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CHAPTER I

The Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to determine what relationship exists between college department chairperson's leadership styles as perceived by teaching faculty and the faculty's feelings concerning the degree of job satisfaction that they have within the department.

The Need and Significance of the Study

The university exists to pursue knowledge and to impart it. For the most part it is the faculty who carry out this mission. If the control of educational policies were exclusively in the hands of the faculty, faculty job satisfaction would not be the brouhaha it is today.

It is not suggested that the entire management of university affairs should be assigned to the faculty. There are a number of concerns that should not be within the faculty bailiwick. The following examples apply: University budgeting, scheduling, admissions, counseling, program development and some non-academic affairs. There are a variety of other problems in which those of administrative experience and executive ability can be of great service. But some scholars believe as MacIver\(^1\) does, that,

"There is an intrinsic area of educational policy that should be the exclusive prerogative of the faculty. What they teach and how they teach, what they investigate and how they investigate, what books they prescribe and what studies they assign, what they add to the curriculum and what they withdraw from the curriculum, these and all kindred matters fall properly within the area of professional competence and should be determined only by the educators themselves and by their committees and councils."

This is not always the case at American colleges and universities. Faculty autonomy in academic affairs does exist to a small degree at most

universities and to a larger degree at some others. The infringements on faculty autonomy vary from mild interventions to what some would call "gross arrogations of control over educational processes."¹

There have been a number of measures taken to more clearly define the line of responsibility between the board and administration and the faculty. As early as the late 1950's and the early 1960's, regular faculty-trustee committee meetings were begun at Reed College, Wellesley College, and Brown University. Other institutions made arrangements by which faculty committees met regularly or occasionally with the board as in the case of Amherst College, the University of Washington, and the University of Wisconsin.

The processes of academic governance and decision making especially at departmental levels have received much attention recently. Leon D. Epstein contends that the governing and decision making processes at institutions of higher learning have moved toward greater decentralization and participation. At the college level, for example, the authority delegated to the respective deans has in practice increasingly been shared with department heads and chairpersons.

The All-University Committee on Undergraduate Education at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo reported that,

"The departments, on the whole, function effectively as academic administrative units. They recruit, appoint, evaluate, and reward faculty. They define and assume responsibility for education in particular areas. They are convenient mechanisms for requesting and allocating funds. They are an important academic and psychological base of support for faculty and students."²

Most colleges and universities are similar to Western Michigan University in this respect—that the most important unit of college and university academic structure is the separate departments. The department is the unit where teaching faculty have a sense of belonging, of esprit d'corps. It is through this unit that faculty articulate concerns and make professional contributions to the institutions they serve. It is also at the department level that many important decisions which affect

¹ibid.

²All-University Committee on Undergraduate Education, Final Report. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1971, p. 66.
faculty job satisfaction are made. Such decisions concerning tenure, promotion, salary, curriculum, and others, though they may be finalized at some higher level, actually originate at the department level. It follows, therefore, that department chairpersons have become important leaders.

The department chairperson provides interesting substance for study. He or she ranges on a continuum from an emergent leader, i.e., one who is chosen by one's peers to serve as a department chairperson, to a status leader, i.e., one who is appointed by superordinates to the position. Department chairpersons are usually a combination of emergent and status leaders because they are chosen by their peers and are subject to the approval of their deans. The chairperson's role is unique also in that often he or she must wear two hats, i.e., he or she must be a member of the teaching faculty as well as an administrator.

There have been many studies on leadership style. Basic to some of them is the belief that a leader's style is based upon where he feels the source of his authority. If this line of reasoning is followed, one may deduce that the chairperson's leadership style will depend to a degree on whether he considers himself a representative of his department to the university administration, or whether he believes that he is a representative of the university administration to his department.

Who designates the chairperson's style? By what criteria is the style distinguishable? These two questions depend upon the chairperson's personal feelings and upon the perceptions of his or her department members. This is the basis for this study. A good indication of the chairperson's style as perceived by the faculty is the degree of job satisfaction that it feels it has under his leadership. More specifically, the faculty's perception of its chairperson's style will depend upon its sense of the degree of opportunities that it has to make decisions concerning: 1) what it teaches; 2) how it teaches; 3) what it investigates; 4) how it investigates; 5) who shall be recruited and hired; 6) what are criteria for tenure and who shall receive tenure, and 7) what are criteria for promotion and who shall receive promotion.

This study is worthy of consideration for the following reasons:
1. It could offer information about the role conflict of leaders who are selected by a group and subsequently appointed by superordinates and who must simultaneously serve both, even when opposing views prevail.

2. It could provide information for helping higher education administrative bodies in formulating policies and procedures as such policies relate to job satisfaction and faculty.

3. It could provide information about faculty feelings of job satisfaction.

4. It could provide information about how chairpersons are selected and the relationship of selection method to leadership style.

5. It could provide information about the relationship between faculty job satisfaction and such demographic variables as faculty rank, sex, salary, and years of service in the department.

Research Hypotheses

The major hypotheses to be tested by this study are:

1. The degree of job satisfaction within a given department (as perceived by the teaching faculty within that department), will depend upon the teaching faculty's perception of the chairperson's leadership style. Faculty who perceive of their department chairperson's style as one which fosters friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in his relationships with them will sense that they have a comparatively high degree of job satisfaction. Faculty who perceive their chairperson's style as one which is concerned with establishing clear cut lines of responsibility and organization and ways of getting the job done will sense that they have a comparatively low degree of job satisfaction.

2. Faculty who believe that they elect or choose their chairperson will sense that they have a higher degree of job satisfaction compared with faculty who feel that their chairperson is appointed by superordinates.
Basic Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following basic assumption has been made.

A department chairperson is selected for office by one of the following methods:

1. He is unilaterally appointed by a superordinate.

2. He is appointed by superordinates, but his appointment is subject to strong support from the department faculty.

3. He is elected by department faculty, but the choice is subject to some superordinate approval.

4. He is elected solely by the department faculty.

Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate a better understanding of certain terms in this study, the following definitions are given:

Department Chairpersons - Those teaching faculty who are elected by their peers, chosen by superordinates, or both to represent their respective departments in administrative affairs of the college.

Perception - The act of viewing, judging, or comprehending a phenomenon.

Leadership Style - Those practices, policies, and procedures by which the chairperson operates to move the department toward the fulfillment of institutional goals. For the purposes of this study leadership style will be measured and indicated by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which was devised by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University.

Job Satisfaction - The degree to which faculty feels it is free to teach and research without coercion, and to the degree that the faculty feels it can share in decisions concerning program, curriculum, tenure, promotion, and the appointment of new faculty.
Scope and Limitations of the Study

The major question explored within this study is: What is the relationship between the perceived leadership style of a department chairperson and the feelings of job satisfaction of department faculty? Another question related to the major one is: What affect does the method by which chairpersons are selected have on faculty feeling of job satisfaction?

The subjects who were selected for this study are department chairpersons and teaching faculty. All of the subjects were selected from two and four year colleges and universities which vary in enrollments and program complexity but from one academic discipline—speech and/or communication. In addition to these extraneous variables there are the following:

1. The size of the departments.
2. The length of a chairperson's term.
3. The length of a faculty member's service.
4. The ranks of faculty members.
5. The sex of faculty members.
6. The salary of faculty members.

Overview of the Study

The intent of the first chapter was to briefly introduce the study and discuss several important aspects. The problem was defined and its purpose was clarified along with the need and significance; the hypotheses were stated. The assumption on which the study was based was noted, pertinent terms were defined, and the scope and limitations of the study were outlined.

Chapter II focuses on relevant literature and research. Emphasis is placed on literature and research studies which deal with leadership and leadership style, and with job satisfaction.

Chapter III presents the research procedures employed in the study. The general design of the study is discussed and the sample and population defined. The method of data collection and techniques
for testing the hypotheses are discussed, along with the methods utilized to process and analyze the data.

Chapter IV consists of the presentation and analyses of the data. Data relative to the testing of the hypotheses are discussed, along with a summary of the results obtained.

Chapter V includes a summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The summary includes a review of the problem, hypotheses, and general design.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

This review was selective, based on the contribution made to developing an appropriate background for the investigation conducted. In establishing this background all areas were not treated in equal detail. In some cases this was the result of limited research in the area; in other cases it would have been a repetition of the obvious. The two major components of this study are leadership and job satisfaction. Both are broad and even nebulous concepts. Accordingly each was explored by beginning with it in a very broad and general sense, then later by narrowing the concept down to the very esoteric relationship that exists between it and higher education and academic departments.

This chapter begins with the writings on leadership including the following sub topics:
1. What A Leader Does and How He or She Does It
2. The Relationship of Authority to the Process of Leadership
3. A Definition and Discussion of Emergent and Status Leaders and an Examination of Some Leadership Style Categories.

The remainder of the chapter is concerned with the literature and research on job satisfaction including the following sub topics:
1. The Concept of Job Satisfaction
2. The Role of the Supervisor
3. Academic and Professional Administration
4. The Role of the Academic Department Chairperson
5. Administration of College Departments and Its Relationship to Job Satisfaction.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
What A Leader Does and How He or She Does It

Basic to any discussion of leadership is the question, what a leader does and how he or she does it. According to Boles, a leader is a person who helps an individual or a group to move toward goals that group members find acceptable. A question basic to the study of leadership is the one concerned with what a leader does or what functions does he or she serve within the group.

Schultz envisions the leader's function as that of a completer. "The best a leader can do is to observe which functions are not being performed by a segment of the group and enable this part to accomplish them."

Catell has classified leadership acts as those which either help the group decide upon its goals or those which help it achieve those goals. Similar to this is the suggestion that an important function of leadership is the altering of the members' motivation.

Several studies have attempted to determine leadership functions in an empirical manner. Carter analyzed reported instances of successful leadership and classified seven categories of leadership behavior: performing professional and technical speciality, knowing subordinates and showing consideration for them, keeping channels of communication open, accepting personal responsibility and setting an example, initiating and directing action, training men as a team, and making decisions.

Mann, defining the role of a supervisor at any given position in

---


an organization states, "structurally, the organizational role of the supervisor at any level is primarily one of linking together different parts of the organizational structure of groups and integrating the specialized performances of these units." This conceptualization highlights an area of activity which is quite important for any leader functioning in a large organization, that of coordination. In a slightly different form this same action can be seen in groups which are not representative to outside individuals and groups.

Roby lists six basic leadership functions: (1) to bring about congruence of goals, and to emphasize existing congruences; (2) to see to it that the group selects tasks that it has the ability to perform; (3) to set up a structure appropriate for the task; (4) to provide information necessary for the completion of the task; (5) to employ any personal potential that he possess for obtaining additional information; and (6) to function as an arbitrator.

Likert lists various roles which must be filled in a successful group. He states that these roles may be filled either by group members or the leader. If these are considered in connection with Schultz's concept of a leader as completer, then it can be seen that depending on the group situation, the leader might have to perform any or all of these functions. Likert divides them into two main categories: Group Tasks Roles and Group Building and Maintenance Roles. Under Group Tasks Roles he lists the following: initiating-contributing, information seeking, opinion seeking, information giving, opinion giving, elaborating, coordinating, orienting, evaluating, energizing, assisting, and recording. Under the heading of Group Building and Maintenance Roles the following are listed: encouraging, harmonizing, compromising, gate-keeping and expediting, setting standards of ideals, observing and following.

---


Getzels and Guba say that to lead is to engage in an act which initiates a structure in interaction with others, and to follow is to engage in an act which maintain a structure initiated by another. According to Getzels and Guba there are three leadership-followership styles, and they are nomothetic, ideographic, and transactional. Nomothetic behavior exhibited by a member of a social system is that behavior that is expected of the individual by the social system. The emphasis is placed on the system's expectations of the individual, and not the individual's own need dispositions. (Need disposition is defined here as the tendency of an individual to act with respect to objects or persons in certain manners and to expect certain consequences.) Ideographic behavior is the reverse of nomothetic in that ideographic places emphasis on the individual's personality and personal need dispositions. Transactional behavior is a combination of, or an intermediate between nomothetic and ideographic. Perhaps Figure 1 will further clarify the leader's task as seen by Getzels and Guba.

Figure 1
Getzels-Guba Leadership Task
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It should be pointed out that the three leadership-followership styles are not different images of the same goal; they are three modes of achieving the same goal. Getzels and Guba say that leaders must achieve the social system's goals while fulfilling the group individuals' needs through the use of high morale. They say that two large variables

make up morale—identification or belongingness and rationality. If a manager, leader, or what have you, is to integrate the institution's goals and the individual's goals, then he must establish an esprit d'corps between the institution, the individual and the goals of each. The following illustration may help to clarify this point.

Figure 2
Getzels-Guba Leadership-Followership Style

Role Expectations

B
E
L
O
N
G
I
N
G
E
S
S

Need Expectations

HERZBERG

GOALS

RATIONALITY

IDENTIFICATION

Herzberg\(^1\) discusses means of motivating followers. One method he calls the KITA plan which is an externally imposed attempt to "install a generator" in the employees. The KITA, anagram for Kick In The Ass, can be used in three ways:

1. Positive KITA where rewards are used as incentives.
2. Negative physical KITA where actual physical stimulation is applied, such as a punch in the nose, or a kick in the pants.
3. Negative psychological KITA where an employer might hint at firing or might ostracize an employee.

The biggest failing of KITA, according to Herzberg, is that it is an externally imposed incentive. True motivation occurs only after the person "wants" to do something and has acquired his own built-in

incentive. Intrinsic ideals is the key to sound motivation. Herzberg distinguishes between what he calls hygienes which are dissatisfaction avoidance reactions, and motivators, which are built-in intrinsics. According to Herzberg, then, leaders ought to achieve the goals of the social institution while fulfilling their followers' needs by providing their followers with motivators that will develop built-in incentives.

The Relationship of Authority to the Process of Leadership

In order to achieve the goals of the institution, and satisfy followers' needs, leaders need authority. What is authority and how is it related to the process of leadership?

According to Boles, authority is that relationship which exists when (1) one person rationally legitimatizes another individual or a group to make decisions or take actions that affect him, or (2) recognizes in another a skill or knowledge that he does not possess. Authority is, in fact, legitimatized power. Leadership is a process in which an individual takes initiative to assist a group to move toward production goals that are acceptable, to maintain the group, and to dispose of those needs of individuals within the group that impelled them to join in. The fact that authority is necessary for a leader to lead is irrefutable. Its irrefutability is obvious upon close scrutiny of the aforementioned definitions, for how can a leader lead unless he has the authority to do so? A number of authorities support this contention; the following are but a few.

Byrd says that leaders need authorization to perform certain acts, make decisions, or commit the organization's future. He further says that leaders derive authority from three forces: 1) from higher-ups who delegate authority; 2) from peers, who agree upon the extent of the leader's authority; 3) from himself, when he assumes responsibility. Power, Byrd contends, is closely associated with authority. Power is

---

1 op. cit.
the ability to control the behavior of other people; it directly affects the way a manager can implement his authority. According to Byrd, "if a leader has no power, he has no authority."1

Jay2 discusses the relationship that exists between authority and the leadership process. He contends that one of the biggest reasons why leaders fail to function is loss of authority. In using an example of tribal chieftains of ancient times, Jay says that leaders must have recognized authority. Others may make decisions and the leader's decisions may be challenged, but his right to make such decisions must never be challenged.

Leavitt,3 like the previously mentioned source, cites the importance of the use of authority in the leadership process. He delineates two kinds of authority: 1) formal authority which he calls "delegable power," i.e., power to influence and change others' behavior; and 2) restrictive authority, which is most often used by leaders to control and sanction the actions of others.

The concept of authority and its relationship to the leadership process is a crucial one. According to Byrd,4 leaders derive authority from higher-ups, from peers, and from themselves, therefore it is important to discuss the manner in which leaders are selected. It is logical to deduce that the manner in which a leader is selected will ultimately affect how he perceives his source of authority.

Boles and Davenport5 state that:

"Individuals may gain positions in which they are expected to lead because of being selected by others . . . Others may obtain leader positions through an emerging from the crowd in already functioning groups . . . "

Two broad relationship selection processes are delineated therefore—emergent leadership and status leadership.

---

1bid.
4op. cit.
A Definition and Discussion of Emergent and Status Leaders and an Examination of Some Leadership Style Categories

Emergent leadership is usually conceived of as being that situation where a leader, either formally or informally is chosen by the members of a group. This is opposed to status leadership, where the choice of the leader is determined by people or groups superordinate to the members. It should be noted that the existence of a status leader does not preclude the emergence of another leader. This could be brought about either by a general dissatisfaction with the status leader, or by changes in the conditions of the group, such that the status leader was no longer able to function effectively. As a group becomes more complex, there is a need for new leaders to meet the new demands of various organizational levels.

Another condition that favors the emergence of new leadership is the existence of a crisis situation in the group. Seligman\(^1\) discusses the expected roles of leaders first from historical points of view, including religious leaders such as Muhammed, Jesus, Calvin and Moses. Also he discusses the emergence of historical leaders during crisis situations such as Churchill.

Group instability is a condition that also favors the emergence of a new leader. Jay\(^2\) says that the very survival of a social system depends upon the ability of the leader to coordinate and satisfy the mutual needs of the social system and the individuals who are a part of that system. When instability occurs, leadership becomes insecure and is likely to change.

As was mentioned earlier, the failure of a head or status leader will also lead to the emergence of new leadership. Katz and Kahn\(^3\)

---


\(^2\)op. cit., p. 275.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
found that in railroad work groups, a spokesman for the men emerged when the foreman was judged to be inadequate.

Hollander\(^1\) states that there are two basic qualifications necessary for an individual to emerge as a leader of a group. First, that he be seen as competent in the group's central task; and second, that broadly speaking he be perceived as a member of the group. Hollander has noted that one of the requirements for being accepted as a group member is conformity to the behavior of the group. Task requirements, however, will often necessitate that an individual, if he is to lead the group to successful accomplishment, take actions that run counter to the accepted norms of the group. Thus an ambiguous situation is often created. Hollander's theoretical construct for explaining this apparent discrepancy is "idiosyncrasy credit." Idiosyncrasy credits are built up over time by the individual's adherence to group standards, and allow him at some later period to "spend" them by suggesting innovation.

In contrast to the emergent leader, the status leader comes by his leadership position in a much more conventional and simplistic way. As was previously stated, status leaders are chosen by the superordinates of the organization they represent. The status leader must be viewed by superordinates as the person who can best carry out and maintain the goals of the organization. Just as the manner in which a leader is selected will affect how we perceive his source of authority, the selection process will affect his leadership style. Boles and Davenport\(^2\) maintain that a leadership style is a consistent manner in which actions are performed in helping a group move toward goals acceptable to its members. Lippitt and White\(^3\) categorized leaders into three styles: **autocratic**, **democratic**, and **laissez-faire**. Autocratic leadership style, as the name implies, is one where the authority and the power rests in the hands of one person. Democratic style is one in which the power is group centered. Laissez-faire style is one where the leader allows the group to do pretty much

---


\(^2\)op. cit., pp. 491-496.
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as it pleases to achieve whatever goals it seeks.

A problem that has received much attention concerns the relative
effectiveness of authoritarian and democratic leadership techniques.
Sales\(^1\) has discussed the basic differences of the two.

"Authoritarian supervision in general is characterized by the
relatively high degree of power wielded by the supervisor
over the work group. As contrasted with democratic super­
vision, both power and decision making functions are absolu­
tely concentrated in the person of the authoritarian.
Democratic supervision on the other hand, is characterized
by sharing of power and by participative decision-making."

The initial investigation in this area was performed by Lewing and
Lippitt\(^2\) in 1938. Boys Clubs were set up under three leadership condi­
tions. In these three conditions the adult leader was respectively
democratic, laissez-faire, or authoritarian. The general conclusion
of the study was that the democratic leadership was superior to the
other two types. For example, it was found that while the boys in the
group with an authoritarian leader spent \(74\%\) of their time working on
the task as opposed to \(50\%\) in the democratic group, the members of the
democratic group spent a significantly greater amount of their total
conversation on work relevant matters. It was also found that when the
leader was called out of the room, the boys in the democratic group spent
more of their total time working, than did those in the authoritarian
group. Thus it would appear that what the investigators based their
conclusion as to the superiority of democratic methods was the increased
degree of autonomy that the boys in that condition developed.

Sales\(^3\) among others, has criticized the above study because of its
lack of an objective measure of output. Other studies that have contrast­
ed democratic and authoritarian leadership techniques have yielded ambiguous
results. McCurdy and Eber\(^4\) for example, performed an experiment in order

\(^3\)op. cit.
to compare the two leadership styles. The task that was employed was to
discover the proper sequence for activating three switches. The results
showed no significant differences between the two leadership styles.

Denmark and Diggory performed an experiment to test the hypothesis
that because of differing role expectations in this society, females
would be more approving of authoritarian leadership techniques than men.
The subjects (fraternity and sorority members) were given questionnaires
on which they indicated either approval or disapproval of various leader-
ship techniques. The results did not confirm the hypothesis, and in
fact, tended to reverse it.

McDonald tested the efficiency of three leadership techniques in a
Job Corps Camp. It was found that permissive leadership resulted in the
highest rate of truancy and delinquent acts. Dominant leadership was
found to be the most effective at first, and democratic techniques were
found to be best when employed with individuals who had been in the camp
for an extended period of time. This result suggests that democratic
leadership might be best when one is working with group members who have
some identification with the group, and that authoritarian might be
preferable in a situation where the members are not identified with the
group.

Some writers maintain that a leader's style is based upon where he
perceives the sources of his authority. If one follows this line of
reasoning, then it seems only natural that one would expand upon Lippitt
and White's classifications. For example, the following list is at least
feasible in light of perception of authority source:

1. **Bureaucratic style:** The leader sees himself as part of an
organization and perceives his power emanating from that
organization.

2. **Demagogic,** where the leader manipulates people's
emotions.

---

1Denmark, F. L. and J. C. Diggory, "Sex Differences in Attitudes
Toward Leaders' Display of Authoritarian Behavior." *Psychological
Reports, XVIII* (1966), 683-872.

2McDonald, W. S., "Social Structure and Behavior Modification in
Job Corps Training." *Perceptual and Motor Skills, XXIV* (1967),
142.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
3. **Paternalistic**, where the leader is assumed to have some special, privileged information and "knows what is best" for his subordinates.

4. **Rationalistic**, where the leader's authority is based on demonstrated skills.

**Fiedler's contingency theory**

A valuable approach to the study of leadership is presented by Fiedler.  

"The Contingency Model of leadership effectiveness has as its underlying hypothesis that the effectiveness of a group depends upon the interaction between the leader's style of relating to his group members and the degree to which the situation is favorable to the leader exerting influence over his group."

The second of the above dimensions, the degree of **favorableness or unfavorableness of the task situation**, is assessed by a combination of measurements on three dimensions: Leader-member relations, task structure, and the position power of the leader. (Position power refers to the amount of power that is inherent in the official designation given the leader.) Thus any army officer working with a group of privates would have high position power. A highly favorable task situation is considered to be one in which there are good relations between the leader and the followers, where the task is highly structured, and where the leader has high position power.

The other dimension, **leadership style**, is assessed by the use of one of two highly correlated scales. The basic measure employed is called the "Assumed Similarity Between Opposites (ASO)" Scale. Descriptions are obtained from the respondent of his most preferred and **least preferred co-worker (LPC)**. People who score low on this scale, those who perceive very little similarity between the two types of co-workers are considered to be **highly task oriented leaders**. Those who score high are considered to be more oriented toward the people in the group, than towards the task itself. The other scale employed by Fiedler is called the "Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC)" Scale and simply consists of using the single description mentioned above. The scale is scored so that a person scoring low

---

has a poor opinion of his least preferred co-worker and is considered to be task, as opposed to person oriented.

The specific prediction of the Contingency Model is that:

"Task-oriented leaders perform best in situations which are highly favorable for them or in situations which are relatively unfavorable. Considerate relationship-oriented leaders tend to perform best in situations in which they have only moderate influence, either because the task is relatively unstructured or because they are not too well accepted although their position power is high and the task is structured."\(^1\)

As a preliminary test of the theory, Fiedler did a reanalysis of several studies that he and his associates had performed. Each of the three task-situation variables were dichotomized into favorable or unfavorable dimensions. Thus six conditions were established.

In a study designed to specifically test the contingency model, Fiedler manipulated the three task-situation variables in a laboratory setting employing men from the Belgian Navy as subjects. The LPC scores were correlated with measures of performance on two tasks; a structured one consisting of finding the shortest route for a ship to visit a list of ports, and an unstructured one consisting of finding the shortest route for a ship to visit a list of ports, and an unstructured one consisting of writing a letter for the purpose of encouraging men to join the Belgian Navy. The results generally confirmed the theory. The correlation between the leader's LPC score and group productivity was -.52 in the most favorable task-situation, -.43 in the most unfavorable task-situation, and +.47 and +.42 in the two middle situations.

Halpin and Winer\(^2\) at Ohio State University introduced a graphic design which depicts a leadership style. The figure below, called the Leadership Quadrant, shows a box divided into four equal squares which indicate stages in the leadership process.

\(^1\) loc. cit., p. 147

Figure 3
The Leadership Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Consideration Low Structure</th>
<th>High Structure and Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure and Low Consideration</td>
<td>High Structure Low Consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INITIATING STRUCTURE (HIGH)

Consideration is defined as behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth between a leader and his staff. Initiation is behavior in which the leader delineates relationship between himself and members of the work group. According to Halpin\(^1\), a situation is ideal when there is high consideration and high initiation.

Blake and Mouton\(^2\) illustrated a leadership style by using a similar figure that they called the Managerial Grid, illustrated in Figure 4.

The Country Club leadership style is one in which the leader would show a high concern for people, but a low concern for getting the production work completed. The Impoverished leadership style would do little of anything; the leader would show little concern for the members of the group, and little concern for getting the organization's work completed. The task leadership style is one in which the leader would be very concerned about getting the production completed, but not concerned about the people in the organization.

Blake and Mouton felt that the ideal situation is team (9-9), which is to say that an ideal leadership style is one in which the leader has a high degree for the concerns of the people in the group and is also highly concerned about the group's task.

\(^1\) Ibid.

A brief summary of some of the related literature findings on leadership is in order at this point. The leader's job though multifaceted, ideally is to achieve the goals of the social system he or she serves, while coordinating the need dispositions of the individuals who comprise the social system. This conceptualization is supported by a number of writers including Schultz, Catell, Carter, Mann, Roby, Likert, Getzels and Guba. In order to perform this coordination, the leader must help individuals to feel a sense of belonging to the social system, to identify the personal need dispositions of individuals within the role expectations of the system, and to provide motivation which will in turn provide built-in incentives. Getzels and Guba support the previously mentioned conceptualizations and delineate what they call leadership-followership styles.

Some writers including Byrd and Leavitt cite the importance of the use of authority (legitimized power), in the leadership process. Byrd maintains that since leaders need authorization to perform certain acts, make decisions, and commit the organization's future, the use of power, which is closely associated with authority is undeniable.

Leadership style was defined by Boles and Davenport as a consistent manner in which actions are performed in helping a group toward goals.
acceptable to its members. The following are some examples of leadership style categories and their respective researchers.

1. Democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire styles as presented by Lippitt and White. The hypotheses which grew out of their research were tested by Denmark and Diggory and McDonald.

2. The Contingency Theory offered by Fiedler which embodies the concepts of task-oriented and considerate-oriented leaders.

3. The graphic Leader Behavior Description Quadrant (LBDQ) designed by Halpin at the Ohio State University.

4. The Managerial Grid, another graphic design (similar to the LBDQ), offered by Blake and Mouton.

One of the purposes of this chapter's previous sections was to establish that there lies a relationship between the leader's function and group individuals needs, and between leaders' functions and the goals of the institution he or she serves. Boles states that:

"Leadership is a process in which an individual takes initiative to assist a group to move toward production goals, to maintain the group, and to dispose of those needs of individuals within the group that impelled them to join it."

For purposes of this study, the leader is a college or university department head or chairperson. The group he serves is his department faculty, and the group needs are expressed in terms of job satisfaction. More succinctly, since the college or university department head or chairperson is the leader of the department, the department members are dependent upon him or her for the disposition of some of their needs. Faculty job satisfaction is therefore related to the leadership of the department head or chairperson.

This researcher felt that since job satisfaction is such a broad and nebulous concept, it is necessary to explore the concept in its general sense before discussing the narrower concept of job satisfaction in college and university teaching departments. What follows, therefore, is a discussion of job satisfaction in its generic sense.

---

1 Boles, op. cit., p. 278.
JOB SATISFACTION

The Concept

The terms job satisfaction and job attitudes are typically used interchangeably. Both refer to affective orientations on the part of the individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying. "Positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction and negative attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction."1

The term morale has been given a variety of meanings, some of which correspond quite closely to the concepts of attitude and satisfaction. For example, Likert and Willits2 define job morale as an individual's "mental attitude toward all features of his work and toward all of the people with whom he works." Similarly, Guion3 has defined morale as "the extent to which the individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction stems from his total job situation."

Job satisfaction, job attitudes, and morale are typically measured by means of interviews or questionnaires in which workers are asked to state the degree in which they like or dislike various aspects of their work roles. Other more indirect methods have been developed by such researchers as Weschler and Bernberg,4 and Weltz and Nuckols.5

Unfortunately there has been little standardization of job satisfaction measures. Most investigators "tailor make" an instrument for the particular population they are studying. Though there are exceptions to this, such as the Brayfield-Rothe\(^1\) Job Satisfaction Scale and the Kerr\(^2\) Tear Ballot, investigators more commonly adopt old instruments or devise new ones to meet their requirements at a given time.

Smith and Kendall\(^3\) through their joint efforts in 1963 completed extensive research on job satisfaction and developed an instrument to measure job attitudes called the Job Description Index. According to Vroom,\(^4\) the JDI is "the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today." Unfortunately the JDI is the product of an unpublished manuscript. This example is cited to emphasize the general absence of standard measuring instruments for job satisfaction.

Having discussed the concepts of job satisfaction it now becomes necessary to consider more fully the parameters of the term. Is job satisfaction a specific variable or a rather general concept composed of a set of variables. The reasons for this distinction are understandable upon examination of various workers and their work. For example, workers can be found who report that they are very satisfied with their supervisors, indifferent toward company policies, and very dissatisfied with their wages. It is difficult to ascertain which one, or combination of these, represents their level of job satisfaction. It is feasible, therefore, to consider that for purposes of this study, job satisfaction was treated as a set of dimensions rather than a single dimension.


\(^4\)op. cit., p. 100.
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The immediate question which arises is how can the characteristics of work roles be divided in order to arrive at useful dimensions of job satisfaction? An examination of some of the research and literature on the subject is in order at this time.

Vroom discussed the nature of job satisfaction relative to how it is affected by such aspects as the nature of supervision the worker receives, the kind of work group of which he is a member, the content of his job, the amount of his wages, his chances for promotion, and his hours of work. Combinations of these aspects make up a worker's perception of his "work role." A large number of work variables have been isolated and the general nature of their effects on job satisfaction determined. A satisfying work role is one which provides high pay, substantial promotional opportunities, considerate and participative supervision, an opportunity to interact with one's peers, varied duties, and a high degree of control over work methods and work pace.

Herzberg, in an attempt to determine the factors related to job attitudes, maintains that most experimental studies have been slow in supporting or opposing opinions. Though he concedes that "some of the specific job factors have considerably more influence than others . . . " he cites a number of questions not readily answerable:

1. Can attitudes toward the specific factors be identified and measured?
2. Are the factors interrelated or relatively independent?
3. Is the influence of a particular factor reasonably constant from one situation to another?
4. Can overall job attitudes be predicted from attitudes about the individual job factors?

He cites two studies that give, "a rough orientation to the kinds of factors involved and to the discrepancies to be accounted for."

---

3 Ibid.
From a study of attitudes of government-employed scientists, Ahlberg and Honey\(^1\) in 1950 report what was liked or disliked about government positions. On one particular question, about 35\% of 335 respondents said that they especially liked their competent, considerate, and desirable co-workers and supervisors. Another 27\% said that they especially disliked their incompetent, inconsiderate, and undesirable co-workers and supervisors.

Herzberg\(^2\) cites a second study by Stagner\(^3\) in which Stagner points out that if the workers are asked directly about the importance of pay in their overall satisfaction, pay invariably ranks near the top in importance. If, on the other hand, more indirect questioning is used, pay drops substantially in importance. These two studies illustrate two of the sources of apparent discrepancies among results of many studies. The Ahlberg Study\(^4\) points out that the same job factor can be a source of great satisfaction to some individuals and a source of great dissatisfaction to others. The Stagner\(^5\) article emphasizes that other apparent differences can be accounted for more simply in terms of the method of measurement used in specific studies.

Herzberg\(^6\) compiled a list of factors from studies on job attitudes and classified the list into Ten Major Job Factors. The following is the Ten Major Job Factors and a brief description of each.

**Intrinsic Aspects of Job.** This factor includes all of the many aspects of the work itself, aspects which would tend to be constant for this work regardless of where the job was performed. This factor as

---

\(^1\)Ahlberg, Clark D. and John C. Honey, "Attitudes of Scientists and Engineers About Their Government Employment." (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, 1950), pp. 23-31.

\(^2\)op. cit.


\(^4\)op. cit.

\(^5\)op. cit.

\(^6\)Herzberg, op. cit., pp. 39-42.
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defined here was mentioned more frequently than any of the other nine factors.

**Supervision.** The aspects of the job situation mentioned second most frequently pertains to the relationships of the worker with his immediate superiors.

**Working Conditions.** The next most frequently mentioned factor includes those physical aspects of the working environment which are not necessarily a part of the work. They are a function of the particular organization or company. For example, "hours" is included in this factor because it is primarily a function of the organization, affecting the individual's comfort and convenience in much the same way as other physical working conditions.

**Wages.** All aspects of the job involving present monetary remuneration for work done. This is one of the most homogeneous of the ten major factors.

**Opportunity for Advancement.** This factor includes all the job aspects which the individual sees as potential sources of betterment of economic position, organizational status, or professional experience. This factor is also relatively homogeneous.

**Security.** This is defined to include those features of the job situation which lead to assurance for continued employment, either within the same company or within the same type of work or profession.

**Company and Management.** This factor includes many of those aspects of the worker's immediate situation which are a function of organizational administration and policy. This factor is among the least unique of the ten defined here, since administrative policies either directly or indirectly affect many of the other factors. In its most specific sense, this factor involves the relationships of the worker with all company superiors above the level of immediate supervision.

**Social Aspects of Job.** Included here are all job aspects involved in the relationships of the worker with other employees, especially those employees at the same or nearly the same level within the organization. This factor includes all on-the-job contacts among these individuals, whether those contacts are for working and operating purposes or for more personal reasons.
Communication. This factor includes those aspects of the job situation involving the spreading of information in any direction within the organization.

Benefits. Included here are all those specific phases of company policy which attempt to prepare the worker for emergencies, illnesses, old age, and hospitalization. Also, included here are company allowances for holidays, leave and vacations.

Herzberg\(^1\) summarized what he called "the best and most representative of approximately 200 other publications which present the opinions and experiences of many individuals concerned with job factors." He does admit that some of the opinions are the result of "pure speculation while others are the products of widespread experience and perhaps even of some experimental data."\(^2\)

In most job situations there exists an actual or psychological gulf between workers and management. Standing in this gulf in the role of go-between is the first line manager. The person may be a foreman but the work role is supervisory in nature. For a number of reasons, this position is germane to this study of leadership and job satisfaction; the following is a brief examination of the supervisor's role.

The Role of the Supervisor

The fundamental problem which springs from the role of the supervisor concerns his position as a middle man between the worker and management. This is particularly true of the first-line supervisor, although at every company level the supervisor is a member of two organizational groups, one in which he is a subordinate and in the other a superordinate. Basically, the first-line supervisor is management's representative to the employee but just as strongly, the supervisor is the employee's major representative to management.

\(^1\)loc. cit., p. 60.

\(^2\)ibid.
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Mann and Dent\(^1\) state the question, "Should the supervisor pull for the company or for the men?" In addition to these alternatives, the supervisor may be able to "pull" for both groups and in other cases he may decide to pull for neither and perhaps join a foreman's union for some rights of his own.

The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan reports the most definitive answers to these questions of the supervisor's "dual role." Charters\(^2\) and Mann and Dent report the major investigations of this problem. In the Mann and Dent\(^3\) study, employees were asked, "Does your supervisor pull for the company or for the men?" The employee's answers, combined with the ratings of the superiors about the supervisors' performance, indicated that:

"The supervisor who can understand the objectives both of the company and of the men, and who is seen by employees as a member and a representative of both management and his work group, is rated highest by management."

Actually, of any group rated, more of the supervisors who "pulled" for the company were rated less effective by management.

It is particularly noteworthy that at least half of the employees in the Mann and Dent study felt that it was possible for the supervisor to pull for both the company and the men. They see a community of interest without conflict and therefore no necessity for the supervisors to take sides.

"This dual membership posses no problem for the supervisor if the goals and the expectations of the two groups are generally compatible and if both groups recognize it.

"If, on the other hand, management fails to recognize this duality and attempts to enlist a supervisor's undivided loyalty, he may lose his


\(^3\)op. cit.
ability to act as a representative of his employees and eventually his effectiveness in helping management gain its objective. At the same time, if the employees fail to recognize the duality of the supervisor's role and try to capture his complete loyalty, he may lose his ability to act as a representative of management and in the long run his effectiveness in helping employees reach their goals.\(^1\)

This conclusion emphasizes again the importance of the superior in the effectiveness of the supervisor for reaching management's objectives.

Some of the literature stress the feeling the supervisor has of this in-betweenness, the feeling of not belonging to either the employee or the management group and yet acting as the major intermediary between the groups. Both the Mann and Dent study and the Charters paper indicate that the proportion of supervisors who have this feeling is less than frequently implied. This feeling was experienced by less than half of the supervisors in the utility company studied by Mann and Dent and by about the same proportion of the foremen in the automobile plant studied by Charters. However, it is noteworthy that even this many foremen and supervisors have this feeling.

Whether such feeling of conflict affects the supervisor's performance and, if so, what can be done to reduce such feelings are questions that are not readily answered. However, some authors have been concerned with the ways in which the supervisor can be made to feel stronger allegiance to the company. McMurry,\(^2\) for example, concludes that if management wants to have supervisors who feel that they are part of management, the company must select supervisors more carefully, train them more adequately, and give greater consideration to their dissatisfactions than is done at present. On the other hand, Armstrong\(^3\) blames the problem on communication between management and the supervisors.

\(^1\)Mann and Dent, op. cit., p. 112.


\(^3\)Armstrong, T. O., "Developing Effective Supervisor-Employee Communication." Personnel, XXVII (1950), 70-75.
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He states that foremen feel management neither makes its policies clear to them nor accepts their ideas. Furthermore, it appears to foremen that they do not receive the same type of treatment from higher management that they are expected to give to those they supervise. A marked difference exists between the responsibilities higher management believes are allocated to foremen and the responsibilities foremen assume to be theirs.

Viteles\(^1\) considers the problem from many angles including status, pay, abrogation of supervisory authority, and the opportunity to act and feel like management. He maintains that a supervisor is convinced he is part of management only if a situation is created, both within and outwardly, which stimulates the supervisor to act and feel as a member of management.

What these authors say leads one to conclude that the suggested attentions to the supervisor are necessary and perhaps sufficient to assure the supervisor's identification as a member or representative of management. However, Herzberg\(^2\) states that "the relative value of such suggestions and the conditions most appropriate to each are not yet known from concrete evidence . . . it is not even known to what extent it is desirable for the supervisor to side most strongly with company and management."

So far the previous concepts of leadership and job satisfaction have been examined in the way to which they are related to business and industry. This researcher found no specific list of job satisfaction criteria for college faculty. For this reason he examined Herzberg's\(^3\) list of job satisfaction criteria as those criteria related to college teachers. Following is Herzberg's list as a college or university teacher might view it.


\[^2\]Herzberg, op. cit., p. 187.

\[^3\]Herzberg, op. cit., pp. 39-42.
Intrinsic Aspects of Job. Like Herzberg's concept, this aspect would include those physical aspects of the working environment which are not necessarily a part of the work itself; aspects which would tend to be constant for this work regardless of where the job was performed. To the college teacher this might include the opportunity to help make decisions concerning departmental curriculum, and course offerings as well as how and what is taught.

Supervision. The worker in Herzberg's research was concerned with his relationship with his immediate supervisor. The immediate supervisor's counterpart to the college teacher is his or her department chairperson.

Working Conditions. This includes those physical aspects of the working environment. Herzberg's workers included hours in this factor. The college teacher might interpret hours in terms of enforced office hours and his teaching schedule.

Wages. This aspect probably connotes the same for workers and for college teachers.

Opportunity for Advancement. This aspect probably connotes the same for workers and for college teachers, though the means by which it is achieved differs. The college teacher would be concerned here about promotional criteria--research and publications, service to the institution, service to the community, teaching excellence, etc.

Security. Assurance for continued employment is crucial to workers and college teachers alike. The college teacher might interpret this concept in terms of tenure. Specifically, he or she would ask what are the criteria for tenure, and who decides whether it is granted.

Company and Management. This factor includes many of those aspects of the worker's immediate situation which are a function of organizational administrators and policy. In its most specific sense, this factor involves the relationships of the worker with all company superiors above the level of immediate supervision. Here the college teacher would be concerned specifically with his or her chairperson's departmental management. Because, though the department chairperson (the counterpart of the worker's immediate supervisor), is a member of the department he or she heads or chairs, the chairperson must serve university and college superiors.
Not only is departmental management important to teacher job satisfaction but also the selection process used to decide upon the department chairperson. Unlike industrial workers who rarely have a voice in the selection of their immediate supervisor, college teachers often help to designate their chairperson. This choice for the college teacher is a crucial one because the chairperson is the intermediary between the teacher and the upper administration.

Social Aspects of Job. Included here are all job aspects involved in the relationships of the worker with other employees, especially those employees at the same or nearly the same level within the organization. Unlike many industrial workers, college teachers sometimes have the privilege of deciding who will be recruited and hired in their departments.

Communication. This factor includes those aspects of the job situation involving the spreading of information in any direction within the organization. For the college teacher this might include vertical information concerning policy or administration of policy from superordinates like deans or vice presidents. Most college teachers would be concerned here about the access they have to information and the ways in which it is disseminated.

Benefits. Like wages, with a few exceptions, means the same to workers and college teachers.

Earlier this researcher said that Herzberg summarized this list for industrial workers from what he called "the best and most representative of approximately 200 other publications which presents the opinions and experiences of many individuals concerned with job factors." He does admit that these are opinions and that some are based on experience and upon speculation. The list expressed in terms of college teachers shares those same qualifications. However, in light of the absence of a job satisfaction list which specifically relates to college teachers, this list is somewhat relevant.

The concept of job satisfaction as it relates to workers is similar in many respects as it relates to college teachers. The contrasts that

1 op. cit.
exists are due primarily to the nature of the organizations, the purposes of the organizations, the work roles of the supervisors or chairpersons, and the work roles of the workers or teachers. Further discussion follows and is more specifically confined to job satisfaction, and leadership as they relate to academe.

**Academic and Professional Administration**

Herbert Simon¹ says professionals have a narrower zone of acceptance than other workers, hence there may be different dimensions to the administration of groups whose members have achieved a high level of personal competence in their disciplines. Because this study concerned college teachers, it was important to review the literature for insights from research and other ideas which might suggest how the "management" of professionals may differ from the management of other organizational participants.

Gross says that, "in modern societies bureaucratic organizations have grown increasingly important, and more and more members of occupations with claims to professional status now work in such settings . . . Merton was one of the first sociologists to point out the problems confronting professionals and intellectuals who work in bureaucracies. Other empirical studies of this subject are, for example, Wilensky's analysis of intellectuals in labor unions, Gouldner's study of the reference groups of professors, and Blau's research on social work agencies, each of which stressed that professionals who work in organizations are subject to both professional and bureaucratic standards that may be conflicting and so give rise to personal and organizational tensions."²

Professionals are changed by organizations, but conversely, professionals effect changes in an organization that other workers do not.


This idea gains impetus when one reads Triandis, who says that an increase in member abilities in an organization will:

1. Result in a "flatter" status structure.
2. Result in job enlargement.
3. Lead to greater responsibility of the members.
4. Lead to more authority by the members.
5. Lead to a shift in the locus of decisions toward the lower levels of the organization.
6. Lead to a larger span of control.
7. Result in fewer roles per number of people.

Professionals often think of themselves as independent practitioners who should have considerable control over their environment and a significant voice in decisions which affect them. The college professorship is often thought of as one of the last bastions of rugged individualism and autonomy. French says the designation, "employee" is not a suitable label for professors. Etzioni sees professors as those who control one another through normative power rather than as subordinates controlled by superiors.

Weber indicated that independent social positions may limit or

---


4. Weber, Max, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 392, 400-401. In a footnote, Talcott Parsons, the translator, indicates that Weber, in talking about control by means of knowledge, did not seem to realize he was discussing professional experts, nor to understand that their organizations were not rigid hierarchies. He says, "Perhaps the best example of this tendency, which Weber curiously enough seems to have overlooked in its bearing on this problem, is to be found in the universities of the modern Western World. Much the same will, on close examination, be found to be true of the professional staffs of such organizations as hospitals or law firms.

"It is probable that Weber's neglect to analyze professional authority is associated with a tendency to over-emphasize the coercive aspects of authority and hierarchy in human relations in general ... " See pp. 58-60.
control authority. Consequently, professionally staffed organizations do not conform with Weber's model of bureaucracy, but are much more nearly communities of equals, or collegia.

Lunsford\(^1\) maintains that the collegium is not defined as a hierarchical bureaucracy, but is instead a company of professional equals in which the locus of decision is in the group, which in its councils performs legislative, judicial, and executive functions. The power of members of the collegium is normative, not legal, and stems from their seniority, performance, or knowledge. Those who carry out the administrative tasks of the professional collectivity are amateurs, functionaries, or mere paper-handlers.

Many professors view the university as a collegium. According to Rourke,\(^2\) "the perennial dream of many an academician is that of a university run entirely by professors--a citadel of learning undisturbed by the presence of registrars, business managers, or even perhaps deans and presidents."

Teffland\(^3\) thinks that the belief that the college or university is a community of scholars is an academic myth. He says,

"The university . . . is . . . an organizational discipline at the same time it must foster independence or freedom for its most important group of organizational members. This is a dilemma neither confined to the university nor to contemporary times."

Clark's\(^4\) thoughts on the modern day collegium are in agreement with Teffland's. He says that the college as a collegium is in conflict with the realities of life in large-scale organizations. There is a perpetual
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"tug of war" between administrators and professionals. "The professional gains authority, compared to most employees, by virtue of his special knowledge and skills; he loses authority, compared to a man working on his own, by virtue of the fact that organizations locate much authority in administrative positions." In universities and colleges where professors have a good deal of influence, intergroup contests may split the organization; thus expertise may fracture rather than unify the institution.

Research concerned with the management of professionals in industry presents similar pictures of conflict between professional values and organizational demands. Marcson\(^1\) says that managers of research laboratories tend to consider the scientists as "employees" rather than as "colleagues." Because administrators and managers in the typical industrial concern assume a relationship between rank, ability, and power, in which ability is invariably rewarded by promotion, it follows that all "workers" have less ability. Hence scientists, treated as just another group of employees, have low prestige and power within the organization. The low status is in direct conflict with their needs for scientific recognition and involvement.

Many professionals feel that their many years of training have prepared them to assume a role which is denigrated in a bureaucratic organization. They have learned to place a high value on professional goals, rather than on institutional or organizational goals. If they perceive they have little power to reach their goals, then they tend to feel insecure.

Hill,\(^2\) in his analysis of the structural and attitudinal aspects of professionalization, and of the organizational settings in which many professional occupations exist, suggested that there is generally an inverse relationship between professionalization and bureaucratization.


The data further suggested that the presence of professionals in an organization affects the structure of the organization, while at the same time the organizational structure can affect the professional process.

Baumgartell concluded from his study of scientists in research laboratories that professionals require a special pattern of leadership. He found that directive leadership was the least effective pattern in a research organization; the two styles which seem to be effective are what he calls "laissez-faire" (in cases where the leader has low competence in the scientific field), and the "participatory" (where the leader has high competence).

The suggested association between patterns of leadership and professional expertise points to a source of potential conflict between the organization and the professionals within it. The professional who attains stature in his discipline has strong lateral relations that make him relatively insensitive to traditional administrative pressures. Professors may acquire both professional reputations and external means of support.

The power of the professor, and correspondingly the power of the chairperson, is affected by the nature of the job market. When the supply of professional talent is limited relative to demand, the threat to leave the organization is an important sanction. The power of academic administrators may be limited if the collegium of scholars performs the hiring function, or if the professional societies such as AAUP, establish standards which become norms of behavior for the professors irrespective of the institutions to which they are attached. The growing influence of governmental activities may restrict the power of administrators of higher education, and the increasing importance of student demands may also be restrictive.

Like the first line supervisor in industry, the academic chairperson is a middle person. He or she is an important link between upper administration and teaching faculty. Often the chairperson must wear two hats, i.e., be a first line administrator as well as a member of the academic

---
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departments' teaching corps. Like the first line supervisor, the success of the chairperson's function often depends upon the ability to manage and carry out university or college policy while tending to the needs and functions of his or her teaching colleagues in the department.

There are, of course, differences between the two supervisory positions. Like those work differences that exist between college teachers and production workers, the differences that exist between labor supervisors and academic chairpersons are due to the differences in the natures and purposes of the institutions they serve. The following is a discussion of the academic department chairperson's role.

The Role of The Academic Department Chairperson

College administration and academic department administration are so closely related that the successful administration of the college depends upon the successful administration of the departments. Every chairperson, therefore, presides over an important segment of the college and becomes an affective college administrator as he carries out college policy. "The ideal chairperson is familiar with the causes of professional happiness among his staff members, of scholarly achievement among his students, and managerial success with his superiors."¹

In light of the aforementioned the question which arises is, who should be in charge of the department, head or chairperson. The position of department chairperson is not an enviable one. The person who holds this office is usually caught between the administrative officers and the faculty in much the same fashion that the university president is caught between the board of regents and the faculty senate. (In fact, this position bears resemblance to that of the supervisor in production labor situations caught between the workers and management.)

Whether a department should be administered by a head or chairperson depends largely on the basic administrative philosophy prevailing in a given institution. One of the major objections to the concept of

chairperson is the lack of continuity in the position of chairperson. This objection is not easily answered, since obviously the effectiveness of a chairperson depends greatly upon his or her knowledge of procedures and on his or her ability to establish good relations with administrative officers. Bowler suggests one way of meeting this objective, that is, to "place more of the responsibility for policy-making in the hands of the permanent department committees." The chairperson then becomes more truly executive in his function, administering policies that continue, regardless of his or her tenure in office. Another common approach to achieving continuity in office is to permit the chairperson to succeed himself if he was elected by the faculty. This last procedure, however, is fraught with political overtones, and this writer feels that faculty members would be very opposed to it.

To advocate the election of a chairperson, as opposed to the appointment of a head, from the premises of political theory or business management is to oversimplify the process. Bowler states:

"... we must understand better the way varieties of academic governments in operation on American campuses; and once we understand them, we must blend our efforts toward explaining them. Maybe by that time we shall be able to decide for ourselves whether we should have a chairman or heads of departments."

What specifically is the job description of the chairperson is a difficult question to answer. That is, it is difficult if one is seeking a "specific" description. The literature lists various functions and roles of chairpersons. Rather than cite several sources and run the risk of certain redundancy, this writer chose to capture the essence of what the various studies and literature said. The chairperson's first job, if he is to serve his school, college, university and his profession well; and if he is to be an active force for progress within his discipline, is to create in his department a climate of trust so that
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1 Bowler, N. W., "Who Should Be In Charge of the Department--Head or Chairman?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII (June, 1962), 315-318.
2 Ibid.
communication of ideas will be free. This will encourage faculty to grow continually as their careers progress. The chairperson's role is two-fold: he will strive to keep the members of his department informed of developments within the field, and he will do all in his power to encourage his faculty to be responsible innovators, guiding his faculty always as an informed and discriminating expert in curriculum and methodology.

The department chairperson is the designated or chosen leader of his or her department. If he has been appointed head of the department by the upper administration, then by previous definition, he is a status leader. If he has been chosen by his teaching colleagues to be chairman, then he is an emergent leader. In many cases, the chairperson or head is a combination of both. Where chairpersons are elected by their departments, often they serve with the approval of the upper administration. Where department heads are appointed by the upper administration, often the administration seeks the approval of the department. In less frequent situations department heads are appointed unilaterally by superordinates, or chairpersons are elected by departments without mandatory superordinate approval. A leader in any of these positions serves two groups. What, then, is the role of the administrator and how is it related to the needs of both groups? A discussion follows.

The Administration of College Departments and Its Relationship to Job Satisfaction

The role of administrators of college departments is sometimes a difficult role to perform. As an administrator, the chairperson presumably would be called upon by deans and higher administrators to articulate the standards and goals of the institution, and to secure compliance with them. But as a scholar in a community of scholars, the members of the department would expect him to satisfy their institutional demands while helping them to build professional reputations and contacts which would remove them even further from organizational control. A review of the literature concerned with college departments should prove helpful for the substantiation or refutation of these ideas.
The academic department has been defined as "a community of scholars who are engaged in an organized program of research and teaching, in a single, clearly-defined field of knowledge."¹ All important functions of the university rests with his collegium; it makes scholarly contributions to represent, and promotes a major academic discipline; it acts as a personnel department, attracting, upgrading and developing professors; it conducts the teaching and in so doing is responsible for developing scholars who will later join the community; that is, it develops its own successors.

Hass and Collen² share this view, and they assert that the department differs from other organizational forms in that there are more democratic processes, such as committees, that the individual professor has academic freedom in the classroom; and that he is protected from illegal dismissal for unsatisfactory performance. Further, Hass and Collen argue that unlike practices in other organizations, the professor is hired by the department to do one thing (teach classes) but is evaluated and promoted primarily on the products of his research activity.

Doyle's³ study of departments in 33 private colleges gives a somewhat different impression of the department. In the institutions studied, teaching was the primary goal, and even the department chairperson spent the majority of his time in teaching and counseling students. Even though the chairperson consulted the faculty frequently, particularly about budgetary concerns, these departments were clearly not collegia. The president, dean, or trustees appointed the chairperson, who served indefinitely at their discretion. In addition, new faculty members were appointed by the higher officials, upon recommendation by the chairperson; the faculty had no official voice in selecting their colleagues.

---

¹ Euwenig, Ben, "The Organization of the Department." The Education Record, XXXIV (January, 1953), 38.
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The chairperson appears to have little power and assert only a minor leadership role in either the university departments on which Hass and Collen report, or in the college departments investigated by Doyle. In the former instance, their power is limited by the power of the professors individually and as groups; in the latter, by the power of the trustees and higher administrators.

Winston Hill,\(^1\) in his study of the power imputed to department chairpersons by professors in five state-supported four-year colleges, found that the greater the power of the chairpersons and the greater the professors level of satisfaction the more likely they were to be productive in terms of their perceptions of the goals of their particular organizations. It was noted that the relationship between the perceived power of chairpersons and the professional output of professors, although slight, was negative.

Support for Hill's findings, that the power of one chairperson may be greater than that of another, is provided by Hemphill.\(^2\) He was concerned with the administration of 22 departments in the liberal arts college of a major university. The results from the administration of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to faculty members showed that the departments with the best reputation for being well administered were those in which the chairpersons were described as above average on both the Consideration and Initiating Structure scales.

Empirical evidence of the relationship between professors' views of their departments and other organizational phenomena was obtained by the Ohio State group from a sample of college faculty members. The results of the Group Dimension Questionnaire revealed that professors' views of their college departments were found to be in agreement with general knowledge of these types of groups: the department was seen as more heterogeneous than homogeneous; low in permeability; high in importance; highly stratified; low on teamwork, cohesion, and freedom from dissension; and low on pleasantness. Also, more members of college departments saw

---

\(^1\) op. cit.

their departments as being low in the dimensions of "control" than did members who saw them high.

A comparison of the Group Dimensions scores with job satisfaction resulted in the findings that the more satisfied professors are those who see their groups as pleasant, important, and united in sharing group goals, but who also describe their groups as de-emphasizing status differences and permitting considerable freedom of individual behavior. Hence it seems that the professors want the chairperson who will help them reach their goals, but do not want their colleagues to exert much control over them.

A review of the above literature suggests the following propositions about the administration of professors in academic departments:

1. The academic department exists in an organization which is basically hierarchical in form (Anderson, Clark, Doyle, Teffland).

2. Nevertheless, the faculty members attached to these departments have considerable power, relative to their administrators, by virtue of the expertise, their lateral connections (Clark), the importance of their voice in personnel and other organizational decisions (Dixon).

3. It is the control over power instruments by the faculty which has led to the persistent view of the university departments as a collegium.

4. The leader of groups which have considerable power will be most effective if he attempts to minister to their needs, acquires more power instruments himself (Hemphill), and treats the members of the group in accordance with their perceptions of their own power through such means as soliciting their service and actively encouraging their participation in decisions which affect them (Baumgartel).

5. Chairpersons of college departments differ in the degree to which they have power ascribed by members of the department (Hemphill).

6. The chairpersons of colleges are perceived to have relatively little power by members of the department faculty.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter is divided into six sections. The first section discusses the questionnaires used in the study. The second section explains the researcher's rationale for the use and in one instance, the development of the questionnaires. The third section discusses the population used in the study and how the respondents were selected. The fourth section deals with processing the data obtained from the instruments. The fifth section deals with the tabulation and analysis of the data. Finally, the sixth section explains how hypotheses were tested.

Questionnaire Development and Rationale

There were three questionnaires used in this study. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was used to measure and delineate department chairpersons' leadership styles. A questionnaire which was developed by Brayfield and Rothe\(^1\) to measure job satisfaction was used. Finally, this researcher developed a questionnaire from some of the related literature and research which was reviewed in Chapter II to measure departmental job satisfaction.

The LBDQ allows group members to describe the behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations. The respondent indicates the frequency with which he perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, never. These responses are obtained from the members of the leader's immediate work-group, and are scored on two dimensions of leader behavior. For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged

\(^{1}\text{op. cit.}\)
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to yield an index of the leader's behavior.

This study deals with the description of department chairpersons' leadership style as such styles are perceived by the faculty within the departments. The LBDQ has been used in industrial, military, and educational settings. Hemphill\(^1\) in particular used the LBDQ to study the leadership styles of 22 department chairpersons in a liberal arts college.

Unlike leadership style, job satisfaction proved to be a more difficult variable to assess. In its generic sense, job satisfaction has been greatly researched and written about; this fact is evidenced by the many sources cited in Chapter II. Accordingly, this writer chose to assess college faculty job satisfaction by using one of the instruments that was cited in the literature, the Brayfield-Rothe index of job satisfaction. This instrument assumes that, "... job satisfaction could be inferred from the individual's attitude toward his work,"\(^2\) and uses five categorical terms or words, strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree, as an attitude scale to delineate workers' feelings about their jobs.

The Brayfield-Rothe instrument was designed to study job satisfaction and morale of workers in business and industry. College professors, according to Simon,\(^3\) French,\(^4\) and Etzioni,\(^5\) should not be viewed in the same way as industrial workers are when job satisfaction is discussed. The resources cited in Chapter II said that professionals like college professors think of themselves as independent practitioners, and as autonomous individuals who control each other through normative power rather than as subordinates controlled by superiors. Therefore an instrument which was designed to describe job satisfaction of industrial and business employees might not be equally valid if used to describe job satisfaction of college professors. College faculty job satisfaction

\(^1\)op. cit.
\(^2\)op. cit., p. 308.
\(^3\)op. cit.
\(^4\)op. cit.
\(^5\)op. cit.
would depend upon the degree to which they felt they had control over their professional situations, such as the degree to which they felt, (1) free to teach without coercion, (2) free to research without coercion, (3) they had a voice in the department's academic program, (4) they had a voice in the department's curriculum, (5) they had a voice in department tenure decisions, (6) they had a voice in department promotion decisions, and (7) they had a voice in department appointments.

Accordingly, another job satisfaction instrument was developed for purposes of this study. Though the format was designed by this researcher, many of the items come from various instruments used in other studies. Two of these were from a study by Payne,\(^1\) and a study by Williams.\(^2\) Other items came from the related literature and research which was reviewed in Chapter II. The instrument was divided into five portions; a description of the instrument follows.

The first portion was designed to get at demographic variables: academic rank, sex, number of years in the department, the method by which the chairperson received his or her position, and the salary range of the respondent. These variables could be useful for purposes of comparing faculty members feelings on job satisfaction.

The second portion dealt with academic affairs and was designed to get at the respondent's opinions of the degree to which he felt free to teach and research without coercion, and to the degree to which he sensed that he had a voice in departmental program and curriculum.

The third portion was designed to discover the degree to which a respondent felt that he had a voice in department decisions on faculty appointments, tenure and promotion.

The fourth section was designed to discover the degree to which a respondent felt that he had a voice in departmental financial affairs.


Finally, the fifth portion of the job satisfaction questionnaire was headed Departmental Committees. Personal experience had taught this researcher that in some instances departmental policies are formulated by committees. Accordingly, it was felt that a respondent's sense of job satisfaction might be affected by the degree to which he felt involved in this policy formation.

In a general sense, job satisfaction may refer to the way one views one's job in terms of interests, enjoyment, pleasantness, lack of boredom, and lack of disappointment. However, as viewed by college professors, job satisfaction includes other variables. Therefore, two separate instruments were used to measure the concept. The Brayfield-Rothe instrument was used to measure respondents' feelings of job satisfaction in its general sense, and a second instrument was used to measure job satisfaction in the university setting.

The Population Used and the Method of Selection

College faculty and college faculty department chairpersons were used. Since the study involved the faculties' perceptions of their chairpersons, the faculty and the chairperson were in the same departments. The Association of Departmental Administrators in Speech Communications was approached at its annual meeting held in December 1974. The Association comprises various speech-communication discipline department chairpersons, and its members represent a number of the nation's colleges and universities. The purpose of the study was explained and the Association's aid solicited. Specifically, chairpersons were asked to solicit the cooperation of their department faculty. There were approximately 10 to 15 chairpersons at the meeting who agreed to help. The corresponding secretary sent a copy of the request to all chairpersons on the Association's mailing list. It is not known how many comprise the list, but 60 replies were returned. Of the 60 who replied 16 said they would not or could not take part in the study; 44 agreed to do so.

It is important to note that direct contact with individual faculty members was never established, only with department chairpersons. When
a chairperson agreed to ask his or her department to take part in the study, he or she returned a form which confirmed the department's willingness and which also noted the total number of faculty in the department. Each chairperson was subsequently mailed enough instruments for the total number of faculty in the department. The total number of departments who agreed to take part in the study was 44; the total number of faculty in those departments was 619.

Halpin¹ says that a minimum of four respondents per leader is desirable when a researcher uses the LBDQ. The returned instruments from a department were discarded if the total returned was less than four and if the number of faculty in the department was greater than ten. In these instances it was felt that two or three returned instruments out of a maximum of three to nine was sufficiently representative of the entire department. So the minimum-of-four rule was waived. As a result of this elimination, the total number of departments represented in the study was reduced from 44 to 31. Because of the nature of the study (faculty describing their chairperson's behaviors, and faculty relating their sense of job satisfaction), the responding faculty's anonymity had to be preserved. The best way to accomplish this was by mailing the chairperson enough instruments for the entire faculty and by asking that the instruments be distributed to all.

After the original mailing and one follow-up letter, 253 responses were received. This is a return rate of 41% based upon the 619 total number of faculty in 44 departments. The characteristics of those faculty who did not return instruments cannot be accounted for. If this is a weakness in the sampling technique, it is felt somewhat justified by the fact that the respondents' anonymity was kept intact. Indeed, without this assurance, the total number of responses may have been even lower.

Of the 253 responses, 65 were discarded. As mentioned earlier, if fewer than four responses were received from a particular department

¹Halpin, Andrew W., "Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1957, p. 2.
whose size numbered greater than ten, then these responses were not used. In addition to this reduction, some responses were not used because the respondents failed to complete one of the three instruments. Another sizeable number of responses were not used because the respondents failed to use the special code number which was provided in order to identify the institution and the chairperson described. After all of these eliminations, the total number of useable responses was 188.

Processing the Data

Processing the data consisted of the following: (1) Scoring the three questionnaires, (2) tabulating the results, and (3) performing the data analysis.

Tabulating and Analyzing the Data

Data were obtained from three separate questionnaires--the LBDQ, the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction index and from job satisfaction instrument developed from the related literature and research.

The LBDQ consists of two scales: initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the chairperson's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself or herself and the members of the department and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the chairperson and members of the department.

Only 30 of the 40 items on the LBDQ are scored, 15 for each of the two dimensions. The 10 unscored items have been retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire. The score for each dimension is the sum of the scores assigned to responses marked on each of the 15 items in the dimension. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 0 to 60. Each LBDQ answer sheet was scored on each of the two dimensions, and the scores secured from the respondents were averaged separately by dimension. Then two average scores were designated as the
chairperson's initiating structure and consideration scores. Each score was rounded to the nearest whole number.

The data obtained, then, were one initiating structure score and one consideration score for each of 31 department chairpersons. This researcher then dichotomized each of the department chairpersons into high and low initiating structure and high and low consideration at the median score for all respondents on both dimensions. If for example, a chairperson received an average score of 38 on the initiating structure dimension, and an average score of 44 on the consideration index and if both of these scores were above the median score for all department chairpersons in the study, then this chairperson would be considered high on both dimensions. This method had been used by Hersey and Blanchard in leadership studies at the Ohio State University.

The first instrument used for measuring job satisfaction was the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index which contains 18 statements describing how an employee felt about his position. The respondent, in this case, the faculty member, indicated his feelings about a statement and thus his degree of job satisfaction, by crossing out one of five adverbs. The adverbs were: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. The items were selected so that the satisfied end of the scale was indicated by strongly agree and agree for one-half of the items and by strongly disagree and disagree for the other half. The neutral response was undecided. The Likert scoring weight for each item ranged 1 to 5 and the range of possible total scores was 18 to 90 with the undecided neutral point at 54. However, in this study, the range obtained was much smaller than 18 to 90 as it was leptokurtic and skewed to the upper end of the scale. Apparently this instrument was less sensitive to college faculty job satisfaction concerns than the instrument developed from the related literature.

The job satisfaction questionnaire which was developed from related research and literature was divided into five sections. The first section dealt with demographic variables. The respondents were asked to simply

---

1 op. cit.
check the appropriate line. In the remaining sections, two through four, respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt involvement in departmental academic affairs, personnel matters, financial affairs, and departmental committees. Respondents indicated what they felt was their involvement, "as it actually is," and "as they would have it." The score could range from 1, no involvement, to 5, total involvement. Average involvement was indicated by 3. The score obtained was the difference between the actual involvement and the way a respondent would have it. If a respondent felt that his actual involvement was about average (3), and also felt that that was the way he wanted it, then he also indicated 3 in the section marked "as you would have it." The difference in this example between the two scores is 0 indicating total job satisfaction. Obviously, the lower the score indicated by this instrument, the higher the degree of job satisfaction.

Testing the Hypotheses

The major hypotheses that were to be tested are as follows:

1. Faculty who perceive their department chairperson's leadership style as above the median on LBDQ consideration, or one which fosters friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in his or her relationships with them will feel that they have a degree of job satisfaction above the median.

2. Faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style as one which is above the median on LBDQ initiating structure or one concerned with establishing clear cut lines of responsibility and organization and ways of getting the job done will feel that they have a degree of job satisfaction below the median.

3. Faculty who think that they elect or choose their chairperson will feel that they have a degree of job satisfaction above the median compared with faculty who feel that their chairperson is appointed by superordinates.
To test the first two hypotheses, the job satisfaction scores of respondents who perceived that their chairperson exhibited one kind of leadership style were compared to the job satisfaction scores of respondents who perceived that their chairperson exhibited another kind of leadership style. If job satisfaction is affected by leadership style, then there ought to be a significant difference in the degree of job satisfaction felt by faculty under different department chairperson leadership style categories.

The third major hypothesis was tested in the same manner as the first two. There should be a significant difference in the degree of job satisfaction felt by faculty who choose their chairperson when compared with the degree of job satisfaction felt by faculty whose chairperson is appointed. The design dealt with studying the effects of one variable on another, and suggested that this could be done by studying means. After analyzing the data, this researcher felt that it did not meet the rigorous assumptions which are required for the parametric \( t \) test or for the one way analysis of variance. Siegel\(^1\) says that the Mann-Whitney \( U \) test is "... a most powerful alternative to the parametric \( t \) test when the researcher wishes to avoid the \( t \) test's assumptions ..." Therefore the Mann-Whitney \( U \) was selected to test both hypotheses.

Summary

This study investigated the relationship between college faculty job satisfaction and department chairperson leadership style. Also this study investigated the relationship of college faculty job satisfaction and the process by which the department chairperson was selected. Thirty-one chairpersons and 188 faculty from various colleges and universities participated in the study. All of the participants were members of the same general discipline, speech-communication. Three questionnaires were used. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
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was used to determine chairpersons' leadership styles. An index of job satisfaction designed by Brayfield and Rothe was used to determine job satisfaction, and a questionnaire was developed from the related literature for the same purpose. Job satisfaction scores of faculty who perceived that their chairperson exhibited one type of leadership style was compared with job satisfaction scores of faculty who perceived that their chairperson exhibited a contrasting style. Similarly, job satisfaction scores of faculty who elected their chairperson were compared with job satisfaction scores of faculty whose chairperson was appointed. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine if the mean job satisfaction scores of the faculty differed significantly under chairpersons of contrasting leadership styles. The same statistical test was used to determine significant differences in job satisfaction scores of faculty who chose their chairperson and faculty whose chairperson was appointed.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter will report and discuss the results of the data analysis. The format will be to report the statistical analysis in numerical form by the use of tables and then to discuss the results.

Table 1, on page 57, shows the number of faculty in each department and the number of these who responded. As the data in Table 1 indicate, 31 departments are represented and 188 out of 381 faculty participated in the study.

Table 2, on page 58, reports the data results by department on the LBDQ for both variables, initiating structure and consideration. The median for all department chairpersons on initiating structure was approximately 44. The median for chairpersons on consideration was approximately 36. As the table indicates, there were nine chairpersons above the median on initiating structure, seven at the median and 15 below the median. There were 14 above the median on consideration, three at the median, and 14 below the median.

Chairpersons' Leadership Style and Faculty Job Satisfaction

Chapter III stated that two instruments were used to measure job satisfaction. Therefore the effects of leadership style on job satisfaction is reported in two separate tables. The data in Table 3, on page 59, are based on the Brayfield-Rothe (BR) job satisfaction index. The data in Table 4, on page 59, are based on the job satisfaction instrument that was designed from the related literature and research, more succinctly called Academic Concerns and Issues (ACI).

Table 3 contains test results to determine if job satisfaction is lower for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style to be above the median in initiating structure. Job satisfaction is indicated on this table as measured on the Brayfield-Rothe index.
### Table 1

Total Number of Faculty by Department and Total Participating in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Number</th>
<th>Total Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Total Participating Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM 9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM 13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH 16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF 17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ 18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB 19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL 21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP 22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH 24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB 28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total            | 381                      | 188                         |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Number</th>
<th>Initiating Structure Score</th>
<th>Consideration Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH 4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO 7</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS 8</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>37+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM 9</td>
<td>46*</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT 10</td>
<td>46*</td>
<td>40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM 13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW 15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH 16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF 17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ 18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB 19</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT 20</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL 21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP 22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 23</td>
<td>46*</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH 24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH 25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 27</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB 28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP 30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 31</td>
<td>53*</td>
<td>45+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Above the median (44) for all of the faculty responses on Initiating Structure.

+ Above the median (36) for all of the faculty responses on Consideration.
Table 3

Job Satisfaction Scores Via the Brayfield-Rothe Index
Comparing Faculty Who Perceived High and Low Chairperson Initiating Structure Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LBDQ Initiating Structure</th>
<th>BR Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above the Median 92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below the Median 96</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show an N of 92 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style above the median in initiating structure, and an N of 96 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style below the median in initiating structure. The mean job satisfaction scores for the former group (high initiating structure) is 57, and for the latter group (low initiating structure) the mean is 55. The Mann-Whitney U test yields a Z value of 0.69 with a probability of .2451. Since the critical value was set at .05, this difference was found not significant.

Table 4

Job Satisfaction Scores Via the ACI Instrument
Comparing Faculty Who Perceived High and Low Initiating Structure Chairperson Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LBDQ Initiating Structure</th>
<th>ACI Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above the Median 92</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>.0013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below the Median 96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lower Mean indicates higher degree of job satisfaction.)

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tail test.
Table 4 contains test results for the same variables as Table 3, using the ACI instrument on job satisfaction. The data show an N of 92 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style above the median in initiating structure, and an N of 96 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style below the median initiating structure. The mean job satisfaction scores for the former group (high initiating structure) is 17, and for the latter group (low initiating structure) is 25. Unlike the Brayfield-Rothe instrument, this job satisfaction instrument indicates that the lower the mean job satisfaction score, the higher the actual job satisfaction. Therefore the lower mean of 17 indicates that this group of faculty (those who perceived above the median on initiating structure) has a higher degree of job satisfaction than the group with a mean of 25. The Mann-Whitney U test yields a Z value of -3.00 with a probability of .0013. Since the critical value for rejection was set at .05, this difference was found to be significant.

Table 5
Job Satisfaction Scores Via the Brayfield-Rothe Index Comparing Faculty Who Perceive High and Low Chairperson Consideration Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LBDQ Consideration</th>
<th>BR Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above the Median N90</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.4129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below the Median N98</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 contains test results to determine if job satisfaction is higher for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style to be above the median in consideration. The data show an N of 90 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's style above the median in consideration, and an N of 98 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership style below the median in consideration. Job satisfaction is indicated on this table as measured by the Brayfield-Rothe index. The mean job satisfaction scores for the first group (high in consideration) is 55.88 and for the second group (low in consideration) is 55.56. The Mann-Whitney U test yields a Z value of 0.22 with a probability of .4129.
Since a critical value for rejection was set at .05, the difference between the two groups was found to be not significant.

Table 6

Results of Job Satisfaction Scores Via the ACI Instrument Comparing Faculty Who Perceived High and Low Chairperson Consideration Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LBDQ Consideration</th>
<th>ACI Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above the Median N90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>.0375*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below the Median N98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Lower mean indicates higher degree of job satisfaction.)*

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tail test.*

Table 6 contains test results for the same variables as Table 5, using the ACI instrument on job satisfaction. The data show an N of 90 and an N of 98 for faculty who perceive their chairperson's style above the median in consideration and below the median in consideration respectively. Job satisfaction mean scores for the two respective N's is 19 and 23. The lower the mean score, the higher the job satisfaction as indicated on the ACI instrument. Therefore the first faculty group (N90) with the lower mean of 19 shows a higher degree of job satisfaction than the second group (N98) with a higher mean of 23. The Mann-Whitney U test yields a Z value of -1.78 with a probability of .0375. Since a critical value for rejection was set at .05, this difference was found to be significant.

Based on the data analysis of job satisfaction using the Brayfield-Rothe instrument, the first two research hypotheses cannot be accepted. However, based on the data analysis using the second job satisfaction instrument, the first research hypothesis can be accepted. Though, the second hypothesis cannot be accepted. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. Faculty who perceive their chairperson above the median on initiating structure, feel that they have a higher (not lower) degree of job satisfaction. This discrepancy in the two analyses is due to the
findings of the two job satisfaction instruments. In both cases, however, the job satisfaction scores are higher for faculty who perceive that their chairperson's leadership style is high in *initiating structure* and high in *consideration*.

**Methods of Selecting Chairpersons and Faculty Job Satisfaction**

Table 7, on page 63, contains test results to determine if job satisfaction is affected by the methods by which department chairpersons are selected. Job satisfaction is indicated on this table as it is measured by the Brayfield-Rothe index. There are four processes by which department chairpersons are selected and these four range from "Elected Solely by Faculty" to "Appointed Solely by Superordinates." The table compares each process, and indicates the N's of faculty who report the use of that process for their department. The table also indicates the mean job satisfaction scores for faculty under each chairperson selection process and the Z values indicated when one process is compared with another.

Using a critical value of .05 for rejection of the null hypothesis, two significant comparisons were found. According to these data, the most significant difference in job satisfaction occurs when one compares a department whose chairperson is elected solely by faculty with a department whose chairperson is appointed by a superordinate with faculty approval. For this comparison a Z value of 3.00 was found with a probability of .0013.

There are three other significant differences in job satisfaction affected by the process by which chairpersons are selected. They are as follows:

1. There is a significant difference in job satisfaction between faculty in a department where the chairperson is elected solely by the faculty and in a department where the chairperson is appointed solely by a superordinate. In the latter situation faculty job satisfaction is significantly higher.

2. There is a significant difference in job satisfaction between a department in which the chairperson is chosen by the faculty with superordinate approval and in a department where the chairperson is appointed by a superordinate with faculty approval. In the latter situation faculty job satisfaction is significantly higher.
Table 7

Results of Job Satisfaction Scores Via the Brayfield-Rothe Index
Comparing Faculty Who Elect Their Chairperson and
Faculty Whose Chairperson is Appointed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process by Which Chairperson is Selected</th>
<th>BR Job Satisfaction Mean Score</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected solely by faculty N28</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected by faculty with superordinate approval N67</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected solely by faculty N28</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.0013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Appointed by superordinate with faculty approval N43</td>
<td>58.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected solely by faculty N28</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.0294*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Appointment solely by superordinate N50</td>
<td>56.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected by faculty with superordinate approval N67</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.0029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Appointed by superordinate with faculty approval N43</td>
<td>58.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected by faculty with superordinate approval N67</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Appointed solely by superordinate N50</td>
<td>56.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed by superordinate with faculty approval N67</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed solely by superordinate N50</td>
<td>56.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tail test.
Table 8

Results of Job Satisfaction Scores Via the ACI Instrument
Comparing Faculty Who Elect Their Chairperson and Faculty Whose Chairperson is Appointed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process by Which Chairperson is Selected</th>
<th>ACI Job Satisfaction Mean Score</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected solely by faculty N28</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Elected by faculty with superordinate approval N67</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected solely by faculty N28</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Appointed by superordinate with faculty approval N43</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected solely by faculty N43</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Appointment solely by superordinate N50</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected by faculty with superordinate approval N67</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Appointed by superordinate with faculty approval N43</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected by faculty with superordinate approval N67</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Appointed solely by superordinate N50</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed by superordinate with faculty approval N67</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Appointed solely by superordinate N50</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lower mean indicates higher degree of job satisfaction.)

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tail test.
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Table 8 contains test results for the same variables as Table 7 using the ACI instrument. The table indicates that faculty job satisfaction is significantly different in departments where the chairperson is elected solely by the faculty compared to departments where the chairperson is appointed by superordinates with faculty approval. In the first situation job satisfaction for faculty is significantly higher. The data in Table 8 also indicate that job satisfaction is significantly higher in departments where chairpersons are elected solely by faculty compared with departments where chairpersons are appointed solely by superordinates.

Discussion of the Test Results and the Discrepancies Between the Brayfield-Rothe Index and the ACI Instrument

In analyzing the data as reported in Tables 7 and 8 there are obvious discrepancies. The data in Table 7 indicate that the third hypothesis cannot be accepted. Indeed the data indicate that the reverse is true, i.e., faculty have more job satisfaction when chairpersons are appointed by superordinates. On the other hand, the data in Table 8 indicate the opposite, i.e., that faculty job satisfaction is higher when faculty participate in selecting their chairperson.

A close look at the tables indicate that there are large differences in job satisfaction means. Table 7 indicates that as the faculty participation decreases, the job satisfaction means increase, and that the highest job satisfaction mean was found for departments in which chairpersons were appointed by superordinates with faculty approval. Table 8, on the contrary, indicates that as faculty participation increases, so does the faculty job satisfaction means. (Recall that lower means indicate higher job satisfaction for this instrument.)

One possible explanation is that the Brayfield-Rothe instrument's norms are established for industry and business, and the other instrument pertains exclusively to the college teaching profession. Workers in business and industry rarely choose their supervisors or foremen as the case might be (supervisors and foremen are likely counterparts for department chairpersons). Unlike workers in business and industry, faculty often have a voice in chairperson selection. For example, the total faculty in this study who elect their chairperson either solely
or with superordinate approval is 95 or nearly half of the entire sample. Faculty like to think of themselves as members of a collegium professional equals according to French, and Lunsford. In many cases faculty would expect to be included in the selection of their chairperson.

The supervisor in business and industry and the college department chairperson may be viewed as either an emergent leader, i.e., one who is selected by his peers, or a status leader, i.e., one who is appointed by superordinates. The employee in business and industry rarely expects emergent leadership that is sanctioned by his superordinates. That is, the employee would not expect to choose his own foreman or supervisor and have that choice recognized by the administration. The college teacher, on the other hand, might very well expect emergent leadership and he might well expect that the choice should be his to make with or without sanction.

As was previously discussed, the Brayfield-Rothe index was less sensitive to faculty job satisfaction measures. The instrument items do not clearly measure faculty input in the decision making process, and this input (according to much of the cited research and literature), is the essence of faculty job satisfaction. It was decided that the ACI instrument was more related to this study and that the items contained therein were more valid for testing the research hypothesis.

Effects of Demographic Variables on Job Satisfaction and Perceived Leadership Style

Table 9, on page 67, indicates how rank, salary, years of department service and sex affect faculty perceptions of their chairperson's leadership style and faculty feelings of job satisfaction. Since job satisfaction is indicated on this table by ACI mean scores, the lower the mean the higher the degree of job satisfaction.

The data show a lower job satisfaction mean for senior faculty than for junior faculty. The data also indicate a higher mean on perceived

---

1op. cit
2op. cit.
Effects of Demographic Variables on Chairperson's Perceived Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK:</th>
<th>ACI*</th>
<th>Perception of Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Perception of Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Faculty</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>32.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Faculty</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>36.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARY:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- $10,000</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td>31.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10-15,000</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-20,000</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>35.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 +</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>36.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS IN THE DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>34.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>36.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>37.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>35.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>35.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lower mean indicates higher degree of job satisfaction.

Chairperson initiating structure and consideration for senior faculty.

The data indicate generally small differences in job satisfaction means for faculty classified by salary. However, there is a large difference in job satisfaction means between faculty who earn more than $20,000 and faculty in other salary classifications. The data indicate slight differences in perceived initiating structure and consideration. Though the means increase as the salary classifications increase, the largest difference is between faculty who earn less than $10,000 and faculty who earn $10,000 to $15,000.
The data indicate that the number of years served in a department has a slight but positive effect on job satisfaction means as well as perceived initiating structure and consideration means. Faculty who have served more than 15 years show the highest job satisfaction means and the highest perceived initiating structure and consideration means.

The data indicate substantially higher job satisfaction means for men, though men and women means for perceived initiating structure and consideration are nearly the same.

Figures 5 through 15 further indicate the relationships between job satisfaction, and perceived chairperson leadership style on the bases of faculty rank, number of years service, salary, and sex.

The data in Figure 5 indicates a slight relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived low chairperson initiating structure. There are also very slight relationships between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure and between low job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. Figure 5 also indicates that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and perceived chairperson consideration.

For senior faculty, the data in Figure 6 indicates a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. The data also indicates a weaker relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. Figure 6 shows a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration.

The data presented in Figure 7 indicate that for faculty who have served in a department for less than five years there is a high relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. The data also indicates a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. The data presented in Figure 7 further indicate a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low consideration. There is also a slight relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration.

For faculty who have served from five to fifteen years the data in Figure 8 shows a strong relationship between low job satisfaction and low perceived initiating structure, and a fairly strong relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure.
Faculty Perception of Chairperson Leadership Style Compared with Faculty Feelings of Job Satisfaction by Rank

Figure 5
Junior Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>initiation structure</th>
<th>below median</th>
<th>above median</th>
<th>consideration</th>
<th>below median</th>
<th>above median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aci above median</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>aci above median</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below median</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>below median</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| q = .20              | n=61         | q = .005     | n=54          |

*including lecturers, instructors, and assistant professors.

**all percentages are rounded off.

***yule's q.

Figure 6
Senior Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>initiation structure</th>
<th>below median</th>
<th>above median</th>
<th>consideration</th>
<th>below median</th>
<th>above median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aci above median</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>aci above median</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below median</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>below median</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| q = .35              | n=27         | q = .35      | n=54          |

| n=48                 |
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Faculty Perception of Chairperson Leadership Style Compared with Faculty Feelings of Job Satisfaction on the Basis of Faculty Years of Service

Figure 7
Faculty with Less Than Five Years of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q=.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8
Faculty with Five to Fifteen Years of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q=.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The data further indicate practically no relationship between job satisfaction and perceived consideration for faculty with five to fifteen years of service.

For faculty with over fifteen years of service the data in Figure 9 indicate a fairly strong relationship between job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. There is also a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. The data further indicate a fairly strong relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration. There is also a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low consideration.

**Figure 9**

**Faculty with Over Fifteen Years Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>Above Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>50% (N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>58% (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q^2 = .66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 indicates that for faculty who earn less than $10,000 salary there is no relationship between job satisfaction and perceived chairperson initiating structure. The data do indicate a fairly strong relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived high consideration. There is also a weaker relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived low consideration.

For faculty who earn $10,000 to $15,000, the data in Figure 11 indicate a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. There is also a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. The data indicate the same relationships for job satisfaction and perceived consideration.
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Faculty Perception of Chairperson Leadership Style Compared with Faculty Feelings of Job Satisfaction by Salary

**Figure 10**

Faculty Earning Less Than $10,000 Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acclamation of Leadership</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
<th>Acclamation of Consideration</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=7)</td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11**

Faculty Earning $10,000 to $15,000 Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acclamation of Leadership</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
<th>Acclamation of Consideration</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=48)</td>
<td>(N=51)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=49)</td>
<td>(N=50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For faculty who earn $15,000 to $20,000 the data in Figure 12 indicate a perfect relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. There is also a strong relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. The data further indicate a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low consideration, and a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration.
Figure 12
Faculty Earning $15,000 to $20,000 Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>Above Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>63% (N=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q=1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For faculty who earn more than $20,000 the data in Figure 13 show a strong relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. The data also show a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. The data further indicate a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration, and a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low consideration.
Faculty Perception of Chairperson Leadership Style Compared with Faculty Feelings of Job Satisfaction on the Basis of Sex

Figure 14

Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55% (N=27)  45% (N=22)  Q=.61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47% (N=23)  53% (N=26)  Q=.45

Figure 15

Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43% (N=61)  56% (N=78)  Q=.59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI Above Median</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI Below Median</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47% (N=66)  52% (N=73)  Q=.36

The data in Figure 14 indicate that for female faculty there is a strong relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure. The data also indicate a relationship between high job satisfaction and high initiating structure. The data further indicate a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low consideration and a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration.
The data in Figure 15 indicate that for male faculty there is a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low initiating structure, and a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high initiating structure. The data further indicate a relationship between low job satisfaction and perceived low consideration and a relationship between high job satisfaction and perceived high consideration.

Summary

The purpose of the first hypothesis was to determine whether faculty job satisfaction was related to department chairperson leadership style. Figure 16 represents a summary of leadership style effects on job satisfaction when job satisfaction is measured on the Brayfield-Rothe index.

**Figure 16**

The Effects of Leadership Style Via the LBDQ on Job Satisfaction Mean Scores Via the Brayfield-Rothe Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>Consideration Above Median</th>
<th>Consideration Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consideration 55.88</td>
<td>Low Structure and Consideration 55 55.56</td>
<td>High Consideration 57 55.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Effects of Leadership Style Via the LBDQ on Job Satisfaction Mean Scores Via the Instrument Which Was Developed from the Related Literature

INITIATING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Above Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median</td>
<td>High Consideration</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Below Median        | Low Structure and  | High Structure     |
|---------------------| Consideration      |                    |
|                     | 25 19*             |                    |

(Lower mean indicates higher degree of job satisfaction.)

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tail test.

Figure 17 represents a summary of the effects of chairperson leadership styles on job satisfaction when job satisfaction is measured by the ACI instrument. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in job satisfaction based on chairperson leadership styles was tested. Though the null hypothesis must be retained on the basis of the data analyses as represented in Figure 16, the null hypothesis can be rejected on the analysis of data represented in Figure 17. Both figures indicate, however, that the degree of faculty job satisfaction is highest when faculty perceive that their chairperson exhibits a leadership style that is above the median in consideration and above the median in initiating structure.

The purpose of the third hypothesis was to determine whether job satisfaction was affected by the process in which department chairpersons were selected. The data analyzed as a result of the Brayfield-Rothe index indicate that faculty have a higher degree of job satisfaction when (1) chairpersons are appointed by superordinates with faculty approval, and (2) when chairpersons are appointed solely by superordinates.
These two processes for selecting chairpersons provided higher faculty job satisfaction scores than any process which would allow faculty a voice in selecting their chairperson.

The other job satisfaction instrument produced contrasting data results. They showed that as a faculty's participation in the selection process increased, so did their job satisfaction.

The discrepant findings of the two job satisfaction instruments were discussed. It was pointed out that the difference in the data produced by the instruments was due to the different populations for which the instruments were designed to study. The Brayfield-Rothe index was designed primarily for business and industrial employees. The other instrument was designed exclusively for college teachers. The uniqueness of the college teaching profession on job satisfaction-related matters was supported by authorities which were cited previously. Because of this uniqueness and the lack of real discrimination in these matters by the Brayfield-Rothe instrument, this researcher felt justified in using the data produced by the related literature instrument on job satisfaction as a means for testing the null hypothesis. Accordingly, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in job satisfaction between faculty who selected their chairperson and faculty whose chairperson was appointed, was rejected. The relationship between job satisfaction and perceived chairperson leadership style was examined on the bases of rank, number of years served in a department, salary, and sex. Essentially job satisfaction was higher for senior faculty, for faculty who served the most years in a department, for faculty who were highest paid, and for men. Perceptions of chairperson leadership style varied but generally senior faculty and highest paid faculty perceived higher degrees of chairperson consideration and initiating structure. In most instances there was a relationship between faculty degrees of job satisfaction and faculty perceptions of their chairpersons leadership style.
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to (1) determine if college faculty job satisfaction was affected by their perceptions of their department chairperson's leadership style, and (2) determine if faculty job satisfaction was affected by the process used in selecting department chairpersons.

A review of the literature on leadership indicates that there are various leader types, and that the leadership processes are also varied. The leader's function depends to a large degree upon the group or the organization of which he is a part and the process by which he is selected for his position. Generally leaders come by their positions in one of two ways. They emerge from within their group when the group feels a need and looks to one of its members to satisfy that need, or leaders are given status positions by individuals who are superordinate to the group. Some authorities contend that in general a leader performs two functions: (1) he moves the organization towards goals that it finds acceptable; and (2) he satisfies the need dispositions of the group members.

In these two functions, the college department chairperson (the position studied in this research), and the first line supervisor in business and industry have commonality. Both positions require that the person serve the goals of the organization and the needs of those group members who are subordinate to the position. These needs are directly related to job satisfaction.

The research on job satisfaction indicates that this topic should more aptly be considered a concept rather than a concrete, definable term. It is a nebulous concept which is most often researched, defined and written about from a business and industrial frame of reference. When job satisfaction is viewed from an academic professional frame of
reference, the concept may not alter, but the specific criteria by which it is determined may.

The difference by which job satisfaction criteria is viewed is due to the existing differences between industrial or business organizations and academic organizations. The differences in these organizations affect differences in the employees of each organization. Concerning the aspects of job satisfaction, power and authority, academic professionals behave and think differently than do their business and industrial counterparts. Several authorities support this contention.

Unlike business and industrial employees, academic professionals like to consider themselves equals who govern each other through normative power. Professors are more apt to expect a voice in matters that determine their employment conditions, as well as their professional careers. Their concepts of job satisfaction, therefore, concern the degree to which they feel they have this voice.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses investigated by this study were:

1. Faculty who perceive their department chairperson's leadership style as above the median on LBDQ consideration, or one which fosters friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in his or her relationships with them will feel that they have a higher degree of job satisfaction.

2. Faculty who perceive their chairperson's leadership as one which is above the median on LBDQ initiating structure or one concerned with establishing clear cut lines of responsibility and organization and ways of getting the job done will feel that they have a lower degree of job satisfaction.

3. Faculty who think that they elect or choose their chairperson will feel that they have a higher degree of job satisfaction compared with faculty who feel that their chairperson is appointed by superordinates.

The academic department chairperson was selected as the position to be studied because it is one that may be accorded emergent leadership, status leadership, or a combination of both. The behavior of the chairperson, possibly more than any single individual, has a direct effect on
the success of the academic department in its efforts to fulfill institutional goals. Leadership style was selected as the independent variable because it is the most succinct and homogeneous way to describe how chairpersons function. The dependent variable, job satisfaction was studied because of its importance relative to the success of the academic department in its efforts to fulfill institutional goals.

General Design

Department chairpersons who were members of the Association of Departmental Administrators in Speech Communications were requested to ask their department faculty to participate in the study. Thirty-one departments from various colleges and universities throughout the nation participated. These thirty-one represented one academic discipline, speech and communications. Each department varied in size from less than ten to more than thirty.

The departments were selected on the basis of their willingness to participate, and on the basis of their having returned a minimum of three sets of questionnaires. The questionnaires asked them to describe their chairpersons' leadership styles, and to describe their personal feelings of job satisfaction.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, developed by Halpin and the Bureau of Business Research at the Ohio State University served as the criterion measure for chairpersons' leadership style.

The job satisfaction instruments that were used was an index developed by Brayfield and Rothe and an instrument which was developed from the related literature and research. The Brayfield-Rothe index was designed primarily for employees in business and industry. The other instrument called Academic Concerns Issues (ACI) was designed specifically for college teachers. A portion of this instrument asked respondents to indicate the method by which their chairperson was selected; another portion dealt with such variables as professorial rank, number of years service, salary and sex.

A score was obtained from both job satisfaction instruments, and the respondents' perceptions of their chairpersons' leadership styles was obtained from below the LBDQ. Each LBDQ dimension score was
dichotomized into above the median on initiating structure, and below the median on initiating structure, and above the median on consideration and below the median on consideration. Job satisfaction scores of respondents who perceived their chairperson in one of the four categories were compared. Also compared were the job satisfaction scores and the methods by which respondents said their chairpersons were selected for their positions.

Findings

The results of the data analyses testing the three hypotheses were presented in Chapter IV. The findings are summarized as follows:

1. The degree of job satisfaction as measured by the Brayfield-Rothe index was not significantly different for faculty who perceived that their chairperson's leadership style was above the median in initiating structure when compared with faculty who perceived that their chairperson's leadership style was below the median in initiating structure. However, when job satisfaction was measured by the ACI instrument, it was found to be significantly higher for faculty who perceived that their chairperson's leadership style was above the median in initiating structure.

2. The degree of job satisfaction as measured by the Brayfield-Rothe instrument was not significantly different for faculty who perceived that their chairperson's leadership style was above the median in consideration when compared with faculty who perceived that their chairperson's leadership style was below the median in consideration. However, when job satisfaction was measured by the ACI instrument, it was found to be significantly higher for faculty who perceived that their chairperson's leadership style was above the median in consideration.

3. The degree of job satisfaction as measured by the Brayfield-Rothe index revealed that job satisfaction is significantly higher for faculty whose chairperson is appointed by a superordinate (either with or without their approval), when compared with faculty who are allowed to choose their chairperson (either with or without superordinate approval). However, when job satisfaction was measured by the ACI instrument, it was found to be significantly higher for faculty who choose their chairperson, when compared with faculty whose chairperson is appointed.
Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the preceding findings:

1. The degree of job satisfaction is highest in college academic departments when the faculty perceives that its chairperson's leadership style is high in initiating structure and high in consideration.

2. The degree of job satisfaction and perceived chairperson initiating structure and consideration increase with faculty rank, years of service, and salary; the last two have the strongest effect.

3. The degree of job satisfaction is higher for male faculty than for their female colleagues, though there is little discrepancy in the way that both sexes perceive their chairperson's leadership style.

4. The degree of job satisfaction is higher when faculty are allowed to select their chairperson. Those with the highest degree of job satisfaction were senior faculty who had served more than fifteen years, and who were earning more than $20,000 in salary. This group also perceived the highest initiating structure and consideration behaviors in their chairpersons. Since women typically held lower ranks, had served fewer years, and earned less salary, they were less satisfied with their jobs. Their comparatively less job satisfaction did not stem solely from their perception of chairpersons' leadership styles, since there was very little difference in their perceptions and the men's perceptions.

Both job satisfaction instruments reveal that faculty who perceive that their chairperson's leadership style is above the median on both LBDQ dimensions have a higher degree of job satisfaction, than faculty who perceive that their chairperson's leadership style is below the median on these dimensions. The degree of difference in job satisfaction, though not found to be significant on the Brayfield-Rothe index, was nonetheless higher for the first group describe above. The ACI questionnaire reveals a significant difference.

Hersey and Blanchard's Leadership Quadrant, and Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid would support these findings. These researchers maintain that the most successful leaders have styles which are characteristically high on both LBDQ dimensions. Several other researchers maintain

\[ \text{op. cit.} \]

\[ \text{op. cit.} \]
that successful leaders satisfy or fulfill the needs of their followers. It is logical to conclude, therefore, that faculty need dispositions (job satisfaction) are most likely fulfilled when faculty perceive that their leaders (chairpersons) exhibit styles which are high on both LBDQ dimensions.

On the basis of the data analysis, this researcher concludes also that faculty job satisfaction is higher in departments chaired by emergent leaders rather than by status leaders. Emergent leadership in academic departments is shown when department faculty are allowed to elect their chairperson with or without superordinate approval. Status leadership on the other hand, is shown when department chairpersons are appointed by superordinates with or without faculty approval.

The Brayfield-Rothe index showed that there was a significantly higher degree of job satisfaction for faculty whose chairperson was appointed. However, this index was designed primarily for business and industrial employees and their expectations of emergent leadership are not the same as those held by academic professionals. College teachers who see themselves as a collegium of scholars who regulate each other through normative power, feel that they are deserving and capable of choosing their own leaders. Accordingly, the ACI instrument which was designed specifically for college faculty, revealed that the degree of job satisfaction was higher when faculty chose their chairpersons.

One final conclusion was drawn which is supported by several writers and researchers though it is not included in any of the hypotheses. Academic professionals have unique characteristics which distinguish them from other workers and employees. These characteristics render them anomalous when so-called standardized indexes are used to assess their job attitudes.

Recommendations for Further Research

In order to conduct this study, an instrument that would measure college teachers' job satisfaction was developed from related research. Studies need to be conducted that would develop a valid and reliable
standardized instrument. Considering the present faculty trends toward collective bargaining, a valid and reliable instrument for assessing faculty job satisfaction is needed.

Secondly, though it is clear to this researcher that chairperson leadership styles and methods of chairperson selection affect faculty job satisfaction, it is not clear what other variables might also affect job satisfaction the same. Studies could be conducted to determine whether a single demographic variable like sex, age, professorial rank, salary and years in a department, for example, have any affect on faculty job satisfaction. Or a study could be conducted to determine whether combinations of these variables and, say, leadership styles have any affect on faculty job satisfaction. The current emphasis on affirmative action plans by many institutions for example, should provide impetus for studies on the effects of age and sex on faculty job satisfaction.

Finally, this study included faculty from a single academic discipline, speech and communication. Perhaps there is something indigenous to particular academic disciplines that necessarily affect the way that faculty view job satisfaction. A study could be conducted to determine whether such a relationship does exist.
APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire

Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index

ACI Instrument
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Name of Leader Being Described

Name of Group Which He Leads

Your Name

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.
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DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A—Always
B—Often
C—Occasionally
D—Seldom
E—Never

1. He does personal favors for group members. A B C D E

2. He makes his attitudes clear to the group. A B C D E

3. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E

4. He tries out his new ideas with the group. A B C D E

5. He acts as the real leader of the group. A B C D E

6. He is easy to understand. A B C D E

7. He rules with an iron hand. A B C D E

8. He finds time to listen to group members. A B C D E

9. He criticizes poor work. A B C D E

10. He gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E

11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E

12. He keeps to himself. A B C D E

13. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E

14. He assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E

15. He is the spokesman of the group. A B C D E

16. He schedules the work to be done. A B C D E

17. He maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E

18. He refuses to explain his actions. A B C D E
19. He keeps the group informed. 
20. He acts without consulting the group. 
21. He backs up the members in their actions. 
22. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. 
23. He treats all group members as his equals. 
24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. 
25. He gets what he asks for from his superiors. 
26. He is willing to make changes. 
27. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. 
28. He is friendly and approachable. 
29. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations. 
30. He fails to take necessary action. 
31. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them. 
32. He lets group members know what is expected of them. 
33. He speaks as the representative of the group. 
34. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation. 
35. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity. 
36. He lets other people take away his leadership in the group. 
37. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members. 
38. He gets group approval in important matters before going ahead. 
39. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. 
40. He keeps the group working together as a team.
Job Questionnaire

Please cross out the phrase below each statement which best describes how you feel about your present teaching job. There are no right or wrong answers. I would like your honest opinion on each one of the statements, so please answer all of them.

1. My job is like a hobby to me.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. I consider my job rather unpleasant.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. I am often bored with my job.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

8. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

10. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.
    STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

11. I definitely dislike my work.
    STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

12. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.
    STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

13. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
    STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

14. Each day of work seems like it will never end.
    STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

15. I like my job better than the average college teacher does.
    STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE
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16. My job is pretty uninteresting.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

17. I find real enjoyment in my work.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE

18. I am disappointed that I ever took this position.
   STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  UNDECIDED  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE
Governance and Administration Questionnaire

Please indicate the degree of your involvement as you view it in DEFINING, DEVELOPING, or IMPLEMENTING the following. Indicate by using the following scale:

1...No involvement  
2...Some involvement  
3...Average involvement  
4...Considerable involvement  
5...Total involvement

If none of these indications apply, or if the question does not apply, do not answer.

CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE
Your involvement in DEFINING, DEVELOPING, or IMPLEMENTING

As it actually is  As you would have it

### ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Your involvement in DEFINING, DEVELOPING, or IMPLEMENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental appointments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New courses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in existing courses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research projects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty duties other than teaching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading practices of the department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teaching schedule</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum class enrollment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONNEL MATTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Your involvement in DEFINING, DEVELOPING, or IMPLEMENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommending tenure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave of absence policy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment of non-academic personnel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PERSONNEL MATTERS (continued)

**CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE**

Your involvement in **DEFINING, DEVELOPING, or IMPLEMENTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As it actually is</th>
<th>As you would have it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recruitment and selection</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty terminations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week faculty should be &quot;on duty&quot;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty merit salary increases</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for faculty promotion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

| Allocation of travel funds | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Allocation of research funds | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Allocation of extra-curricular activity funds | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Allocation of co-curricular activity funds | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Allocation of equipment funds | 1 2 3 4 5 |

For this section please indicate your perceptions of departmental committees in terms of the committees' **MEMBERSHIP** and **FUNCTION**. Use the following scale:

1. Always
2. Usually
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Does not apply
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES</th>
<th>As they actually are</th>
<th>As you would have them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The membership is repre-</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentative of the faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a whole ................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The membership is more</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative than the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty as a whole .......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The membership is more</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal than the faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a whole ...............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The membership seems to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be chosen from a relatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small group .............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more able members</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the department seem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to serve on committees ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committees have consid-</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erable influence on decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that affect the whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department ..............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS

Instructions for Department Chairpersons

Follow-up Letter
March 20, 1975

Dear Department Chairperson or Head:

Thank you for graciously consenting to help me in my study. Here are the instruments that I told you about in my request. I have enclosed the following sets:

1. The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire
2. The instrument entitled, Faculty Perception of Job Satisfaction Within the Department She or He Teaches

I trust that you will find the directions for each of these simple and self-explanatory. Though the instruments look as though they are time consuming, actually the responses are merely checks or circles and take a relatively short time.

There should be one of each instrument for each of your department members who agree to take part in the study. So each respondent should complete ONE LBDQ INSTRUMENT AND BOTH JOB SATISFACTION INSTRUMENTS.

One last request. Please ask all respondents to return both instruments in the self-addressed envelope by April 15 if at all possible.

Thanks once again.

Sincerely,

Earl M. Washington

PS
If you or your colleagues would like the results of the collected data, let me know.
April 17, 1975

Dear Department Chairperson:

A few weeks ago your department consented to participate in a research project by completing three instruments. Although I have received many responses, some have yet to come in. Perhaps due to the rush that typically takes place during the end of the winter term your department has misplaced or forgotten about the instruments.

Will you please ask the department to make a special effort to find and complete the questionnaires so that I can complete the research. If your department has already cooperated, please express my sincere thanks and appreciation.

Sincerely,

Earl M. Washington
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