biographical variables and leader behavior of chairpersons of the colleges of education in the State of Michigan. The demographic variables suspected to be related to leader behavior are: age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, siblings, career path, publication, and professional membership.

Hendrix (1964) hypothesized that selected administrative procedures (rank, tenure, and evaluation) and policies of different organizations were related to life-record data of the working personnel. It is believed that certain institutions acquired certain personal characteristics and that this difference could be discovered through a careful examination of past record data. He therefore concluded that it is safe to conclude that these policies do result in the differential selection of faculty members (1964, p. 157).
Age

The evidence as to the relationship of age to leadership is quite contradictory. Pigors (1933) observed leadership behavior in children and concluded that leadership does not appear in children before the age of two or three years, and that active leadership of a group rarely appears before the age of nine or ten.

According to Pigors, there are four stages necessary for the appearance of leadership in children: (1) development of determination and self-control, (2) grasp of abstractions and social ideals, (3) awareness of personalities, and (4) sufficient memory span to pursue remote goals rather than immediate objectives. But Arrington (1943) argued that he found no evidence from a survey of time sampling experiments to support Pigors' proposition that leadership increases with age in preschool children.

Arrington's findings supported earlier studies done by Baldwin (1932), Finch and Carroll (1932), and Garrison (1935), which found leaders to be younger than their followers. Contrary to these findings, leaders were found to be older than followers by Buttgereit (1932); Goodenough (1931); Gowin (1945); Moore (1935); Newstetter (1938); Nutting (1923); Parten (1933); Partridge (1934); and Zeleny (1939). Owing to much controversy over age as a predictor of leadership, more research study is needed to throw more light on this ongoing debate on the relationship between age and leadership. Burt (1964, p. 65) concluded that studies of this nature will help to identify those who will be accepted into leadership positions.
Gender

Gender is one of the variables that is often used to categorize leaders. Benedetti (1975), for instance, studies differences in the personality styles of executives, using sex as the independent variable. Male and female executives were asked to self administer the Fleishman Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (1969). Benedetti concluded that women who are in business play a relatively less active role in directing group activities through planning, supplying information, trying out new ideas, and criticizing than their male counterparts. Her study suggests that gender is a characteristic affecting leader behavior.

More recent studies have attempted to incorporate variables descriptive of the kind of organization in which a leader functions. Fleishman (1969), Hennig (1970), and Benedetti (1975) reported differences among executives and managers within varying employment settings. Results of such findings were conflicting. Accounting for the conflicting results, Benedetti suggested that the differences in results could be attributed to the fact that her sample was women while others were of men. It is possible that sex affects leaders' personalities to a greater extent than the kind of organization in which a leader functions.

Doll (1965) found, in studying matched pairs of mail and female leaders, that women were older than the men and were employed in smaller firms. Both women and men had attained a higher level of education than their parents. Doll found a substantial relationship between age...
and salary for men while, for women, education and salary were substantially related. Schlack (1974), in a study of upper and middle management women student personnel administrators, found that the average age of respondents was forty; they were unmarried, held a master's degree, and earned approximately $11,000. With regard to leader behavior, Schlack found that about half of management levels scored high on both dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Lyle and Ross (1973), with reference to leader behavior, found one-third of the women were task-oriented; one-third were operating with a permissive philosophy; one-sixth used a detached or under-controlling style; while the remaining one-sixth used exploitive tactics. However, the investigator did not make any correlation between age groups and leader behavior.

Harrison (1973, p. 6) accounted for differences between women and men and said:

The messages that are given to girls and boys are daily and unremitting; they are trivial, perhaps, in each stance, but taken cumulatively, they articulate a world view; they tell our children what it is to be a male and what it is to be a female human being.

Jeneway (1971, p. 18), in her contribution to differences in sex, said:

Nothing happened—man's world, women's place remain, and our society continues to ascribe different psychological attributes to each sex, and to assign different duties and ways of living to men and women, because it is assumed they have differing capabilities, moral, social and intellectual as well as physical.
Lewis (1968) sums up the controversy with: "Sex differences exist, of course, and will continue to exist, but differences do not imply one group is superior to another" (p. 8). This fact suggests that differences in socialization will result in differences in perspectives about issues and consequently differences in leader behavior based on gender.

For example, Heinmen, McGlauchin, Legeros, and Freeman (1975) suggested that women managers had particular difficulty in dealing with interpersonal conflict among subordinates, due to their socialization which encourages them to avoid confrontation.

Using a sample of 122 men and 122 women, Sleeth and Humphreys (undated) found women reporting themselves to be slightly higher in Consideration than Initiating Structure.

In reverse, Eskilson (1975) reported that women who emerged as leaders of three-person laboratory groups showed more intensive involvement with the task than men who emerged as leaders. The controversy over the relationship between gender and leader behavior still goes on; hence, there is more need to look into this relationship.

Educational Background

Although many studies have found a positive relationship between education and leadership (Feil, 1950; Fox, 1947; Harrell, 1963; Hulin, 1962), other researchers have found no relationship between education and leadership (Bass, 1955; Blake and Mouton, 1961). An impressive relationship between education and leadership was found by Johnson,
Peterson and Kahler (1968) when they studied 496 foremen in a company over the years 1940 to 1961. The average increased from 31.2 years in 1940-44 to 41.2 in 1955-59. Years of schooling increased from 10.8 to 11.2 during the same period.

There is evidence that the educational level attained within a black community in America is related to leadership. Thus, Cobb (1974) showed that those blacks nominated as the most influential members in their black community were well educated in diverse fields. In a typical black-white intelligence study, Elliot and Penner (1974) reported that the mean score for blacks was substantially lower than the mean for whites. But, when black and white executives were surveyed by Jennings (1980), the mean intelligence scores for black and white were similar. This suggests a great relationship between educational level attained and leadership. Despite controversy regarding the relationship between educational background and leader behavior, the investigator still believes that there is a relationship between the two.

Experience

Although many studies have shown consistency of leadership performance (Bass, 1954; Carter, 1953; Gibb, 1947; Bell and French, 1955), some studies argue that leadership performance varies from situation to situation and from task to task (Flanagan, 1949). Fisk's study of naval officer performance showed that highly rated naval officers did not necessarily obtain high ratings in officer candidate school.
Knoell and Fogays (1952) showed that the same air crew might perform excellently on one task and quite poorly on another. This finding suggests that even if one's performance is excellent on one task, it is obvious that we cannot predict with certainty how a leader will perform on another test.

The strong criticism leveled against findings which support a relationship between experience and leadership is that these studies were conducted in a highly controlled laboratory setting in which leadership situations were quite similar. Even though Gibb's study (1974) showed that groups were given widely different tasks, it is argued that leadership performance was rated by peers, and such ratings are likely to be highly influenced by the halo effect.

In reverse, life experience inventory developed and validated by Malloy and Ivanoff (1964) indicated a substantial increase in the prediction of college marks. Boles (1971) and Bolles (1977) supported Malloy's findings by suggesting that knowing a job search procedure is important for attaining a position with a new institution, and that information or strategy for advancement is helpful.

Boles and Davenport (1975, p. 411) in their leadership text discussed four steps in getting from a present position to a desired one:

1. Getting the necessary paper qualifications,
2. Securing a quality education,
3. Locating job opportunities, and
4. Developing strategies for getting oneself considered in preference to other applicants.

This quotation indicates the importance of knowledge of job search procedures. Therefore, experience is included in the study.

Social Status

Bass (1960) examined how certain childhood and adolescent relationships at home, in school, and elsewhere might result in tendencies during formative years which might later emerge as good leadership qualities. Substantial relationships were found in parental relationships, birth order, family size, and experiences with peers.

It was noted that the mother played a dominant role as a source of interaction experience. Bishop (1951) thus indicated that there is a great transfer of patterns of interaction between children and mothers. If mothers were directive, interfering, critical, their children tended to be inhibited, reluctant, and noncooperative. But a normal maturing child can accept both parental and school authority (Murphy, 1947). Anderson (1943) provided data suggesting that parents are models for their children. In a study of a rural New York area, Anderson found that the social participation of an individual is a family trait--if the father participated, so did the mother. If both participated, the children usually did so also.

In another study, H. H. Anderson (1937) stressed the importance of parental interaction or lack of it when he found that public
nursery school children interacted more and attempted more leadership than children from a nursery in an orphanage. But Bass (1954) failed to confirm Anderson's findings when he conducted an experiment with children. He found that no substantial correlations emerged when students' success as a leader in an initially leaderless discussion was correlated with their ratings of their parents' behavior.

In reverse, Bass (1960) indicated that there are experiential opportunities during adolescence that are likely to affect leadership behavior as an adult. These studies are indicative of a relationship between social status and leadership.

Marital Status

Schlack (1974) conducted a study dealing with upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators and found that on the average respondents were 40 years old and were unmarried. She found a substantial relationship between marital status and leader behavior; that is, fewer married (12.8%) scored low on the Consideration dimension, whereas 29.9% of those classified as single ranked low on Consideration.

Schutz (1966, p. 24) found that an administrator who is married does very well as a small district principal, especially in the interpersonal area; that is, unmarried principals do not succeed in small towns, but they do quite well in suburban areas. Schutz, in the same study, found that married superintendents in the population centers were rated quite well in all phases of their jobs.
Smith (1979) carried out a descriptive inquiry into the marital status of 239 community educational leaders randomly selected from the National Community Education Association members and found that 10 respondents indicated that their divorce/separation occurred while they were working as a community educator; six indicated that it did not occur while working as a community educator. Of the 10 divorces that occurred among males while working as a community educator, six indicated that their occupations had contributed to their divorce/separation.

In an effort to determine the career pattern of women administrators in higher education, Gardner (1966) concluded that single women attained administrative posts more easily than married women, and at least a master's degree was necessary for an administrative post.

Related to marital status, Schlack (1974, p. 109) found that the largest proportion of both groups of women (upper and middle management) officers were unmarried. When divorced and widowed respondents were added to the single group, the result was that two-thirds of each management level were unmarried. About half of those women who were married in each group had no children. Schlack (1974) suggested that being single and/or childless was an advantage to women in student personnel services. But, in the analysis of data, Schlack (1974, p. 118) found that married women "scored consistently higher on the Consideration dimension of Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ)" and states that such findings should be further researched.
From this brief review of literature, it seems that there is a relationship between marital status and leader behavior yet to be fully explored. The stability of being married or not married seems to be an important factor to some occupations. A department chairperson position is generally seen as an administrative/professional level, and the investigator believes there would be a high incidence of a stable relationship between marital status and leader behavior.

siblings

The Oxford American Dictionary (1980, p. 631) defines sibling as "a child in relation to another or others of the same parent, a brother or sister." Several studies have been conducted in which some kind of relationship was found between siblings and leadership. For example, in an in-depth study, Hennig (1970) found that most women executives who had stayed with one or two companies for the duration of their career were the eldest or only child; all 25 were firstborn females. These female executives had a close relationship with their fathers and established an early preference for men rather than for women.

Hennig (1970) also found that all but three of the respondents had fathers in the middle-management positions. In two instances, the mothers' influence equaled the fathers'. In 13 cases, mothers had a higher level of education than the fathers. In a related study, Schonner and Harrell (1965) held that firstborn children tended to be anxious and, therefore, have stronger affiliative tendencies. These tendencies help them to go out and look for jobs to satisfy their needs.
Many studies have indicated that successful women had close relationships with their parents (Hennig, 1971; Macaby, 1963). Cross (1968), in her study, found that socio-economic factors influenced entry of women into college; that is, women who entered college were likely to come from higher socio-economic homes. She concluded that such women came from parents with better education than those of college men.

In a study comparing personal characteristics and leadership styles of university upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators, Schlack (1974) found that the oldest female child tended to score higher on the Structure dimension of the LOQ, and the firstborn children scored very high on the Structure dimension. She also found that if the respondent's mother was employed at the professional/managerial end of the scale, the subject was more likely to score high on Consideration. She further found that the great majority of women who responded were only children or had only one sibling. It was also noted that very few women in the sample came from families of more or more children. More significant was the finding that three-fourths of the women in each group were reported as being the oldest female child.

From the review of this variable (siblings), the investigator believes that there is a relationship between siblings and leader behavior. This belief is supported by Toman (1970) who stated succinctly that the "oldest children will inevitably learn to be leaders" (p. 68).
Career Path

There seem to be two general career patterns in use:

1. There is a general tendency for people to work in the field in which their degree was earned and then move up within the institutions where they are working. For example, Schlack (1974) found that 84% of the women administrators "moved up within the institutions for which they were working." But, she indicates that this career pattern has its attendant problems such as pressure for a full-time uninterrupted career, pressure of child-bearing and family development, and "the problem of entering a career that is populated and, to a degree, dominated by men." (p. 42)

2. Sex seems to be a determinant of the differentiated roles along the road to the top (Bass, 1981, p. 503). There tended to be a strong association between children's careers and parental employment (Almquist and Angrist, 1971; Fogarty et al., 1971; and Astin, 1967). For example, Schlack (1974, p. 111) found that a large proportion of women at each managerial level indicated that mothers had greater influence on them.

Related to sex as a factor for career paths, Donnelly (1976) showed that larger firms have developed affirmative action programs and more standardized promotion programs to avoid sex bias. Historically, according to Bowman, Worthy and Greyser (1965), women were found to be more successful managers in smaller firms. It is indicated that most women enter managerial ranks in staff rather
than in line positions where they can become specialists and "earn" credit and acceptance from male colleagues for their skills, expertise, and task competence" (Hennig & Jardin, 1977; Jacobson & Kock, 1977).

Trying to find an answer to reasons why men are more successful than women in their upward career paths, Wood (1976) gave two reasons, according to a survey of 100 male managers: (1) Women are unwilling to help other women, and (2) they have a tendency to be overdemanding, particularly of other women.

Related to the question of career patterns for women, Benedetti (1975, p. 43) did not find a substantial behavioristic trend regarding what influenced women's career paths but concluded that educational and societal influences were placed on women's career paths (p. 46). She enumerated causes of sex inequality in employment and promotion as ranging from "biological, psychological and educational factors with continuing controversy in each area" (p. 2).

This review indicates a kind of controversy regarding sex as a determinant of career paths. The investigator would like to research this further to have a better perspective in this area.

Publications

Publication, for the purpose of this study, refers to writing and publishing of books, monographs, articles, or journals. Publication generally involves thinking and writing. Ortyoyande (1981, p. 49), writing his master's thesis on A Model for the Training of Educational
Leaders with Reference to Benue State, Nigeria, provided three in-service pathways (devices) for an individual principal: (1) Self-evaluation; (2) reading; (3) writing. He indicated that writing could make principals a lot wiser in their work if they got involved in sharing their ideas through publications. He wrote:

Writing forces us to brutally examine our thoughts. Such writings, whether published or not, are more valuable to the writer than the receiver (p. 49).

The investigator believes that professional literature can expand the vision of leaders' roles, especially when such literature is not only wide but varied to broaden individual perspectives and bring to the leaders' observations the freshness and the perspectives that their responsibilities demand.

There is, however, contradictory evidence showing the relationship between publication and leader behavior. For example, Benedetti (1975, p. 88) compared publication records between women administrators in education with women administrators in business and found that women administrators in education published an average of 9.59 (less than women administrators in business), while women administrators in business had a mean publication of 11.77.

However, women administrators in education presented twice as many publications of papers at professional meetings, "with an average of 13.9, as opposed to 6.8 for women in business" (p. 88). Presentation of publications yielded a substantial difference, but it was rather unfortunate that neither group published books. The two groups
indicated a non-professional publication of 4.35 for women educators and 3.23 for women in business.

In a study conducted by Schlack (1974, p. 116), in which upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators were compared, she found that a larger proportion of women in upper management as opposed to middle management had published in the last five years. It was noted that the majority of the women in the sample for the study had not published in the past five years; that is, there was not substantial difference in the publishing record between upper- and middle-management groups.

The review of literature provides us with not enough information regarding publication and leader behavior. Hence this variable is included in the study for further analysis.

Professional Membership

Bass (1981, p. 137) stressed that leadership occurring within any organizational setting is much affected by individual differences such as how much one "needs to identify with the organization, how he is located in the organization vis-a-vis his values and behavior." He pointed out that many people attach a great importance to a feeling of belonging to an organization. Mullen (1954) conducted a study of 140 foreman clubs in 32 states. He found that 88% of the foremen surveyed wanted to feel identified with the company. To buttress this point, Braun (1976) found that lack of alienation was even more strongly associated with community leadership in Mankato, Minnesota.
It was then concluded that the extent to which supervisors enhance their subordinates' sense of belonging to the organization tends to pay off in better subordinate performance. Therefore, supervisors who value belonging do much to increase the sense of ownership in activities among their subordinates. Weiss (1977) demonstrated that subordinates tended to be more likely to share values with their supervisors if the supervisors displayed Consideration behavior. Consistent with this, according to Anikeeff (1957), the greater the satisfaction of managers, the greater the similarity between attitudes of managers and workers.

But the problem arises when members belong to more than one organization: Conflict! Although Bass (1981, p. 138) indicated that people belonging to two organizations tend to maintain loyalty to both, though certain aims of the organizations may be in conflict, Walker (1962) found that leaders belonging to more than one organization experienced more conflict and stress than actually existed. This indicates that there is a relationship between an organization to which one belongs and one's leader behavior. This investigator intends to explore such relationship.

The review of literature indicates:
1. There is demand for strong leadership today.
2. Inconsistencies are great regarding the relationships between demographic factors: age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, and organizational membership.
3. There is a great demand for a review of demographic factors as they relate to leader behavior (Halpin & Croft, 1962).
4. R. A. Ehrle indicates that the inconsistencies and inadequacies may be due to problems related to instrument. The problems attributable to faulty instruments point to the need for a new device to measure the relationship between these demographic factors and leader behavior.

The investigator hopes that further research can improve the understanding and provide better insight into these inconsistencies.

Hypotheses, Propositions and Questions

1 $H_0$: Under the null hypothesis, there is no relationship between leadership behavior and any of the following demographics:
   a. age
   b. gender
   c. educational background
   d. experience
   e. social status
   f. marital status
   g. professional membership
   h. siblings
   i. career path
   j. publications

$H_a$: Under the alternate hypothesis, the study proposes that there is a relationship between leader behavior and these demographics.

2 $H_0$: There is no congruence between the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings done by the observers on Initiating Structure (IS) and Consideration (C) dimensions.
3. Leader effectiveness of chairpersons can be predicted prior to their selection.

4. Are chairpersons selected on the basis of their leadership potential?

5. Is department chair a leadership position?
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Purpose

The main purpose of this study was fourfold:

1. To describe the demographic variables: age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, professional membership, siblings, career path and publications; and to determine the relationship existing between these demographic variables and leader behavior (measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration).

2. To determine the leader effectiveness of the chairpersons as rated by themselves and their faculty members (observers).

3. To determine if there are ways to predict the effectiveness of chairs prior to their selection.

4. To determine how chairpersons are selected.

Research Questions

The information to be sought ought to address the following research questions:

1. To what extent is there a relationship between demographic variables (age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, professional membership, siblings, career path, and publications) and leader behavior (measured on two dimensions: 51
Initiating Structure and Consideration)? In other words, what does it take to be a leader? Is leadership behavior related to any of these variables?

2. Can we predict leader effectiveness of chairpersons prior to their selection?

3. To what extent is there congruence between self-ratings of the chairs and ratings of observers regarding leader effectiveness of the chairs?

4. How are chairpersons selected in some of the public colleges in the State of Michigan?

Population Sample

In order to collect information regarding the relationship between demographic variables and leader behavior of chairpersons, a research population was drawn from:

a. Three departments from the College of Education, Western Michigan University.

b. Four departments from the College of Education, Michigan State University.

c. Three departments from the College of Education, Eastern Michigan University.

d. Eight departments from the College of Education, Central Michigan University.

All chairpersons in all of these departments became respondents, while a random sample of six faculty members (observers) was
selected from the provided list of faculty members in each of the departments. A total sample of 18 chairpersons and 108 observers was obtained from a total population of 21 chairpersons and 384 observers. This sample is more than the 20% minimum required to establish a relation/non-relationship (Gay, 1976, p. 77).

The breakdown of respondents is as follows:

TABLE 1
Composition of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number of Departments</th>
<th>Number of Chairs Selected</th>
<th>Observers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sample seems representative of the population for the study (Kerlinger, 1964). The estimate of 384 observers is based on the data received from the 18 participating departments. Random sampling procedures were not used for the selection of universities for the study, because the investigator believes that very little purpose would be served by following such procedures; furthermore, the criteria precluded the use of any random sampling.
Criteria for the Selection of Population Sample

The selection of universities was based on:

a. The proximity of institution so that the study would be not only manageable but also cost effective.

b. Only public institutions were involved in the study; therefore, in terms of generalization, the findings will only pertain to Michigan State public institutions.

c. Any public institution involved in the study ought to have at least three departments in the College of Education.

d. Universities participating ought to be accredited institutions offering at least master's degree courses in the College of Education.

e. Participating institutions must be in the State of Michigan.

f. The study of leader behavior is restricted only to department chairpersons in the College of Education.

The investigator believed that these criteria would control the sampling of respondents for the study and that the criteria to determine leader behavior were made explicit. Initially, five public universities were invited to participate in the study, but one declined for two reasons: (1) It had recently undertaken an evaluative study which introduced changes. (2) Some departments were being merged at the time of this study.

In order to avoid identifying departments by names, all 18 departments was henceforth designated A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, and R.
Source of Data

Data were collected by using two methods: (1) Questionnaire: two questionnaires designed for the purpose of this study were mailed to chairpersons and observers, respectively. Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) and Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) were used to gather information regarding the relationship between demographic variables and leader behavior, and leader effectiveness, respectively.

Two mailed questionnaires were used to collect the required information, one for chairpersons and the other for observers. The questionnaire for the chairpersons was divided into two sections: Section one contained demographics (DQ) (age, gender, educational background, experience, marital status, social status, professional membership, siblings, career path and publications, selection process of chairpersons and problems related to the position of a chairperson. Section two of the questionnaire, called the LBQ, was the same for both chairpersons and the observers. LBQ was contained in section one of the questionnaire forms for the observers with a few aspects of demographics (such as age, gender, educational background and publication) only for the purpose of reference.

Questionnaires were used to gather information from a total of 126 respondents regarding the relationship between the selected demographics and leader behavior, because such an instrument has the advantage of allowing respondents to think before answering (Schlack, 1974) and can avoid the investigator's influence, thus making responses more reliable (Borg, 1983).
(2) Interview method: (in addition to the questionnaire) was used to gather pertinent information from the chairpersons regarding the selection process of the department chairpersons. Questions were prepared prior to the interview. Questions asked during the interview included: Who selected you as a chairperson? What criterion was the most important in your selection as chairperson? Were you satisfied with the method used in selecting you as chairperson?

Procedure to Collect Data

Introduction

The approval to conduct the study was first sought from the chairman, Human Subject Committee, Western Michigan University, Dr. Christ Koronakos. The approval was granted. The intention to conduct the study was also made known to the Dean, College of Education, Western Michigan University, and Director, Educator Feedback Center. A letter, signed by the Director of the Study, Director of Educator Feedback Center and the principal investigator, was mailed to the deans of the selected institutions, requesting their respective institutions to take part in the study. Four out of five universities accepted the request (after several follow-ups with telephone calls and constant reminders by the Director of the Study).
Data Collection

Confidentiality

Respondents were assured of confidentiality in the first letter mailed to the deans of selected colleges of education in the State of Michigan. To maintain this confidentiality throughout the study, all questionnaires were given identification codes. Questionnaire forms for the chairpersons were marked blue, while those of the observers were marked pink. Names associated with these codes were kept by the investigator for follow-up purposes.

Procedures to Increase High Response Rate

One of the criticisms leveled against mailed questionnaires is the low response rate that is generated, thereby making generalization to the rest of the population difficult (Kerlinger, 1964). In order to increase a high response rate, the following procedures were adopted:

Questionnaire and cover letter:

The cover letter was prepared on letterhead paper from the Educator Feedback Center. It was the hope of the investigator that this would main and enhance credibility of the study. All letters mailed contained self-addressed, stamped envelopes to promote a high return rate. Two to three weeks later, follow-up letters or telephone calls followed.
Instrumentation

About two decades ago, McIntyre (1964, p. 36) indicated that there had been no uniformly accepted criterion instrument to describe effectively or determine effective leader behavior. He wrote:

By far the most obvious generalization that can be made concerning research . . . is that nobody has solved the criterion problem. Unfortunately, it would appear that there have been few serious attempts to tackle it. In most instances, a handy but highly questionable substitute is found . . . usually professional school grades or, at best, on-the-job ratings by supervisors.

In order to obtain information on chairpersons' biographic data and leader effectiveness, two instruments were developed for use: (1) the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) and (2) the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ). Regarding the DQ, information was gleaned from two sources: Schlack (1974) and Benedetti's (1975) Biographic Questionnaire. LBQ was a combination from three sources: (1) Schutz, 1966; (2) Anderson, 1973; and (3) Hemphill, 1956. In order to obtain appropriate information, three considerations were used to maintain reliability and validity criteria:

1. The investigator adopted a procedure for categorizing leader behavior into two dimensions (Initiating Structure and Consideration) based on the listing of different but correlated ways of describing the extremes which include the following:
# TABLE 2

Management and Style of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (by year)</th>
<th>Work Related and/or Authoritarian, Autocratic</th>
<th>Person-Related and/or Equalitarian, Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1938) Lewin &amp; Lippitt</td>
<td>Authoritarian, autocratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1950) Katz et al.</td>
<td>Production-oriented</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1951) Hemphill et al.</td>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>Constitutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1957) Fleishman</td>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>Employee- oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1958) Kahn</td>
<td>Path-goal structuring, modifying goals, enabling achievement</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1960) Cartwright &amp; Zander</td>
<td>Goal achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Group maintenance-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1960) MacGregor</td>
<td>Theory X</td>
<td>Theory Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1960) Bass</td>
<td>Coercive, persuasive</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1964) Blake &amp; Mouton</td>
<td>&quot;9, 1&quot; (production, not employee concerned)</td>
<td>&quot;1, 9&quot; (employee, not production concerned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1964) Day &amp; Hamblin</td>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>Non-punitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1961) R. Likert</td>
<td>High performance, technical, close in supervision</td>
<td>Supportive, group methods, general in supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1962) Blau &amp; Scott</td>
<td>Distant, formal, aloof, cold</td>
<td>Close, informal, warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1965) F. C. Mann</td>
<td>Administrative, technical</td>
<td>Human relations-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1966) Bowers &amp; Seashore</td>
<td>Work facilitative, goal emphasizing</td>
<td>Interaction facilitative, supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1966) P.J. Burke</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Nondirective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967) Bass</td>
<td>Task, self-oriented</td>
<td>Interaction-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967) Fiedler</td>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>Relations-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967) R. Likert</td>
<td>System I, II</td>
<td>System III, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969) Heller</td>
<td>Coercive, directive</td>
<td>Joint decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1970) Wofford</td>
<td>Order, achievement, personal enhancement</td>
<td>Personal attraction, security and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1971) Yukl</td>
<td>Decision centralization, initiation</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1974) D. R. Anderson</td>
<td>Traditional, prescriptive</td>
<td>People-centered, supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1976) Flowers</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1976) Keller &amp; Szilaguy</td>
<td>Nonrewarding</td>
<td>Rewarding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. The investigator developed criteria for measuring leader effectiveness based on the two dimensions of leader behavior (Initiating Structure and Consideration).

3. The investigator devised an instrument thought to be reliable to gather information regarding demographic variables for study.

Development of Instruments

Demographic Questionnaire (DQ)

The demographic questionnaire (DQ) was designed to collect information in five areas:

1. Personal characteristics of chairpersons and observers.
2. Professional characteristics of the chairpersons.
3. Job characteristics of chairpersons' parents.
4. Selection criteria of the chairpersons.
5. Job problems of the chairpersons (question 17).

The questionnaire requested information regarding 18 items, which were based partly on items suggested by similar questionnaires and partly constructed by the investigator to meet the current needs of the study. All the 18 items were evaluated by several persons, such as faculty members, doctoral students, a few department chairs, and graduate students. It was finally cross-checked by the Dissertation Committee members (see Appendices B and C).
Rationale for Questions in Demographic Questionnaire

The rationale for including 18 questions in the DQ was based on the category of information sought.

Category 1: Personal characteristics. This category includes questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17.

Category 2: Professional characteristics. Questions 7, 8, 13.

Category 3: Job characteristics of parents. Questions 15, 16.

Category 4: Job problems of chairpersons. Question 18.

Category 5: Question 18 sought to know if the chairpersons would like to get the abstract of the study. The rationale for this question was to test the extent to which they liked the study. Seventeen chairpersons answered that they would like to get a copy -- only one person answered "no."

Some items were reconstructed or eliminated to enhance content validity.

Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ)

The Leader Behavior Questionnaire has been used in several studies which seek information about the perception of subordinates regarding their leaders' supervisory style or leader behavior (Fleishman, 1973). This instrument, which was developed at Ohio State University, provides 12 subscales. For the purpose of this study, the investigator utilized only two subscales: Initiating Structure and Consideration, which were deemed as two dimensions of leader behavior by the investigator.
The LBQ was developed as a research device for selection, assignment, and assessment purposes (Fleishman, 1973). Similar instruments, which yielded relationships and have been used in past studies, found reliabilities of subscales as determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The reliability yielded a conservative estimate of .76 to .87 for Consideration and .70 to .80 for Initiating Structure. Although, for the use of this study, changes were made in the instrument regarding criteria set for elimination of items (such criteria include: redundancy of items, unclarity of statements, inappropriateness, lack of content validity, and lack of response stimulus), care was taken not to tamper with the content validity of the instrument; that is, only items that fulfilled the stipulated decision rules on the LBQ were retained.

The LBQ is divided into two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration. Each dimension has 20 answers; there is a total of 40 answers, each measured on a scale of one to five, providing a maximum score of 100. Responses consisted of checking one of the following: "Always," "Often," "Occasionally," "Seldom," or "Never" for both "Real" and "Ideal" dimensions.
Reliability and Validity Information

Internal reliability and validity of instruments were checked by graduate associates, two chairpersons, and finally the Dissertation Committee. The criteria set for inclusion of items in the questionnaire included clarity of words and statements, the appropriateness of items, and the adequacy of items to measure the variables intended.

Validity of Sampling

Gay (1981) defined validity as "the degree to which a test measures what it is intended to measure" (p. 110). Tuckman (1972) supported Gay's definition in stating that, as a matter of fact, validity is concerned with the degree to which the test measures the characteristics that it is designed to measure. Kerlinger (1964, p. 540), in referring to the reliability of behavioral observations, stated:

> The reliability of behavioral observations measures is a simple matter, though by no means an easy one. It is usually defined as the agreement among observers .... Practically speaking, then, the reliability of observations can be estimated by correlating the observations of two or more observers (p. 540).

In this study, all the rated observations or scores of both chairperson and observer were correlated. In order to enhance the content validity, questionnaire items were constructed in such a way that they would, according to Galfo (1975, p. 48):

a. Convey to the respondent the intended meaning.

b. Enable the investigator to tally the results readily.
c. Enable the investigator to code for mechanical electronic data analysis.

d. Reduce the time required to complete the questionnaire (pp. 29-30). For example, for the question regarding marital status, the respondent was asked to check one: single ___ married ___ divorced ___ separated ___.

Methodology for Testing Hypotheses

Three tests were used to test the hypotheses: In order to determine a relationship or non-relationship between demographic variables (age, gender, educational background, experience, social status, marital status, professional membership, siblings, career path and publication) and leader behavior (measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration), the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) was the appropriate correlation coefficient to test the hypotheses. The mean and the standard deviations were first calculated for each of the variables to determine the amount of similarity of the respondents for each variable. The mean and the standard deviations thus formed the basis (index) for interpreting the correlation coefficient because, when the group is homogenous (meaning a restricted range of scores on either or both variables), the correlation coefficient tends to be smaller (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1979).

The Pearson correlation coefficient was used for the interval data, while the Kendall tau was used for ordinal data.
In order to determine congruence between the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the observers indicative of leader effectiveness, the student t test was used. The null hypothesis was to be rejected at the alpha level of .05. Frequencies of the responses by the chairpersons regarding the selection of the chairpersons and the criteria for their selection were compiled. A step wide regression was used to establish predictive leader effectiveness of the chairpersons prior to selection.

**Independent Variables**

The demographic factors and leader behavior of chairpersons used in this study were identified as the independent and dependent variables, respectively. The demographic factors were measured on 10 levels: (1) age, (2) gender, (3) educational background, (4) experience, (5) social status, (6) marital status, (7) siblings, (8) career path, (9) professional memberships, and (10) publications. These variables were selected because they were suspected to be causative of leader behavior and, therefore, were considered very important in determining the effect on the dependent variable of leader behavior.

**Dependent Variables**

Leader behavior is the dependent variable in this study and is measured on two dimensions: (a) Initiating Structure (IS) and (b) Consideration (C). There were 20 criteria for measuring each dimension. These were measured on an interval scale of 1-5,
designated "Never," "Seldom," "Occasionally," "Often," and "Always," with the scoring format of -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, respectively. The two dimensions consisted of "Real" and "Ideal" perceptual ratings of the chairpersons and their observers.

Summary

Chapter III contains a description of methods and procedures used in the study. It contains the population and sample for the study of selection criteria, the method for developing the sample, the instrumentation procedures used to obtain data, and a brief review of methods used for analyzing data.

Method:
1. Administer a Demographic Questionnaire to selected chairs in colleges of education in the State of Michigan.
2. Administer the LBQ to chairs and observers.
3. Analyze the congruence of chairs' and observers' opinions of chairs' leader effectiveness.
4. Relate the demographic data to the LBQ data.
5. Interview deans regarding the criteria for selection of chairpersons.

In chapter IV which follows, the results of the testing of the hypotheses are presented.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

As was stated in chapter I, the purpose of this study was fourfold:

1. To determine the relationship between demographics (age, gender, educational background, experience, marital status, social status, siblings, career path, professional membership and publications) and leader behavior (measured on two dimensions: Initiating Structure [IS] and Consideration [C]) of department chairpersons.

2. To determine the leader effectiveness of the chairpersons as rated by themselves and their observers.

3. To determine if there were ways to predict the performance of the chairpersons prior to selection.

4. To determine how chairpersons were selected in some colleges in the State of Michigan.

Research Questions

The information to be sought ought to address the following questions:

1. Is department chair a leadership position?

2. To what extent is there a relationship between the selected demographics and the leader behavior of the chairpersons? Is leader behavior related to any of these variables?
3. Can one predict leader performance of chairpersons prior to their selection?

4. To what extent is there congruence between self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the observers regarding leader effectiveness of the chairpersons?

5. How are department chairpersons selected in some of the public colleges in the State of Michigan?

Survey Response

Survey data packets were sent to 18 chairpersons and 108 observers serving in four universities in the State of Michigan. The four universities had a total of 76,122 student enrollment and 384 instructional staff. Questionnaire forms were mailed to 18 chairpersons and 108 observers during the spring semester. All 18 chairpersons responded. Of the total number of observers, 86% responded; 14% did not. Of the total of 126 potential respondents, 93% responded; 7% did not. In order to effect a high rate of return, follow-up letters were sent and telephone calls were made. In several instances, the investigator made appointments with the respondents. The investigator assumed that large institutions would provide a variety of leadership situations and behavior. Only universities with over 10,000 enrollments were included in the study. (For more information regarding how data were handled, refer to Appendix E.)

In analyzing data, the following procedures were used:

1. The mean and standard deviations for each department were found for both chairpersons and observers.
2. In order to determine the relationship between the demographics and leader behavior, both the Pearson correlation coefficients and the Kendall (tau) were used.

3. Attempts were made to determine the congruence between self-ratings of the department chairpersons and the observers by using the following formula:

\[
\text{faculty mean scores} - \text{chairpersons mean scores} = 0
\]

\[
\text{Calculated } t = \frac{\text{difference} - 0}{S (\text{difference})}
\]

4. A stepwise regression analysis was used to ascertain whether or not leader effectiveness could be predicted.

5. Frequencies were used to determine the selection process of the chairpersons.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The 18 department chairpersons had a mean age of 51, a range of between 41 and 61 years, and a standard deviation of 7.5. There were two females and 16 male chairpersons. All the 18 chairpersons had doctorate degrees. None of them was pursuing a post-doctorate program. Their publication records indicated that 11 had published either books, articles or chapters.

The chairpersons' demographics were studied. The results were found as presented in Table 1.
TABLE 3

Chairpersons’ Demographics (DM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Publications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Previous Administrative Positions Held</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Present Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: 2 female, 16 male

Highest Degree: 18 doctorates

11 Chairpersons published in the last five years.
7 Chairpersons did not publish in the last five years.

N = 18

1. Is department chairperson a leadership position? Regarding the department chairperson as a position, 17 out of 18 chairpersons who were interviewed agreed that the department chairperson was a leadership position. They wrote down problems associated with the position of the department chairperson (see Appendix D).
2. What is the relationship between demographics and leader behavior?

The relationships between demographics and leader behavior were studied using both the Pearson correlation coefficients and the Kendall (tau). No relationship was found to be significant between age and leader behavior. The same was true for gender, educational background, marital status, social status, career path, total publications and professional membership.

When studying the relationship between years of experience and initiating behavior, a significant relationship was found with respect to the "Real" dimension only. A Kendall tau of .396 with associated probability of .049 was found. The more years of experience the chairperson had, the higher he scored on initiating behavior.

When studying the relationship between the number of siblings and leader behavior, a significant relationship was found with respect to "Ideal" and Ideal (IS); that is, a Pearson correlation of negative -.535 with an associated probability of .027 for "Ideal" and a correlation of negative -.504 with associated probability of .039 for "Ideal (IS)" resulted. Those from smaller families scored higher on initiating behavior and scored lower on the consideration scale.

The birth order of the chairpersons was studied. The results showed that:

10 were the oldest male children.

5 were the youngest male children.
1 was the only female child.
1 was the youngest female child.
1 missing data

N = 18

**TABLE 4**

**Number of Chairpersons' Siblings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Siblings</th>
<th>Number of Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Chairperson was an only child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Chairpersons had 1 sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 Chairpersons had 2 siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 Chairpersons had 3 siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Chairpersons had 4 siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Chairpersons had 5 siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 Chairperson had 6 siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1 Chairperson had Missing data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 18

The level of employment of the chairpersons' mothers and fathers was also considered. The study showed the following results in Tables 5 and 6.
### TABLE 5

**Mother's Level of Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Chairpersons</th>
<th>Level of Mother's Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>intermittently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>other (e.g., farming, trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>missing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>not employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 18 \]

\[ \bar{x} \text{ of employment record} = 1.588 \]

### TABLE 6

**Father's Level of Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Chairpersons</th>
<th>Level of Father's Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>intermittently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>other (e.g., farming, trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>missing data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 18 \]

17 were employed
\[ \bar{x} = 1 \]
3. Is there any congruence between the chairpersons' self-ratings and those of the observers?

The congruence of the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the observers was studied. The results were found as seen in Table 7. The \( t \) test was used to test whether the difference between the observers' composite scores and the chairpersons' composite scores was equal to zero.

**TABLE 7**
Congruence Between Observers and Chairpersons (Observers' Mean Scores - Chairpersons' Mean Scores on Each Dimension)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>-8.277</td>
<td>-4.90</td>
<td>0.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.5681 (N.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real (IS)</td>
<td>-4.722</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>0.0008 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal (IS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (N.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real (C)</td>
<td>-3.555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal (C)</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3343 (N.S.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Accept the null hypothesis at \( \alpha = .05 \)
* = Reject the null hypothesis at \( \alpha = .05 \)
Smaller probability than alpha level = noncongruence.
Larger probability than alpha level = congruence.
Table 7 presents the results of the test to see whether mean difference between observers and chairpersons is zero. The results showed chairpersons rated themselves higher than do the observers on "Real," "Real(IS)," and "Real(C)." Observers' mean ratings were higher than those of the chairpersons on "Ideal" and "Ideal(C)." There was, however, a congruence on "Ideal(IS)." This was indicated by the mean difference of zero.

4. Can leader performance of the chairpersons be predicted prior to their selection?

Prediction was studied by way of stepwise regression analysis. When "Real" was the dependent variable, leadership experience proved to be the only predictor of performance; that is, an F of 8.71 with associated probability of 0.009 is significant at the alpha level of .05 as seen in Table 8. That is how one performs a leadership function is related to the amount of previous experience.
TABLE 8
Stepwise Regression for Real Initiating Structure and Ideal Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>121.88</td>
<td>121.88</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>0.009 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>690.08</td>
<td>230.03</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.019 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at alpha level of .05

When "Ideal" was studied, leadership experience and number of siblings were found to be significant predictors; that is, leadership experience generated an F of 13.19 with associated probability of 0.003, while number of siblings generated an F of 7.20 with associated probability of 0.019.

When "Real(IS)" was studied, leadership experience was found to be the only predictor with an F and probability of 4.67 and .047, respectively. "Ideal(IS)" was predicted by leadership experience and number of siblings. Leadership experience gave an F and probability of 8.02 and .013, respectively; while number of siblings gave an F and probability of 7.51 and .016, respectively.

For "Real(C)," leadership experience was found to be the single best predictor, with an F of 9.94 and associated probability of .007.
"Ideal(C)" was predicted by three variables; namely, (1) total publications, (2) number of siblings, and (3) leadership experience. The F and probability for total publications were 3.71 and .076, respectively. The F and probability for leadership experience were 9.45 and .009, respectively. Finally, the F and probability for siblings were 4.08 and .065, respectively.

By and large, leadership experience was the best predictor of any of the measures of leadership. Siblings entered the picture less frequently than leadership experience. Total publications was of some value.

5. How are the department chairpersons selected?

The selection process was studied. The result showed that most chairpersons involved in the study were selected by their fellow faculty members as seen in Table 9.
TABLE 9
Who Selected the Chairperson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not known</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 18
Mean = 2.83
Std Dev = 1.04
Variance = 1.09
Std Error = 0.25

The selection process of the chairpersons was studied. Table 9 showed how they were selected. Most chairpersons were selected by their fellow faculty members. This was indicated by an absolute frequency of 11 out of the total number of 18 chairpersons who responded. Two respondents indicated that they either did not know how they were selected or the selection involved the faculty members, the dean and the president.
The criteria for the selection of the chairpersons were also studied. Tallies showed that leadership potential, professional experience and educational background were the criteria for the selection of the chairpersons as seen in Table 10.

TABLE 10
Criteria for Selection of Chairpersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership potential</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Educational background</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professional membership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Publication record</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Faculty membership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Not known</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 18

The criteria of the selection process of the chairpersons were studied. The respondents indicated that the selection process was most influenced by three criteria with frequencies; namely, leadership potential (12); professional experience (13); and educational background (9).
Other Findings

The ratings of the chairpersons of educational leadership departments were compared with the chairpersons of the other departments, in terms of scores on the six leadership behavior subscales (Real, Ideal, Real[IS], Ideal[IS], Real[C], Ideal[C]). No differences were found.

The ratings of the chairpersons by the observers in educational leadership departments were compared with the ratings of the chairpersons by the observers in other departments. Differences were found on the "Real" and "Real(IS)" dimensions. For "Real," the t and associated probability were 2.35 and .024, respectively; while, for the "Real(IS)," the t and associated probability were 2.54 and .015, respectively.

Institutions were compared with respect to the ratings done by the chairpersons. No differences were found on any of the six subscales.

Institutions and departments within the institutions were compared with observers as raters. On the "Real" dimension, the institutions differed with an F and probability of 6.73 and .011, respectively; but the departments did not differ.

On the "Ideal" dimension, the institution differed with an F and probability of 3.64 and .016, respectively; but, the departments did not differ. On "Real(IS)" and "Ideal(IS)," departments differed; but institutions did not. On the "Ideal(C)" dimension, the institutions differed; but departments did not.
The difference between the observers and the chairpersons' other publications was studied (H0: difference between faculty and chairperson = 0). The hypothesis could not be rejected at .05 alpha level. The same was true of total publications (see Tables 11 and 12).

**TABLE 11**

Difference in Other Publications between Observers and Chairpersons

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.6575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0.1486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cannot reject at alpha = 0.05)

**TABLE 12**

Difference in Total Publications between Observers and Chairpersons

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0.1815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cannot reject at alpha = 0.05). That is, there was no difference in total publications between the observers and the chairpersons.
The career paths of the chairpersons were also studied. It was found that most of the chairpersons began as teachers and were subsequently promoted to positions such as building principles, directors, department chairpersons and deans. Educational background of the chairpersons was also studied (see Table 13).

Summary

This chapter presented the purpose of the study, the research questions, the survey response and the analysis of data. The Pearson correlation coefficients, the t-test, the Kendall (tau) and the stepwise regression were used to test the research hypotheses and propositions. Chapter V presents the summary, the conclusions and recommendations.
TABLE 13
Chairpersons' Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairpersons</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>SP.</th>
<th>Doct.</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Field of Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phys Ed</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ment Imp</td>
<td>Elem Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Educ Adm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psych</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lib Arts</td>
<td>Child/Fam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>HPER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soc Stud</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phys Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psych</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Educ/PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Elem Ed</td>
<td>Com Ld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Elem Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phys Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(M) = Missing, information not available

Summary: 2 had Doctorate degree(s) in Administration and Management
          5 " " " Physical Education
          2 " " " Curriculum and Instruction
          4 " " " Education (Elementary/Secondary/Psychology)
          2 " " " Special Education
          1 " " " Health Science
          1 " " " Child and Family Studies

N = 18
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter covers a summary of chapters I through IV, followed by a description of the limitations of the study.

The purpose of the study was fourfold:

1. To determine the relationship between the selected demographics and the leader behavior of the department chairpersons in colleges in the State of Michigan.

2. To determine the leader effectiveness of the chairpersons as rated by themselves and their observers.

3. To determine if there are ways to predict the performance of chairpersons prior to their selection.

4. To determine how the department chairpersons in some colleges of education are selected in the State of Michigan.

This chapter is divided into three sections: Section one is a brief summary covering chapters 1 to 4; section two deals with the conclusions based on the findings of the study; while section three provides a list of recommendations based on the findings.

Study Summary

The reasons for conducting this study included, but were not limited to, (1) the limited information available regarding the relationship between demographic factors and the leader behavior of the chairpersons
(Dilley in Brann and Emmet, 1972), (2) requests by researchers for more data on leadership behavior (Heimler in Brann and Emmet, 1972), (3) inconsistencies regarding the available data, and (4) absence of any previous study of this nature.

In chapter I, information on the background of the problem was presented. It was pointed out that several efforts have been made in recent years by researchers to identify background variables which could account for effective leader behavior. For example, Kirkpatrick (1968, p. 10) used a series of personal histories in an effort to predict with precision effective leadership. The study further pointed out that employers who must select leaders must recognize effective leadership qualities that would maximize production. The problem of leader selection is compounded by the increasingly intense competitions that stem from four reasons as indicated by Culbertson (1964):

1. There is a proportionate amount of increase in managers and leaders needed to head and manage complex organizations.

2. The age group from which society's leaders will come during the next 20 years will remain constant, while the total population will increase by one-third.

3. The development in science administration, itself, has brought a more rigorous and intellectually demanding content in preparatory programs which, in return, has placed great emphasis on the recruitment of a higher caliber of students/administrators.

4. Great incentives have been used to attract workers into scientific and research careers during the last decade. Hence, there is a great need to select leaders with measurable payoff potentials.
The study indicated that the study of the relationship between the demographic variables and leader behavior of the department chairpersons might provide useful information on a subject which has generated a lot of interest and research in the past decades. It was also intended that this study might shed light on ways to provide (a) leader selection, (b) leader effectiveness, and (c) useful data for further analysis.

The review of the pertinent literature was presented in chapter II, which led to the development of the hypotheses. The review of literature dealt with six sections; namely, (1) the role and functions of the chairperson, (2) the selection of the chairpersons, (3) leader behavior of the chairpersons, (4) leader effectiveness of the chairpersons, (5) perceptions of observers, and (6) demographic factors as they related to leader behavior. Literature regarding the relationship between the selected demographics and leader behavior presented a lot of inconsistencies which led to the development of the null hypothesis:

There is no relationship between the leader behavior and (a) age, (b) gender, (c) educational background, (d) experience, (e) marital status, (f) career path, (g) siblings, (h) social status, (i) professional membership, and (j) publications.

The investigator also wanted to determine the leader effectiveness of the chairpersons and whether or not there were ways to predict the leader effectiveness of the chairpersons. The investigator further determined how chairpersons were selected in colleges in the State of Michigan.
Chapter III presented the research design and methodology. A detailed description of the population and the sampling procedure was presented. Out of 21 departments, 18 and a randomly picked sample of 108 out of the population of 384 observers participated in the study as respondents. Questionnaires were mailed to the respondents. A couple of weeks later, there were follow-up letters and telephone calls. The efforts yielded a reasonably high response rate of 93% for both the chairpersons and the observers.

Regarding the instrument, both Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) and the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) were used to gather data. When data were collected, the mean and the standard deviation for each department were calculated for both the chairpersons and the observers. In order to determine the relationship between the demographics and the leader behavior of the chairpersons, the Pearson Correlation Coefficients and the Kendal (tau) were used for interval and ordinal data, respectively. Attempts were made to determine the congruence between the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the observers. Regarding whether or not leader effectiveness could be predicted, a stepwise regression analysis was used, while a table of frequencies was used to determine the selection process of the chairpersons.

Five research questions were asked. The organization of the study and the collection of data centered around these questions:

1. Is department chairperson a leadership position?
All but one chairperson were interviewed. All those interviewed indicated clearly that the department chairperson in colleges of education is a leadership position. The chairpersons mentioned a number of problems related to their leadership position. The most frequent ones included:

a. Dealing with the declining enrollment.
b. Lack of adequate resources.
c. Little power to initiate changes.
d. Budget.
e. Too much teaching responsibility.
f. Public relations.

(For more problems of the chairpersons, see Appendix D)

2. What is the relationship between the selected demographics and the leader behavior of the chairpersons?

Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to measure the relationship between demographics (age, gender, educational background, experience, marital status, social status, career path, professional membership, siblings and publications) and leader behavior (measured on six subscales of Initiating Structure and Consideration; namely, "Real," "Ideal," "Real(IS)," "Ideal(IS)," "Real(C)," "Ideal(C)."

No relationship was found to be significant between age and leader behavior. The same was true for gender, educational background, marital status, social status, career path, total publications and professional membership. However, a significant relationship was found between experience and leader behavior with respect to the
"Real" dimension. That is, a Kendall (tau) of .396 with an associated probability of .049 was found.

A significant negative relationship was also found between siblings and leader behavior with respect to "Ideal" and "Ideal(IS)."

3. Is there any congruence between the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the observers?

The congruence of the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings of the observers was studied to determine effective leadership of the chairpersons. The t test was used to check if the difference was equal to zero. For the purpose of this study, congruence indicates effective leadership. The result showed a congruence between the chairpersons and the observers on "Ideal(IS)." That is, the t test indicated a mean difference of zero. However, chairpersons rated themselves higher than observers on "Real," "Real(IS)," and "Real(C)." Observers' ratings were higher on "Ideal" and "Ideal(C)."

4. Can leader performance of the chairpersons be predicted prior to their selection?

In response to the prediction of leader effectiveness, a stepwise regression was used. Leadership experience was found to be a significant predictor of leadership effectiveness on the "Real" subscale. That is, F value and p were 7.20 and .009, respectively.

When "Ideal" was studied, leadership experience and number of siblings were found to be significant predictors. That is, leadership experience generated an F of 13.19 with an associated probability of
.003, while the number of siblings generated an F of 7.20 with an associated probability of .019, respectively.

"Ideal(C)" was predicted by three variables; namely, (1) total publications, (2) number of siblings, and (3) leadership experience. The F and probability for total publications were 3.71 and .076, respectively. The F and probability for leadership experience and number of siblings were 9.45 and .009; 4.08 and .065, respectively.

By and large, leadership experience was the best predictor of any of the measures of leadership, followed by siblings and then by total publications.

5. How are the department chairpersons in colleges of education in the State of Michigan selected?

Tallied responses indicated that department chairpersons were selected, more often than not, by their faculty members; although the selection had to be approved by the central administration. The criteria for their selection were: (a) leadership potential, (b) professional experience, and (c) educational background.

Conclusions

Guidelines for interpreting tests were taken from highly respected statistical textbooks. These textbooks include: Hinkle et al. (1979), Neter and Wasserman (1974), Siegel (1956) and Borg (1983).

Some of the findings are consistent with the preview research studies; others are not. Some findings are still controversial.
The study found no significant relationship between leader behavior and some of the selected demographics such as age, gender, educational background, social status, marital status, career path, and professional memberships. The research finding of no significant relationship between age and leadership supports Arrington's findings (1943). It is interesting to note that the mean age of the chairpersons and their observers is 51 and 46, respectively. It seems to the investigator that the older one becomes and the more experience one acquires, the better are the chances of one becoming a leader. This proposition is supported by the work of Buttgereit (1932) which found leaders to be older than followers. More research study is suggested to clear the mystery surrounding the age-leader behavior relationship. This study further studied the mean age of the chairpersons and the mean age of the observers department by department. The results showed that:

In 5 departments, the chairpersons were older.

In 13 departments, observers (faculty) were older.

N = 18.

Regarding the non-significant relationship between gender and leader behavior, generalization is not necessary because there were only two female chairpersons, compared with 16 male chairpersons involved in the study. The investigator considers this number too small for a meaningful comparison.

Benedetti (1975, p. 36) gave five reasons why there are not many women in administration and said:
1. Women do not aspire to higher administrative positions.
2. They are not qualified.
3. Neither women nor men like to work with or for women.
4. The attitudes of the society and of those doing the hiring do not allow for the selection of women.
5. Organizations operate on myths that tend to keep women out.

Cussler (1958, p. 3), in his study, said that people who do choose not to employ women, do so because women are:
- too aggressive or too yielding;
- too feminine or too masculine;
- too emotional or too icy;
- too rigid or too indecisive;
- too person or too impersonal.

It may be possible that gender can affect the leader behavior as was reflected in the study of Lewis (1968). More research is therefore suggested in which larger samples can be used.

There was no significant relationship between educational background and leader behavior. This is contrary to the findings of Feil (1950) who found a positive relationship between educational background and leader behavior. It ought to be noted that educational background was not found to be significant when the correlation coefficient measure was used. But, paradoxically, the chairpersons indicated that it was one of the three criteria for the selection of the department chairpersons. (The other two criteria were leadership potential and
leadership experience.) The investigator suspects that this problem is more complex than meets the eye; more research is therefore suggested.

Marital status had no significant relationship to leader behavior when correlation coefficient measure was done. But it is interesting to note the chairpersons' tallies showed that 80% were married. The investigator suggests that this should not be one of the prime factors for selection, because there is not enough information regarding the relationship between marital status and leader behavior. Attention should, however, be drawn to Schultz' study (1966, p. 24) which found that married administrators did well as principal administrators.

There was no significant relationship between social status and leader behavior when correlational studies were conducted. But, the chairpersons' records showed that 56% of their mothers were not employed; while 94% of their fathers were employed. These figures are, however, reported for the sake of information; conclusions may not readily be drawn from this information.

Career path was also studied. There was no significant relationship between career path and leader behavior when correlation coefficient was used. Paradoxically, when four educational leadership departments were compared with 14 other departments, chairpersons from educational leadership department who began as teachers and were later promoted as principals and chairs were ahead of the rest of the department on "Real" and "Real(IS)." This is not surprising that academic departments are less likely to attain leadership theories and practice. The 17 out of 18 chairpersons took an upward movement instead of a vertical and lattice career path. Only one chairperson indicated having once been a city commissioner.
The relationship between professional membership and leader behavior was studied. No significant relationship was found. This is contrary to Mullen's study (1954) which found that 88% of the foremen surveyed wanted to feel identified with the company. The current finding presents an imbalance that defies statistical interpretation. Further research is suggested.

There was no significant relationship between siblings and leader behavior when the $t$ test was used. This finding is contrary to some research studies (Schlack, 1974; Toman, 1970) that found a significant relationship between siblings and leader behavior. When stepwise regression was used to determine the relationship between the number of siblings in a family unit, a significant negative relationship was found on "Ideal" and "Ideal(IS)." The investigator believes that the larger the family, the lower the expectations that are held for members in the family. It might be suggested that the number of siblings in a family unit is related to leader behavior. During interviews, employers should therefore scrutinize carefully people with a fewer number of siblings in a family, because there is some indication that: (1) children who come from smaller families tend to become better leaders in terms of accomplishing organizational goals (task orientation), and (2) the firstborn tend to become leaders. This finding conforms to that of Schlack (1974).

Publication records were studied using the Pearson $r$. No significant relationship was found between publication records and leader behavior. But, when publication records were studied, department by
department, it was found that 12 departments had more "total publications" of articles, 5 departments had more "other publications;" while in 4 departments, there was no difference. Comparing publication records of the chairpersons with those of the observers, it was found that in 7 departments, chairpersons had more extensive publication records than the observers; while in 10 departments, observers had more extensive publication records than the chairpersons. In only one department did the chairperson and the observers have equal publication records.

Regarding congruence of the self-ratings of the chairpersons and the ratings by the observers, there is an agreement on "Ideal(IS)." That is, both the chairpersons and their observers agree on what a chairperson ought to do to be effective. The implication of the study is that the findings are valid because of the congruent ratings of the chairpersons and the observers. Chairperson ought to be working towards the "Ideal(C)." Furthermore, the observers' ratings on "Real" and "Real(IS)" differed. This discrepancy calls for further investigation.

Concerning the selection of the chairpersons, the study indicated that observers (faculty) select and that the dean approves the selection. The selection process conforms to one of the earlier findings (Murray in Brann and Emmet, 1972, pp. 18-19). The investigator is, however, appalled that a few chairpersons did not know how they were selected. Criteria for selection seemed to be based on three factors; namely, (1) leadership potential,
professional experience, and (3) educational background of the applicants. More research is needed to validate the findings.

Regarding the ability to predict leader effectiveness, the investigator believes that it can be done. For example, based on the stepwise regression formula and the data for this study, one can predict leadership experience on the "Real" by using the following procedure:

\[ Y = a + b \times x \]

where
- \( Y \) = real score
- \( b \) = slope of the graph
- \( x \) = number of leadership experiences
- \( a \) = intercept

An example: Suppose \( Y = 3.99 \) and \( b = 2.34 \), what would be the real score of the applicant who had 2 leadership experiences?

Prediction: \[ Y = a + b \times x \]
\[ Y = 3.99 + 2.34 \times 2 \]
\[ Y = 8.77 \]

Translate this into a graph:

That is, the chairperson would have a predictive \( Y \) of 8.77.
The investigator used the following model to determine how well the three variables (leadership experience, siblings and total publications) predict \( y \) (\( y = \) the variable being predicted).

**TABLE 14**
Prediction Model

\[
y = a + b \, x_1 + c \, x_2 = d \, x_3
\]

Where:
- \( a \) = intercept
- \( b, c, d \) = coefficients
- \( x_1 \) = number of leadership experiences
- \( x_2 \) = " " siblings
- \( x_3 \) = " " total publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>*Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) intercept</td>
<td>15.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) total publications</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Positive high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) leadership experience</td>
<td>4.605</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Very positive high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) siblings</td>
<td>-2.261</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Moderately positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hinkle's (1979) interpretation of \( r \).

How well do total publications (\( r = .70 \)), leadership experience (\( r = .80 \)) and siblings (\( r = .54 \)) predict \( y \)?

Obviously, if \( r \) were +1.0, one could predict these variables (publications, leadership experience and siblings) with complete accuracy (Galfo, 1975); an \( r \) of 1 indicates a direct and complete correlation between two factors. But as \( r \) deviates away from +1 or -1 toward 0, the prediction of one factor from the other becomes less accurate. Thus, \( r \) of leadership experience, publications and siblings are high enough to be used as part of criteria for hiring (Hinkle, 1979).
Concerning the ability to predict leader performance, a step-wide regression analysis showed three significant variables; namely, (1) leadership experience, (2) total publications, and (3) the number of siblings. Attention ought to be paid to these significant variables when interviewing candidates for the selection of the position of a chairperson. However, caution should be exercised; because two variables are correlated does not imply that one causes the other (though it may be true that variable X is causally related to variable Y). It is not entirely safe for one to impute relationships to such variables on the basis of the correlation coefficient alone, because it is possible that both variables, X and Y, may be caused by variable Z, which is indirectly responsible for the existence of the relationship between X and Y (Popham, 1973). Therefore the selection process can be facilitated by these variables (leadership experience, the number of siblings, and total publications). Might it be possible that people who come from smaller families are better leaders? A combination of these variables should be encouraged. Those already in leadership positions should not be affected by being removed as a result of these findings.

Institutions were compared with chairpersons as raters. No differences were found. The investigator is surprised in that one would expect to find differences in leader behavior depending on the size of the institution, in terms of mission, purpose and goals. This finding is difficult to interpret unless the ends (numbers)
are too small to allow for generalized conclusions. When institutions were compared with observers as raters, differences existed on the "Real" dimension. This finding is not surprising, because larger institutions have more universal missions, goals and purposes than smaller ones. Departments differed on "Real(IS)," "Ideal(C)," and "Ideal(IS)." This finding is quite similar to the one isolating other departments in colleges of education from educational leadership departments, where leadership is, in itself, the content taught as well as a role of the respondent.

Recommendations for Further Study

It is possible that refinements in the findings of the present study can occur as data from other studies and that samples can become available. Several suggestions are therefore made for future study.

1. Visual inspection techniques might yield erroneous conclusions concerning correlation coefficients for the chairpersons and the demographics. Such errors might occur due to selective perceptions of the respondents or of the investigator when scanning data (Popham and Sirotnik, 1973, p. 65). Other studies are necessary to validate the findings of the present study.

2. Some of the findings regarding the relationship between the selected demographics and leader behavior are contrary to the previous findings; for example, the correlation coefficient measure found no significant relationship between educational background and leader behavior, contrary to Feil's finding (1950), which found a positive
relationship between educational background and leader behavior. Further research is therefore suggested to bring to light the "real" relationship.

3. Some chairpersons did not know how they were selected. The investigator suggests that an explicitly written procedure be provided (where this has not been done) and brought to the attention of all chairpersons and faculty members (observers).

4. A lot of problems were cited by the chairpersons in the area of the performance of their functions. When preparing workshops or in-service programs for department chairpersons, these problems attached in the dissertation (Appendix D) should be treated with considerable concern. Some problems seemed to be related to a lack of knowledge concerning the activities of the central administration in various universities. It is possible that the chairpersons who do not understand how the institution works will soon lose vision and a sense of direction.

5. More research is needed regarding the demographics studied. Much is yet to be learned about the concept of leader behavior and leadership characteristics. This learning aspect will help to clear the mystery or misconceptions and ambiguities about leader behavior and selection, because, as Shakespeare once stated, "When two persons ride of a horse, one must sit behind!" All educators need to make a concerted effort to eliminate a continuation of the status quo. The struggle continues.
## APPENDIX A

Psychological Managerial Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Basis of Classification</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Lewin-Lippit</td>
<td>Initiation Guidance</td>
<td>Democratic, Laissez faire, Autocratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*McGregor</td>
<td>Assumptions About the Nature of Man</td>
<td>Theory &quot;X&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Power Impulse, Hierarchial Orientation</td>
<td>Abdicrat, Bureaucrat, Autocrat, Democrat, Neurocrat, Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Order Impulse, et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Blake-Mouton</td>
<td>Concern for Production, Concern for People</td>
<td>1.1; 1.9; 9.1; 5.5; 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>Leadership Skills, Hostile Self-Seeking, Dependent - Exploited, Interpersonal Orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Carron</td>
<td>Consideration Scores</td>
<td>Laissez Faire, Democratic, Autocratic, Paternalistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources with two common personality variables, task orientation and relationship orientation.
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May 29, 1984

ATTN: SECRETARY

Thank you so very much for your cooperation during my visit to your department to administer the questionnaires to department chairpersons and faculty members.

Will you, please, do me one more favor — that is, collect the completed questionnaires from your chairperson and the following faculty members:

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

I shall return on June 4, 1984 to pick them up from you. Thank you for all your help.

Sincerely,

John H. Ortyoyande
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
March 2, 1984

Dean John Sandberg
College of Education
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Dear Sir:

I am working with Dr. Lawrence Schlack in the department of Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University on a research study regarding leadership characteristics of administrators in higher education.

The study focuses on the relationship between characteristics and leadership behaviors of department chairpersons in Colleges of education in five universities in the state of Michigan. The study seeks to discover this relationship by using self-ratings by the chairpersons and ratings done by faculty members.

We hope you and your administrators will be willing to participate in this study and to furnish their names to us. If so, will you please complete the enclosed data sheet and return it, using the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please be assured that your administrators will not be identified by name in the completed study.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John H. Ortyoyande
Principal Investigator
Western Michigan University

Enclosure
DATA SHEET

1. The name of your university is ____________________________.

2. Please list the names of your departments, the chairpersons, the number of faculty members in each department, and the approximate student enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Name of Chairperson</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Members*</th>
<th>Approximate Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3. Please enclose a listing of the names of your faculty members in each department for purposes of effective random sampling.

4. Do you have assistant/deputy chairpersons? __________ If yes, how many? _________

5. What is the current student enrollment in the college of education? __________

6. What is the total student enrollment in your university? __________

PLEASE RETURN THIS DATA SHEET NOT LATER THAN MARCH 25, 1984 to:

Dr. Lawrence Schlack
Director of the Study
Educational Leadership
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

If you have any questions, please call Dr. Schlack at 616/383-1997.
May 21, 1984

Dear Respondent:

I am presently involved in a project at Western Michigan University, which is under the auspices of the Educator Feedback Center. Dr. Lawrence Schlack is my supervisor. In fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral degree, I am conducting a study at this University regarding the relationship between selected demographic characteristics and leader behavior of chairpersons in the Colleges of Education throughout the State of Michigan.

Your name has been selected at random from a listing of your department members. I would like to ask you to please do the following:

1. Complete the enclosed questionnaire.
2. Seal the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope which is provided.
3. Leave the sealed envelope with your department secretary, ________.

I will come and pick up the envelope on or before May 31, 1984.

I thank you for your cooperation which is so vital to the successful completion of the study. Your help is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

John H. Ortyoyande
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE - FACULTY FORM

Part I

This questionnaire requests information about:
Name of your university
Your demographic data
Your "Real" and "Ideal" perceptions of the department chairperson's effectiveness

PLEASE:

1) Complete all parts of the questionnaire.
2) Mark all the answers in the spaces provided.
3) Promptly return the completed answer sheet to your department secretary.
4) Be assured of your anonymity in this study.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

Part I

1. Name of institution __________________________________________________________________________

2. Your age _____________

3. Gender Male ( ) Female ( )

4. Highest degree earned
   BA ( )
   MA/MSC ( )
   Specialist ( )
   Doctoral ( )
   Other ( )

5. How long have you been teaching at the college level (years)? _________

6. How long have you been teaching in the present institution (years)? ______________

7. Have you published in the last five years? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes, number of books: ______ number of articles: _____
   number of other ______

Part II

Real-Ideal Leader Effectiveness Rating Scale

"Real" (R) means your perception of the chairperson's actual behavior.

"Ideal" (I) means your image of what chairpersons should do to be effective in your department.
Answer each question by checking the box which most nearly reflects your "Real" and "Ideal" perceptions of your chairperson's leader behavior.

The numbers under Evaluation Scale mean:
(1) NEVER  (2) SELDOM  (3) OCCASIONALLY  (4) OFTEN  (5) ALWAYS

### Initiating Structure

1. Stimulates initiative and willingness to accomplish meaningful goals and tries new approaches (innovation).
   - **a. Real**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
   - **b. Ideal**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5

2. Makes constructive appropriate and timely decisions (decision-making).
   - **a. Real**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
   - **b. Ideal**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5

3. Assigns faculty members to particular tasks (ability to delegate).
   - **a. Real**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
   - **b. Ideal**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5

4. Knows how to manage department resources (resource management).
   - **a. Real**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
   - **b. Ideal**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5

5. Adjusts rapidly to needed changes in plans on procedures (flexibility).
   - **a. Real**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
   - **b. Ideal**
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
6. Maintains faculty cohesiveness (faculty cohesiveness).
   
a. Real
   
   b. Ideal

7. Explains clearly and emphasizes the goals of the department (goal clarity).
   
a. Real
   
   b. Ideal

   
a. Real
   
   b. Ideal

9. Uses human resources effectively (human resources).
   
a. Real
   
   b. Ideal

10. Takes care of matters, such as schedules, building maintenance, and availability of instructional materials (organizational ability).
    
a. Real
    
    b. Ideal
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Consideration

1. Does personal favors for few faculty members (personal favors).
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □

2. Finds time to listen to faculty members (listening skills).
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □

3. Looks for the welfare of individual faculty members.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □

4. Refuses to explain actions.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □

5. Is friendly and approachable.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □

6. Puts suggestions by the faculty members into operation.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □

7. Gets faculty members' approval on important matters being considered.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □ □ □
8. Acts without consulting faculty members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Encourages interpersonal communications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Creates a feeling of unity and enthusiasm among faculty members (morale maintenance ability).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 22, 1984

TO: Department Chairs in Colleges of Education in Michigan

This letter is to introduce Mr. John Ortyoyande who is a doctoral student of mine at Western Michigan University. Mr. Ortyoyande is gathering data regarding department chairs for his dissertation.

I can vouch for his seriousness and integrity with the topic, and I feel you will find him pleasant to work with.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lawrence B. Schlack
Associate Professor
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

This questionnaire requests information about:
Name of your institution
Your demographic data
Your "Real" and "Ideal" perceptions of your leader behavior

PLEASE:

1) Be assured of anonymity and confidentiality where necessary.
   After data are collected, all scores will be pooled and
departments will be designated as A, B, C, etc.;
institutional identity will be lost.
2) Complete all parts of the questionnaire.
3) Mark all answers in the spaces provided.
4) Promptly return the completed answer sheet to the secretary
   of your department.
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QUESTIONNAIRES FOR CHAIRPERSONS

Biographic Questionnaire

1. The name of your institution ____________________________________________

2. Your age ______________

3. Your gender Male ( ) Female ( )

4. Your current marital status Single ( ) Married ( ) Divorced ( ) Widowed ( )
   If married, how long ______________

5. Your educational background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Degree Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BSc ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA/MSc ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are you working toward an advanced degree? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes, MA ( ) Doctorate ( ) Other ( )

7. List, in order, the last professional positions you have held (no more than five), beginning with the most recent one.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Months/Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How long have you been in the present position (approximate number of years)?

9. Who selected you as a chairperson? Select only one item.

   - President and Dean
   - Dean
   - Faculty
   - Rotation of faculty members
   - Other (specify)

10. What criterion was the most important in your selection as a chairperson? Check all those that apply.

   - Leadership potential
   - Age
   - Educational background
   - Professional experience
   - Professional membership
   - Gender
   - Marital status
   - Publication record
   - Current faculty member
   - Not known
11. Comments, if any:

12. Have you published in the last five years? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes, number of books _____ number of articles _____
   number of other _____

13. Are you a member of any professional organization?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes, list the positions held, if any

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How many brothers and sisters do you have? _____
   What was your position in the family?
   Oldest male child? Yes ( ) No ( )
   Oldest female child? Yes ( ) No ( )
   Youngest male child? Yes ( ) No ( )
   Youngest female child? Yes ( ) No ( )
15. Was your father employed while you were a child?
   Yes ( ) No ( ) Intermittently ( )
   If yes, at what level? Professional ( )
                     Managerial ( )
                     Service occupation ( )
                     Other ( )

16. Was your mother employed? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes, at what level? Professional ( )
                     Managerial ( )
                     Service Occupation ( )
                     Other ( )

17. What do you consider your major problems as the department chairperson?

18. Would you like a copy of the abstract from this study?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
Real-Ideal Leader Effectiveness Rating Scale

There are twenty items. Each one asks for two self-perception ratings: your perception of your REAL behavior and your perception of IDEAL expectation of a chairperson in your department. Answer each item by checking the box provided that most nearly reflects your perception. "Real" means a "self-evaluation" of your behavior for each of the items. "Ideal" means your behavior as it ought to be maximally effective as a chairperson.

The numbers under the self-ratings scale mean:
(1) NEVER (2) Seldom (3) Occasionally (4) Often (5) Always

Initiating Structure

1. Stimulates initiative and willingness to accomplish meaningful goals and tries new approaches (innovation).
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Real |   |   |   |   |   |
   b. Ideal |   |   |   |   |   |

2. Makes constructive, appropriate and timely decisions (decision-making).
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Real |   |   |   |   |   |
   b. Ideal |   |   |   |   |   |

3. Assigns faculty members to particular tasks (ability to delegate).
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Real |   |   |   |   |   |
   b. Ideal |   |   |   |   |   |
4. Knows how to manage department resources (resource management).

   a. Real
   b. Ideal

5. Adjusts rapidly to needed changes in plans or procedures (flexibility).

   a. Real
   b. Ideal

6. Maintains faculty cohesiveness (faculty cohesiveness).

   a. Real
   b. Ideal

7. Explains clearly and emphasizes the goals of the department (goal clarity).

   a. Real
   b. Ideal


   a. Real
   b. Ideal

9. Uses human resources effectively (human resources).

   a. Real
   b. Ideal

10. Takes care of matters, such as schedules, building maintenance, and availability of instructional materials (organizational ability).

    a. Real
    b. Ideal
Consideration

1. Does personal favors for few faculty members (personal favors).
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □

2. Finds time to listen to faculty members (listening skills).
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □

3. Looks for the welfare of individual faculty members.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □

4. Refuses to explain actions.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □

5. Is friendly and approachable.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □

6. Puts suggestions by the faculty members into operation.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □

7. Gets faculty members' approval on important matters being considered.
   a. Real □ □ □ □ □
   b. Ideal □ □ □ □ □
8. Acts without consulting faculty members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Real</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ideal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Encourages interpersonal communications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Real</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ideal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Creates a feeling of unity and enthusiasm among faculty members (morale maintenance ability).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Real</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.Ideal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Major Problems of the Department Chairpersons

Written Comments on Question 17 by the Chairpersons

Question: What do you consider your major problems as the department chairperson?

Comments: "A great deal of responsibility with little power to initiate change."

"Dealing with a cumbersome university administrative organizational structure."

"Lack of status, interest or understanding of teacher educators in a university structure."

"Lack of adequate resources."

"Union and its contracts which maintain status quo."

"Public Relations."

"Dealing with a declining enrollment."

"Getting enough resources for faculty."

"Helping people develop new perspectives and abilities needed for providing leadership in a changing educational world."

"Maintaining a balance among multiple activities and interdisciplinary views on research, teaching and service."

"Budget."

"Too many people seeking solutions to small problems which they, unrealistically, think the chair can fix very quickly."

"Attempts to manipulate and control the total department by a very few. When they fail, they become obstructionists."

"Satisfying people."

"Role conflicts, insoluble problems and lack of adequate resources."
"Finding financial support for programs."

"Developing faculty productivity in a changing environment."

"Faculty personality conflict."

"Initiating new programs, a struggle to keep everyone employed, and resistance to major changes by older faculty."

"Assigning tasks."

"Teaching responsibility is too much."

"Finding time to address the 'real' problems or opportunities in the face of day-to-day demands of students, faculty and administration."

"Inadequate funding and faculty development."
APPENDIX E

How Data Were Handled

Ninety-three percent of the questionnaire forms for both chairpersons and observers were returned. There were two sections of the questionnaire:

1. The first section was the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ). The Demographic Questionnaire for the chairpersons, had 18 questions which sought information from chairpersons regarding their age, gender, educational background, leadership experience, how they were selected as chairpersons, what criteria were used in their selection and whether or not they had published books and articles in the last five years. The questionnaire also sought some information regarding the professional memberships of the chairpersons, their position in the family and their family size, the level of their parents' employment and problems associated with their position as chairpersons.

The Demographic Questionnaire for the observers requested some information regarding their age, gender, degree earned, teaching experience, and publication record.

All the Demographic factors were given identification codes for the purpose of entering the information in the appropriate columns on Fortran Coding Form. "X" was used in a column where information was not supplied. The information was later entered into the computer for editing and analysis.
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Ninety-three percent of the questionnaire forms for both chairpersons and observers were returned. There were two sections of the questionnaire:

1. The first section was the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ). The Demographic Questionnaire for the chairpersons, had 18 questions which sought information from chairpersons regarding their age, gender, educational background, leadership experience, how they were selected as chairpersons, what criteria were used in their selection and whether or not they had published books and articles in the last five years. The questionnaire also sought some information regarding the professional memberships of the chairpersons, their position in the family and their family size, the level of their parents' employment and problems associated with their position as chairpersons.

The Demographic Questionnaire for the observers requested some information regarding their age, gender, degree earned, teaching experience, and publication record.

All the Demographic factors were given identification codes for the purpose of entering the information in the appropriate columns on Fortran Coding Form. "X" was used in a column where information was not supplied. The information was later entered into the computer for editing and analysis.
2. The second section was Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ). The LBQ sought some information regarding two dimensions of leader behavior; namely, Initiating Structure (IS) and Consideration (C). The chairpersons were asked to rate themselves regarding how they were actually performing (Real) and how they ought to perform (Ideal) in their positions as chairpersons. Each dimension had 20 answers. Each question was measured on a scale of 1 to 5, providing a maximum of 100 responses. Responses consisted of checking one of the following: "Always," "Often," "Occasionally," "Seldom," or "Never" for both "Real" and "Ideal" dimensions, with the scoring format of 2, 1, 0, -1, -2, respectively. Similarly, observers were asked to rate chairpersons on the two dimensions; first, as they saw chairpersons performing and, secondly, as they believed chairpersons ought to perform in their position as chairpersons.

All the scores for both chairpersons and observers obtained from both Demographic Questionnaire and Leader Behavior Questionnaire were, first, coded on the Fortran Coding Form and then entered into the computer for editing and analysis.
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