

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8112165

TIBOAH ANSAH, GODFRED

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN
AND CHAIRWOMEN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY WITH RESPECT
TO THEIR UPWARD MOBILITY TO THEIR PRESENT POSITION, THEIR
RETROSPECTIVE ROLE EXPECTATIONS, AND THEIR JOB SATISFACTION

Michigan State University

PH.D.

1980

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ACADEMIC DEPART-
MENT CHAIRMEN AND CHAIRWOMEN AT MICHIGAN
STATE UNIVERSITY WITH RESPECT TO THEIR
UPWARD MOBILITY TO THEIR PRESENT
POSITION, THEIR RETROSPECTIVE
ROLE EXPECTATIONS, AND
THEIR JOB SATIS-
FACTION

By

Godfred Tiboah Ansah

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1980

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN AND CHAIRWOMEN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY WITH RESPECT TO THEIR UPWARD MOBILITY TO THEIR PRESENT POSITION, THEIR RETROSPECTIVE ROLE EXPECTATIONS, AND THEIR JOB SATISFACTION

By

Godfred Tiboah Ansah

The academic department in the institution and the department chairpersons are very important in determining the educational success of the institution. The academic department is that part of the college or school where most academic actions take place. In spite of the importance, very little research has been conducted on department chairpersons, especially in a large university. Further, virtually no research has been done on academic department chairwomen. This study focused on the chairpersons' upward mobility to the present position, retrospective role expectations, and their job satisfaction.

Two methods of data collection used were an in-depth interview and questionnaire. The data were presented and analyzed both statistically and descriptively. Quotations provided additional information to the qualitative analysis.

Conclusions

It was concluded from the study that (1) the amount of paperwork attached to the job of the department chairperson is overwhelming. This leaves the chairperson less time for other responsibilities; (2) there was no difference in factors of upward mobility, actual behavior, and job satisfaction between the chairmen and chairwomen; (3) the chairpersons valued the quality of work, "psychic compensation," and intrinsic rewards of their job more than financial compensation. Although they received far less than those administrators with similar qualifications and experience who are in business, government, and private organizations, the chairpersons would not like to go into business, government, or private organizations; (4) the position of the department chairperson is a difficult and complex one. However, being a chairperson allows one to schedule time more freely than in some other jobs.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were offered for higher echelon administrators, researchers, and prospective chairpersons in large universities and/or departments.

- (1) Because almost all respondents indicated that the previous chairperson had resigned, there is a need for a study of former chairpersons who resigned their positions to identify and examine the factors that led to their resignations.

- (2) Higher level administrators should try to reduce or alleviate restrictions on the department chairpersons for effective operations.
- (3) Higher level administrators should really re-evaluate the specific need of paperwork demanded of the chairpersons. The administrators should make use of other sources of information, such as the computer.
- (4) Prospective chairpersons should anticipate less time for teaching and research than for administration.
- (5) Persons interested in the position of chairperson should not go into administration immediately after the Ph.D. degree. The person should establish himself or herself by means of research and teaching. This would enable the person to go back into teaching or research when the administrative position is not just as he/she wanted.
- (6) The administration should give more control to departments and chairpersons; the chairpersons should be given the opportunity to reward good behavior.

DEDICATION

This document is dedicated to God, the Giver
of all things, my mom, dad,
and daughter, Kate.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Life could not afford to be meaningful if I came to this institution of higher learning, pleased myself, and forgot my assignment here at Michigan State University. This document is the product of the efforts and results of the assignment here. However, this document would not have come into being at this time if it were not for the help of others. Indeed, worthy accomplishments are seldom obtained without the support, guidance, and encouragement from others. I do hereby thank all and sundry who contributed in diverse ways to help in the achievement of my goal at this institution.

My special thanks go to my excellent doctoral committee which has ably guided my efforts. I am very much indebted to Dr. Howard Hickey, my committee chairman, who has been a wonderful person in my life. Dr. Hickey has been my counselor, my mediator, my teacher, a brother, and a friend.

I am also indebted to Dr. Richard Featherstone for his continuing interest, his suggestions, and encouragement. My unreserved gratitude also goes to Dr. Melvin Buschman, who was my advisor during my master's program. Without his professional counseling, my advanced degree might not have

been continued. I am grateful to Dr. Lawrence Foster of Management for all of his assistance and guidance.

My deepest appreciation goes to Dr. Marylee Davis, Assistant Vice President for Public Relations and Assistant Professor, Administration and Higher Education, for her interest and support in the study. Her support letter for the survey was very helpful. I also appreciate the help and expertise of Mr. Khalil Elaian, a Staff of the Institute for Research in Teaching (IRT), College of Education. His assistance in the computer aspect of the study and in the analysis of the data has been enormous.

I am very grateful to Dr. Ralph Bonner, Director of Human Relations, and Mr. Silas Taylor, Jr., Assistant Director of Minority Programs, for their brotherliness, passion and the unique ways they have been of help to me. Indeed, they have made my life meaningful in so many ways to be listed. My grateful acknowledgments are extended to all the staff of the Department of Human Relations for their support and good working relationship.

Only those who have been there can appreciate the close friendships that grow during doctoral struggles. I am very grateful to Priscilla Diane Davis for the fine typing she did on the first manuscript and for sharing the trauma of my doctoral struggle.

Finally, I would like to express my unreserved gratitude to all the chairpersons, who, although very busy,

gave me the time to interview them and to complete the questionnaire. I appreciate their expertise and the demonstration of their professionalism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Rationale for the Study	7
Purposes of the Study	10
Significance of the Study	11
Generalizability and Limitations of the Study	13
Definitions of Important Terms	14
Summary	18
Overview of the Remaining Chapters	19
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	21
Introduction	21
Mobility of Men and Women Professionals in Higher Education	22
Reasons for Underrepresentation of Women Administrators	29
Retrospective Role Expectations	58
Job Satisfaction	60
Job Difficulty and Frustrations of Department Chairpersons	68
Summary	74
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	76
Introduction	76
Research Design	77
Research Questions and Hypotheses	78
The Procedures	83
Population and Sample	83
Instrumentation	84

CHAPTER	Page
Data Collection Procedures	88
Data Analysis	91
Summary	91
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	93
Introduction	93
Overview of the Academic Department Chairpersons	94
Personal Information and Opinions About Present Position	95
Nature of Previous Position and Reasons for Changing Position	100
Summary	106
Factors of Upward Mobility of Department Chairpersons	107
Factors Affecting the Mobility of Chairwomen	108
Factors Affecting the Upward Mobility of Chairmen	113
Additional Factors Affecting Upward Mobility and Their Statistical Analysis	116
Respondents' Opinions on Why Few Women Administrators Are Serv- ing in Administrative Posts in Higher Education	119
Respondents' Suggestions for Prospective Department Chairpersons	126
Summary	131
Retrospective Role Expectations	133
Retrospective Role Expectations of the Chairwomen	134
Retrospective Role Expectations of the Department Chairmen	136
Expected Utilization of Time Versus Actual Use of Time	140
Statistical Analysis	145
Summary	159
Job Satisfaction	160
Challenges of the Job of Chair- person	160

CHAPTER	Page
Theories of Job Satisfaction in Relation to the Chairpersons' Satisfaction	164
Power, Authority, and Influence of the Department Chairpersons . . .	168
Job Difficulty and Concerns of the Department Chairpersons	171
Overall Job Satisfaction	177
Statistical Analyses	179
Summary	181
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOM- MENDATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS	183
Summary	183
Introduction	183
Overall View of the Study	184
Findings of the Study	188
Conclusions	192
Recommendations	193
Reflections	194
BIBLIOGRAPHY	195
APPENDICES	203
APPENDIX	
A. An Account of What is Expected of a Chairperson in a Large University	203
B. Duties of a Divisional Chairman at Harrisburg (PA) Area Community College	206
C. Questionnaire	211
D. Interview Guide	225
E. Survey Letters	228
F. Data Report on Computer Output	233

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Employed and Unemployed Women, Annual Averages 1950-76	23
2. Occupational Distribution of Employed Women, Annual Averages Selected Years 1950-1976	26
3. Women as a Percentage of Faculty Members in Four-Year Colleges and Universities	27
4. Women as a Percentage of Academic Admin- istrators in Four-Year Colleges and Universities, 1969-70	28
5. Percent of Employed Women in Each Occu- pation Group with Year-Round Full- Time Jobs in 1975	36
6. Length of Time on Current Job of Women and Men, January 1973	37
7. Employment of Women in Selected Occupa- tions 1950, 1970, and 1976	50
8. Differences Between Actual Average Salaries of Male and Female Faculty Members and Average Salaries Predicted on the Basis of the Equation for the Opposite Sex, by Type of Institution, 1969	56
9. Age Categories of the Chairpersons	95
10. Marital Status	96
11. Years as Chairpersons for All Respondents . . .	97
12. Rank or Status Compared with Previous Position	98
13. Difference Between Present Salary and Salary That Would Have Been Received	99

Table	Page
14. Suitability of Position for Chairpersons	99
15. Years of Experience as Faculty Member and/or Administrator Before Present Position	101
16. Number of Years in Present Position	103
17. Relationship of Individuals Who Encour- aged Chairpersons to Go to College or Seek Advanced Degree(s)	110
18. Incidents of Support and Nonsupport	112
19. Average Percentage of Time in Three Roles . . .	141
20. Perception of Role of Self	143
21. Frequencies of Responses for Chairwomen	148
22. Frequencies of Responses for Chairmen	151
23. Frequencies of Responses for All Chair- persons	154
24. Ratings of the Job, Department Chairperson . . .	161
25. Comparison of Outcome of Duties and Inputs . . .	165
26. Percentages of Chairpersons on Perception of Influence in Decision-Making	172
27. Percentages of the Chairpersons Who Would Apply for the Job	178

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Historical Overview of Academic Departments

The present-day academic department is the product of specialization of disciplines and decentralization of control and authority that started in about 1825. Though the term "department" is used by Hastings Rashdall in his Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages when describing the University of Paris in 1213, the term seems to have been used to refer to an earlier form of organization that is equivalent to our present-day college and professional school pattern, rather than to the modern academic department.¹

As stated by Kay J. Anderson, Josiah Quincy's History of Harvard University (1840) provided the first reference to something called a department at Harvard College in 1739. Speaking of the overzealous encroachment

¹Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, edited by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), Vol. 1, p. 324.

of a governing board upon departmental prerogatives, Quincy noted:

The zeal and anxiety of the Board of Overseers at this period, extended not only to the religious principles held by the Professors and Tutors at the time of their election, but also to the spirit and mode in which² they afterwards conducted their respective departments.

From their review of the historical development of departments, Dressel and Reichard report that in 1823, a student rebellion at Harvard resulted in the expulsion of forty-three of a class of seventy, and prompted the Board of Overseers to a thorough examination of the College. Among the resulting changes effected in 1825 was the reorganization of the university (so recognized in 1780 by the Massachusetts state constitution) into six departments. The two authors assert that a move toward departmentalization was also apparent at the University of Virginia, which began instruction in 1825 and was organized into separate and distinct schools, each headed by a full professor.³

The departmentalization of Harvard and the University of Virginia was followed by that of the University of Vermont (1826) and the University of Wisconsin (1837).⁴

²Kay J. Anderson, "The Ambivalent Department," Educational Record XLIX (Spring, 1968), p. 207.

³Paul L. Dressel and Donald J. Reichard, "The University Department: Retrospect and Prospect," Journal of Higher Education XLI (5) (May, 1970), pp. 387-402.

⁴Merle Curti and Vernone Carstensen, The University of Wisconsin, 1848-1925: A History (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), Vol. 1, pp. 77-81.

Departmental organizations at these universities injected a new idea--providing a new flexibility for students and organizing the faculty into specialized instructional units--into other higher institutions and universities such as Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Yale, Princeton,⁵ and the University of Chicago⁶ became thoroughly departmentalized.

From the first establishment (in 1825) to the last decade of the nineteenth century, departmentalization had been a gradual process. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, founded in 1905, proceeded to establish standards which specified that a college, in order to participate in its pension program, must have at least six departments.⁷

As colleges became complex in organization and as specialization grew, the academic department became part of the organizational structure of higher education.⁸ By the first decade of the twentieth century, the department, with

⁵Laurence R. Veryse, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 320-321.

⁶Richard I. Storr, Harper's University: The Beginnings (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), pp. 75-76.

⁷Ernest V. Hollis, Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 136-137.

⁸Paul L. Dressel; F. Craig Johnson; and Philip M. Marcus, The Confidence Crisis (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969), pp. 2-4.

all of its inherent strengths and weaknesses, was firmly entrenched in the American university.⁹

The Academic Department Today

During the course of its development, the academic department was used as an administrative device to delegate responsibility while avoiding total faculty involvement. It soon became apparent that the reputation of a university depended upon the reputation of its departments and the scholars within them. Today, the university judges itself and is judged by the quality of its departments. The department likewise judges itself on the basis of national, rather than local norms.¹⁰

The academic department is now considered the "center of actions"--that part of the college or school where most academic actions take place. It is estimated that 85 percent of all administrative decisions take place at a departmental level.¹¹ Dressel and Reichard reported:

The academic department in the modern university is, like the university itself, the result of the interaction of many forces. And . . . it has become a potent force, both in determining the stature of the university and in hampering the attempts of the university

⁹Dressel and Reichard, op. cit., p. 394.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 395.

¹¹James H. L. Roach, "The Academic Department Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities," Educational Record (Winter, 1976), p. 13.

to improve its effectiveness and adapt to changing social and economic requirements.¹²

In defending departments, Trow wrote:

. . . the academic department remains the central organizational unit of American universities and of many colleges, and it must be given much of the credit for the extraordinary success of American higher education over the past century in extending both educational opportunities and the frontiers of knowledge.¹³

Most institutions are departmentally organized and administered. In his Notes for a Talk on Departmental Organization, T. R. McConnell points out: "As an institution grows larger and more complex, decision-making and administration are increasingly decentralized. The locus of effective decision-making moves progressively closer to the members of the organization who are finally affected."¹⁴ Thus, the department has been ". . . the major avenue through which faculty members in large universities have influenced decisions."¹⁵

¹²Dressel and Reichard, op. cit., p. 387.

¹³Martin Trow, "Departments as Context for Teaching and Learning," Academic Departments, eds. Dean E. McHenry and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 33.

¹⁴T. R. McConnell, Notes for a Talk on Departmental Organization, talk presented at the Workshop for Department Chairmen, sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Institute for College and University Administrators, Salishan, Oregon, November 5-7, 1967.

¹⁵Doris W. Ryan, "The International Organization of Academic Departments," Higher Education 43 (June, 1972), p. 464.

The Department Chairperson

There are many who would agree with Roach that the department chairperson is the individual upon whom the success of the department largely depends. Today the academic department chairperson is a key to the successful achievement of the school's primary mission. This is the man or woman caught in the middle in any serious effort to change the way higher education functions.¹⁶ Writing on "Apologia for the Department Chairman," Gerald F. Kreyche parallels the importance of the academic department chairperson to that of the top sergeant in the army thus:

It is an Army truism that you could do away with generals, colonels, and majors, but, if you wanted the job done, you could not do away with the top sergeant. He ran the company. Every enlisted man--as well as a few officers--knew it. He was the hidden decision-maker, the enforcer, the grease that took the squeak out of the machinery. In every organization, he has a counterpart. In academia, his counterpart is the chairman.¹⁷

Corson views the chairperson as a "bastion of the status quo or a means by which presidents, provosts, and deans can make their leadership effective."¹⁸ James Brann noted:

. . . the department chairman is the person who makes the institution run. He really is the foreman. As one

¹⁶James H. L. Roach, op. cit., p. 13.

¹⁷Gerald F. Kreyche, "Apologia for the Department Chairman," Intellect 101(2343) (October, 1972), p. 49.

¹⁸J. J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 93.

chairman put it . . . "he is the guy who gets hell from everyone."¹⁹

Rationale for the Study

In spite of the importance of the academic department in the institution and of the department chairpersons in determining the educational success of the institution, very little research has been conducted on them.

Dressel et al. noted that the most extensive systematic investigation of department chairpersons has been done with small private colleges. They challenge: "The department chairmen of large universities, both private and state, have to be investigated empirically."²⁰ Thus there was a need seen to investigate chairpersons of large universities. The lack of extensive research on departments and department chairpersons was also identified by Heimler.²¹ Charles Heimler, as cited by Clark, reported that:

Extensive research has been done on management of industrial enterprises with resultant improved management procedures. He found that similar studies in higher education could contribute to upgrading of teaching and other college services. However, little research has

¹⁹James Brann, "The Chairman: An Impossible Job About to Become Tougher," in The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, eds. James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet (Detroit: Balamp, 1972), p. 6.

²⁰Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus, op. cit., p. 243.

²¹Charles H. Heimler, "The College Department Chairman," in The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, eds. James Brann and Thomas A. Emmet (Detroit: Balamp, 1972), p. 205.

been done on the chairperson's place in management and administration.²²

Worse still, research on the female academic department chairperson is almost nonexistent. Almost all reports and books on the status of women in higher education discuss the lack of women in administrative posts in colleges and universities. Very little research has been done which sheds light on the reasons that there are so few women in administrative posts in either primary-secondary education or higher education.

In a comparative study of men and women in administrative positions in 312 schools of education, Mattes and Watkins found that women held only 8 percent of the total administrative positions.²³ Their report indicated that 5 percent of the women were deans, 7 percent were assistant deans, 4 percent were department heads, 23 percent held other related positions classified as "staff" positions.

²²Eldon Lavern Clark, A Study of Art Department Chairpersons of the Big Ten Universities: Their View of Their Role, Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, 1978.

²³Linda Mattes and Foster Watkins, "Women in Administration in Schools of Education," Intellect C11 (November, 1973), pp. 132-133.

Van Meir also reported that the percentage of women in administrative leadership posts during the past four decades has steadily declined.²⁴ He indicated:

In 1928, according to a National Association of Elementary School Principals research report (Thirty-Seventh Yearbook, 1958), 55% of the elementary principalships were held by women. By 1958, this percentage had dropped to 41%, and by 1968 the figure had decreased to 22%.

In her dissertation on Women Administrators in the Big Ten Universities, Florence Stevenson noted: "Literature pertaining to higher education abounds; however, literature concerning women administrators is rare."²⁶ It is very imperative that intensive studies are made on women administrators, especially department chairwomen, so that strategies of how those administrators made it would be known and assist others in getting into high administrative positions.

This study, therefore, attempts to examine the mobility, retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction of academic department chairmen and chairwomen.

²⁴Edward J. Van Meir, "Sex Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors 38(2) (Summer, 1975), pp. 163-167.

²⁵Department of Elementary School Principals, "The Elementary School Principal," Thirty-Seventh Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958).

²⁶Florence Byrd Stevenson, "Women Administrators in Big Ten Universities," Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1973.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were:

1. To provide additional information on department chairpersons and thereby contribute to the body of knowledge on administrators in higher education.
2. To provide mobility strategies--academic, vocational, or otherwise--adopted by chairpersons to get to where they now are in their careers. These strategies may be helpful to others aspiring to be academic department chairpersons.
3. To identify the retrospective role expectations of the chairpersons and the reality--their actual experience on the job.
4. To examine whether or not academic department chairpersons are satisfied with their jobs.

The bases for the third and fourth purposes are that (a) the more an individual's expectations are met on the job, the greater his or her satisfaction with the job,²⁷ and (b) the more an employee is satisfied with the job, the less likely will he/she voluntarily quit or withdraw.²⁸

²⁷M. E. Katzell, "Expectations and Dropouts in Schools of Nursing," Journal of Applied Psychology 52 (1968), pp. 154-157.

²⁸A. H. Brayfield and W. H. Crockett, "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance," Psychological Bulletin 53 (1955), pp. 396-424. (Brayfield and Crockett found evidence of a strong relationship between employee dissatisfaction and withdrawal behavior.)

Finally, the study took a comparative approach to examine differences and similarities in the areas of upward mobility, retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction between chairmen and chairwomen of academic departments. Attention to the findings reported herein could be helpful to university administrators in knowing the concerns of department chairpersons, advisors to women students, and affirmative action officers.

Significance of Study

This study is important for the following reasons:

1. Patterns of mobility strategies employed by the chairwomen and/or chairmen will be of help to other administrators and faculty members who would want to get into the seat of the department chairperson. The means by which the chairpersons got to their present positions may serve as "Routes to the Executive Suite"²⁹ of academic departments of higher institutions. In Hennig and Jardin's book on mobility, portraits of the personal and professional lives of twenty-five women who did make it to the top--as vice-presidents and presidents in major industries--identify the qualities and the

²⁹Dr. Eugene E. Jennings, Professor of Organizational Behavior in the Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University, gives a comprehensive account of mobility strategies and psychology that today's business executives need for their climb up a corporate ladder in his well-documented book, the Routes to the Executive Suite.

environment that were conducive to their success and show how competent women can follow in their footsteps.³⁰ The findings of this study have indicated qualities that would help women, as well as men, in higher education to get the position of academic department chairperson.

2. The expectations which the chairpersons held of their job before they assumed duty might have affected the degree of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The study was expected to indicate whether there is a relationship between the chairpersons' retrospective role expectations and their satisfaction with their jobs.
3. The study was expected to indicate whether department chairpersons are satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs. In general, very strong evidence has been found in support of the contention that overall job satisfaction represents an important force in the individual's participation decision and withdrawal (turnover). This has been demonstrated among a diversity of work group populations and in organizations of various types and sizes.³¹

³⁰Margaret Hennig and Ann Jardin, The Managerial Woman (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977).

³¹Clay W. Hamner and Frank L. Schmidt, Contemporary Problems in Personnel (Chicago: St. Clair Press, 1974), p. 348.

In this study, areas of concern have been identified wherever they do exist. Suggestions from the chairpersons themselves and the researcher's own recommendations will serve as indices by which upper echelon administrators can work to remove the source(s) of dissatisfaction.

Generalizability and Limitations of the Study

Generalizability

Since the sample was limited to chairpersons at Michigan State University, the findings can only appropriately be generalized to this institution. Referring to how complex departments are, McConnell wrote:

The nature of departments varies so greatly, not only among institutions, but with particular institutions, that it is very difficult to make valid general statements about departmental organization and administration.³²

In spite of the fact that the departments in this institution vary (for example, in size and complexity), the components of the community which the departments serve or respond to--students, faculty and staff, and administrators--are the same. Thus the findings of this study may be generalized to large departments at Michigan State University and/or large universities.

³²T. R. McConnell, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

Limitations

The study's limitations were as follows:

1. This study did not cover the expectations which students, faculty and staff, and/or upper echelon administrators hold of the departments and department chairpersons.
2. Since the women chairpersons in the population were few, all female chairpersons and assistant chairpersons were part of the sample.
3. Representativeness was limited to those chairpersons willing to participate in the study.
4. Since temporal elements prohibit exact replication of this study, these findings must be evaluated in view of the questions contained in the questionnaire and interview guide.
5. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher for this study and since there was no check of validity and reliability, this limits the generalized ability of the study.
6. Directors of schools, institutes, and centers were not considered as part of the population of this study.

Definitions of Important Terms

Definitions for key terms used in this study will follow to provide a common basis for understanding.

Academic Department: A subadministrative element of a university or college usually associated with a field of study or academic discipline, for example, the Department of Geography.

Department Chairperson: The administrative head of a department. A female chairperson is referred to as a Chairwoman and a male chairperson a Chairman. Academic department "Head," "Chairman," and "Chairwoman" are used synonymously in this study, although there is a little distinction between the term "chairman" and "head." Featherstone explains the distinction: "The difference between department head and department chairman is often a philosophical distinction, in which the 'head' title is treated as the 'authority,' being appointed by the dean, while the 'chairman' title reflects a more democratic role, since the faculty tends to elect the chairman."³³

Men/Women Administrators: Men/women above entry level, employed full-time, primarily in nonteaching positions involving broad responsibilities, decision-making, supervision of staff, and general management functions.

Mobility: The quality or state of having the opportunity for or undergoing a shift in status within the hierarchical social level of the society. Lateral mobility is a shift in status when an individual assumes a position

³³Richard L. Featherstone, The Development of Management Systems for the Academic Department (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1972), p. 24.

similar to what he/she had. This happens when there is a transfer, a lateral move in organizational change, or a change of organization. Upward mobility results when there is a promotion (in the same organization) or a change of organization.

Visiposure: The word is a combination of visibility and exposure, with visibility being the ability of the aspirant to see the top of the "corporate olympus" and exposure the position of being seen by the men/women above. The abilities to see and copy those who can influence his career and to keep himself in view of those who might promote him are all-important to success.³⁴ High visiposure is a crucial condition of mobility. Visiposure is the reason that lateral moves count more than stays.

Mobility-channels: These are routes that a preponderant number of people have taken to the top in the past. An organization will want to know the channels to the top to establish the most common mobility patterns. Some organizations or corporations do not have channels, but most do, even though they are not precisely known.³⁵

³⁴Eugene E. Jennings, Routes to the Executive Suite (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976), p. 113.

³⁵Definition given by Dr. Eugene E. Jennings, Professor of Organizational Behavior in the Graduate School of Business, Michigan State University, East Lansing. Definition was provided in a handout for Management 818 class, Fall 1978.

Retrospective Role Expectations: The expectations which an individual had of his/her roles on a job before starting the job. The degree to which those expectations are fulfilled will affect his/her satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job.³⁶

Job Satisfaction: This refers to a person's affective attitudes or orientation toward a job. It is one measure of the quality of life in organizations. There is an increasing acceptance of the view that material possessions and economic growth do not necessarily produce a high quality of life. Recognition is now being given to the importance of the kinds of affective reactions that people experience on the job.³⁷

Withdrawal: The act of drawing someone or something back from or out of a place or position. Withdrawal is used in the study to refer to voluntarily withdrawing from a position. It is more of resignation than of being fired.

Turnover: The movement of people into, through, and out of a place considered all as a single process. One index of turnover is the number of persons hired within a period to replace those leaving or dropped from a working force.

³⁶Katzell, op. cit., pp. 154-157.

³⁷Richard J. Hackman; Edward Lawler III; and Lyman W. Porter, Perspectives in Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1977).

Control: The regulation and exercise of power through hierarchical structures or through members of a collegial group.

Authority: A power or right delegated or given, especially as a result of one's position or status. Organizational authority is executive authority. Professional authority is the authority of the expert based on special competence.

Influence: The legitimacy of authority.

Input and Output: Input is the quality or amount of time, energy, money, etc. invested in an operation. Outcome is the amount or quality produced; for example, salary, pay fringe benefits, intrinsic satisfaction. Outcome is used for "output."

Socialization: The process by which a human being beginning at infancy acquires the habits, beliefs, and accumulated knowledge of his society through his education and training for adult status.³⁸ Socialization is making fit for life in companionship with others.

Summary

This chapter consists of a brief description of the historical development of the academic departments, the present-day academic departments, and the importance of

³⁸Noah Webster, Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged (Springfield, Massachusetts: G & C Merriam Company).

departments and department chairpersons. The need for the study is explained by reference to the dearth of material on female and male chairpersons of academic departments of higher institutions and the purposes and significance of the study are explained. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the generalizability and limitations of the study, definitions of important terms used in the study, and an overview of the remaining chapters.

Overview of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter II is a review of the pertinent literature related to the study. Special attention is given to mobility of men and women administrators in higher education, retrospective role expectations, job satisfaction, and job difficulty and frustrations of department chairpersons. Theories of job satisfaction are discussed and the theoretical connection between job satisfaction and retrospective role expectation is referred to in this chapter.

Chapter III describes the design, test of hypotheses, and the population and sample of the study. The chapter poses the research questions and hypotheses, describes the instrumentation and data collection procedure, and discusses the method of data analysis of the study.

Chapter IV presents a detailed account of the findings of the study from interview and questionnaire responses. Data is presented, analyzed by means of the computer, and demographic information reported quantitatively. That

aspect of mobility, retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction that could not be presented statistically is provided descriptively.

Chapter V is a summary, interpretations of the findings, conclusions emanating from the findings, recommendations and reflections.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The focus of this study was the department chairpersons--their upward mobility, their retrospective role expectations, and their job satisfaction. To provide insight into these areas, a literature review was conducted. The review of the related literature was organized and presented under four major sections. These are: (1) Mobility of Men and Women Professionals in Higher Education; (2) Retrospective Role Expectations; (3) Job Satisfaction; and (4) Job Difficulty and Frustrations of Department Chairpersons.

These sections have not been presented with the intention of providing a detailed description of these areas, but rather are offered as an encapsulated form to provide a better understanding of why the investigation of the study was undertaken. Research findings in the literature have provided the base for the research questions and hypotheses of this study.

The sources of the literature search included:

- (1) Dissertation Abstracts International; (2) E.R.I.C. (Educational Resource Information Center); (3) Educational

Index, and (4) books, journals, bulletins, periodicals, and other publications.

Mobility of Men and Women Professionals
in Higher Education

The Labor Force

According to June 1974 bulletin of the United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau:

- (a) More than half of all women aged 18 to 64 were workers in 1974.
- (b) More than 35 million women were in the labor force; they constituted nearly two-fifths of all workers.

Table 1 shows the trend of employment and unemployment of women, relative to men. According to the United States

Working Women: A Data Book:

By mid-1977, 40 million women were in the labor force--about 41 percent of the country's entire labor force ³⁹ and 49 percent of all women 16 years of age and over.

Occupational Distribution

Continuing with the statistics, the Women's Bureau (1974) said:

- (a) The average woman worker is slightly better educated than the average man worker. Women have completed a median of 12.5 years of school, while the median

³⁹U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Working Women: A Data Book, Bulletin 1977, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Table 1

Employed and Unemployed Women, Annual Averages 1950-76

Year	Employed			Unemployed		
	Total both sexes	Women		Total both sexes	Women	
		Number	Percent of total employed		Number	Percent of total unemployed
1950	58,918	17,340	29.4	3,288	1,049	31.9
1955	62,170	19,551	31.4	2,852	998	35.0
1960	65,778	21,874	33.3	3,852	1,366	35.5
1965	71,088	24,748	34.8	3,366	1,452	43.1
1970	78,627	29,667	37.7	4,088	1,853	45.3
1975	84,783	33,553	39.6	7,830	3,445	44.0
1976	87,485	35,095	40.1	7,288	3,320	45.6

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Handbook of Labor Statistics 1975--Reference Edition and BLS, Employment and Earnings, January 1976 and January 1977.

age for men's educational achievement is 12.4 years.

However,

- (b) Women workers are concentrated in low-paying, dead-end jobs. As a result, the average woman worker earns less than three-fifths of what a man does, even when both work full-time and year-round.
- (c) Fully employed women high school graduates (with no college) have less income on the average than fully employed men who have not completed elementary school.
- (c) Women managers and administrators make up 5 percent of the total woman work force, whereas men managers and administrators form 14 percent of the work force. The Bureau points out that women are more apt than men to be white-collar workers, but that the jobs they hold are usually less skilled and pay less than those of men.

Women as Faculty Members and Academic Administrators

The review of literature indicates relatively small numbers of women faculty members and women administrators.

The Carnegie Commission contends:

. . . women represent about 46 percent of all undergraduates and about 37 percent of all graduate students in higher education, but, according to the most recent data available, they represented only 27 percent of college faculty members in 1971-72 (National Education Association, 1972). However, there is a tendency for ratios of women to men to be much smaller in

universities, and especially in highly research-oriented universities, than in other types of universities.⁴⁰

Referring to the lack of women faculty members in the 1960s, the Commission lamented:

Even more striking is that, during the decade of the most explosive growth in the history of higher education--the 1960s--women lost ground as a percentage of members of regular faculty ranks in four-year institutions, especially at the associate professor level, and gained ground only at the instructor level.⁴¹

The Commission's report indicated that Catholic women's colleges and predominantly black colleges have comparatively large proportions of women on their faculty.

On women in administration, the report said:

If women are thinly represented on faculties, especially in traditionally male fields, they are so rarely represented in top academic administrative positions as to be practically non-existent in the upper echelons. The Catholic women's colleges are an exception.⁴²

Pifer adds:

In the latter part of 1971, virtually no four-year co-educational institution was headed by a woman. Even among the nonsectarian women's colleges, there were only eight female presidents in marked contrast with the situation in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early years of the present century. And schools of social work, which used to have women deans quite frequently, were almost exclusively headed by men.⁴³

⁴⁰The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, "Women as Faculty Members and Academic Administrators," Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, Their Current Participation, Prospects for the Future and Recommendations for Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., September, 1973), p. 109.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 110.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³A. Pifer, Women in Higher Education, a paper presented at a meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Miami, Florida, November 29, 1971.

Table 2

Occupational Distribution of Employed Women,
Annual Averages Selected Years 1950-1976

Occupation Group	Percent Distribution				Women as percent of all workers in occupation group, 1976
	1950*	1960	1970	1976	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	40.1
Professional-technical	12.5	12.4	14.5	16.0	42.0
Managerial-administrative except farm	4.4	5.0	4.5	5.5	20.8
Sales	8.7	7.7	7.0	6.7	42.9
Clerical	27.8	30.3	34.5	34.9	78.7
Craft	1.5	1.0	1.1	1.6	4.8
Operatives, including transport	19.6	15.2	14.5	11.8	31.3
Nonfarm laborers	0.8	0.4	0.5	1.1	9.3
Service, except private household	3.6	4.4	1.8	1.3	16.2

*Data are for women fourteen years and over in April, 1950.

Source: U.S. Census of Population 1950, P-E No. 1B, Occupational Characteristics and Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, December, 1969, January, 1971, and January, 1977.

Table 3
 Women as a Percentage of Faculty Members
 in Four-Year Colleges and Universities

Faculty Rank	1959-60	1965-66	1971-72
All ranks	19.1	18.4	19.0
Professor	9.9	8.7	8.6
Associate professor	17.5	15.1	14.6
Assistant professor	21.7	19.4	20.7
Instructor	29.3	32.5	39.4

Source: National Education Association (1972, p. 13).

The Carnegie Commission believes that one of the factors that has contributed to a decline in the number of women holding administrative positions in co-educational institutions has been the elimination of deans of women or their subordination to deans of students.

Table 4 gives the percentages of academic administrators in higher institutions.

The Office of Women in Higher Education within the U.S. Department of Education, in 1975, completed the first of a series of statistical reports on the number of women serving in major administrative posts in accredited

Table 4

Women as a Percentage of Academic Administrators in Four-Year
Colleges and Universities, 1969-70

Administrative Offices	Total (454 institutions)	Public Colleges	Private Colleges	Over 1,000 Students	Under 1,000 Students	Women's Colleges
Presidents	11*	3	8	0	13	47
Vice-Presidents	4	0	4	0	8	17
Directors of Development	4	1	3	0	3	6
Business Managers	9	1	9	2	4	32
College Physicians	8	9	7	10	5	13
Financial Aid Directors	23	9	23	12	32	67
Placement Directors	28	14	30	10	33	73
Counseling Directors	19	9	20	5	32	67
Dean of Students	23	9	18	5	26	81
Head Librarians	35	22	37	8	62	61
Academic Deans	18	8	14	17	15	62
Associate or Assistant Academic Deans	17	11	16	12	20	44
Counselors	25	19	22	16	26	51

*Figures in percentages.

Source: R. M. Oltman, Campus 1970: Where Do Women Stand? (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C.).

institutions of higher education. This report revealed that only 148 of the 1,500 institutions had women as chief executive officers. More specifically, only four institutions with enrollments of over 10,000 were headed by women. One hundred and nine of the 148 women presidents were at two-year and four-year church-related colleges. Sixty of the 109 women's colleges had men as presidents. Similar to this pattern is the fact that there were far fewer women chairpersons than men chairpersons.

Reasons for Underrepresentation of Women Administrators

The reasons why there are so few women administrators (including women chairpersons) may be many and in some cases, intertwined. Some of the reasons given in the literature are discussed below.

Relative Ability

The most common hypotheses are that men are better suited to educational administration and that there are basic differences between the sexes in administrative ability. A number of research studies appear to provide some support for opposite views.

A study of eighty women in leadership positions in North Carolina from 1967-69 was undertaken to explore the characteristics of women leaders and compare these characteristics to male leaders. The findings of the personality questionnaire showed that women leaders participating in

the study were more intelligent, more abstract in their thinking, and had higher scholastic capacity than 91 percent of the general population.⁴⁴ The researcher, Norman, commented:

A composite picture of women leaders in North Carolina pictures these women as women of high intelligence, confident, self-assured, sufficient, resourceful, temperamentally independent, uninhibited, able to face wear and tear without fatigue, socially precise, . . . self-motivated, creative, shrewd, calculating with an intellectual approach to the situation. These women leaders are high in ability to initiate structure in an organization, and are considerate, taking into account regard for well-being and status and contributions of followers, scope of initiative, decision and action. They can tolerate uncertainty and postponement and can reconcile conflicting demands and maintain cordial relations with superiors.⁴⁵

In a similar study, Van Meir investigated the suitability of men and women for leadership positions among elementary school principals in Illinois and provided this comment:

Leader behavior of female and male elementary principals as perceived by teachers provides little evidence as to the superiority or inferiority of one group over the other. And although the two groups appear more equal than unequal, the evidence tends to favor the behavior of the female group.⁴⁶

In studies carried out at the University of Florida over a six year period on the behavior of elementary school

⁴⁴B. Norman, "A Study of Women in Leadership Positions in North Carolina," The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 1970, 36, pp. 10-14.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 11.

⁴⁶Edward J. Van Meir, Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Elementary Principals, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1971.

principals, women as a group exceeded men as a group in measures of an effective elementary school principal.⁴⁷

The study found that "democratic" behavior was more characteristic of women, with teachers expressing greater satisfaction with the human relations which existed in schools administered by democratic rather than by undemocratic principals. On relative intelligence of men and women in graduate school, the Carnegie Commission observed:

Most of the available evidence suggests that women who enter graduate school are relatively able and that women who receive the doctorate are more able on the average than men who receive the doctorate.⁴⁸

Evidence also shows that women receive higher grades in colleges than men. Among the graduate students in the Carnegie Commission Survey of Faculty and Student Opinion (1969), about 24 percent of women, as compared with 17 percent of the men, reported an undergraduate grade point average of A. On the other hand, only 11 percent of the women, as contrasted with 22 percent of the men, reported an undergraduate average of C or less. Commenting on college admissions tests, the Commission said:

On Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores, however, the record is more mixed and resembles that on college admission tests. In the period from 1969 to 1972, mean GRE scores of women on verbal ability tests were 503, as compared with 493 for men, but on quantitative

⁴⁷ H. Grobman and U. A. Hines, "What Makes A Good Principal?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1956, 40, pp. 5-16.

⁴⁸ Carnegie Commission Report, op. cit., p. 92.

ability tests, the averages were 468 and 545 for women and men, respectively.⁴⁹

The report cautioned that the fact that far fewer women relatively major in fields requiring extensive use of mathematics as undergraduates must be kept in mind in interpreting these differences.

In a frequently quoted study, Harmon (1963) obtained high school records of a large sample of men and women who were awarded Ph.D.'s in the years 1959 to 1962. The results showed superior performance for the women, not only in terms of high school rank, but also in terms of intelligence tests.⁵⁰ An especially interesting aspect of these results was that the difference between male and female test scores in physical science was larger than the average for all fields. This suggests that women who have the motivation and persistence to attain a Ph.D. in physical science are exceptionally able. Citing from findings of Harmon,⁵¹ Jessie Bernard states:

Intellectual ability is admittedly a complex variable. It is a function, among other things, of motivation, opportunity, and stimulation. Whatever its value, the finding is reported that women who receive doctor's degrees are, on the usual type of measure, are intellectually superior on the average to men who do. The

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 92.

⁵⁰Lindsey R. Harmon, Doctorate Production in United States Universities, 1920-1962, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1963.

⁵¹Lindsey R. Harmon, "The High School Backgrounds of Science Doctorates," Science, March 10, 1961.

three measures which produced this finding were high school intelligence test scores, rank in high school graduating class, and a high school general aptitude test in mathematics and science.⁵²

The writers, therefore, reject the notion that women are less capable--intellectually and personality-wise--than men in administrative roles.

Edward Van Meir, in his article "Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities (1975)," cited several suggested reasons for the lack of women in administrative roles.⁵³

Lack of Appropriate Preparation

Van Meir suggested that women are less well prepared academically to assume leadership roles. He notes:

. . . Findings tend to support this position. Data show that women are not, in general, preparing themselves for administrative positions in education. In 1962, less than 16% of women teachers had two college degrees, whereas 40% of men teachers held two degrees. . . . National Education Association data (December, 1963) indicate that 37.1% of men teachers hold master's degrees or higher, compared to 18.5% of women teachers.⁵⁴

⁵²Jessie Bernard, Academic Women, The New American Library, Inc., 1964, p. 78.

⁵³Edward J. Van Meir, "Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities," Journal of National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors--Special Issue: Women in Administration, Part 3 38(4) (Summer, 1975).

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 163-164.

Taylor (1966) noted that men hold four doctoral degrees in education to every one held by women.⁵⁵ Van Meir cogently agrees:

Also, there is evidence that women are not earning administrative credentials at the same rate as men. Figures from the United States Office of Education indicate that a greater percentage of women are receiving master's degrees (34.7% in 1967, as compared to 21.2% in 1950); however, they are not receiving them in administration, supervision, and finance.⁵⁶

Citing from Koontz,⁵⁷ Van Meir adds: "Of the 7,230 degrees earned in 1969 in these areas, 22.2% were conferred to women and 77.8% to men."

Work Span: Transitory Nature
of Work and Career
Interruption

Another frequently stated reason as to why women do not secure administrative positions is that women often lack the tenure to qualify for administrative posts. Van Meir explains:

Another reason behind women's failure to achieve administrative positions is that they are more transitory. An NEA (National Education Association) study shows that 45.2% of men teachers have been teaching in only one school system. In contrast, 30.9% of women teachers have been with only one system. Since school districts tend to give preference to teachers with

⁵⁵H. A. Taylor, "Women in Administration," in M. C. Nottle (Ed.), An Introduction to School Administration (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1966).

⁵⁶Van Meir, op. cit., p. 164.

⁵⁷E. D. Koontz, 1969 Handbook of Women Workers (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

tenure when filling administrative positions, men have an advantage.⁵⁸

On interruption of women's careers, Van Meir observes:

Career interruptions also account in part for the lack of women appointees to educational administrative posts. The teaching careers of women show a large record of leaves and temporary retirements. Two-thirds of the married women teachers, the NEA reveals, have taken at least one extended absence from teaching.⁵⁹

Generally, women have been on their current job a substantially shorter time average than men. The largest differences are for persons aged 45 to 64.⁶⁰ Table 5 provides the percentages of employed women in occupational group with year-round full-time jobs in 1975. Table 6 compares men and women on length of time on current job in 1973. For women who worked only part of the year (1975) and those who did not look for work, their major reason was "home responsibilities." Other reasons given for working only part of the year or for not looking for jobs were: illness, going to school, inability to find a job, and retirement. The percentage of women who gave "home responsibilities" as the major reason for working only part of the year was 42.8% and those who gave "home responsibilities" as the reason for not working was 69.7%.

⁵⁸Edward Van Meir, op. cit., p. 164.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 164.

⁶⁰U.S. Working Woman, op. cit., p. 55.

Table 5

Percent of Employed Women in Each Occupation Group
With Year-Round Full-Time Jobs in 1975

Occupation Group	Percent Who Worked Year Round, Full Time
All Occupations	41.4
Professional-technical	52.0
Managerial-administrative, except farm	64.5
Sales	25.8
Clerical	49.6
Craft	43.1
Operatives, except transport	38.7
Transport equipment operatives	17.4
Nonfarm laborers	32.7
Service, except private household	26.5
Private household	13.1
Farm	25.3

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Special Labor
Force Report 192, "Work Experience of the Population," 1975.

Table 6

Length of Time on Current Job of Women and Men,
January 1973

Length of Time on Job	Percent Distribution	
	Women	Men
Total	100.0	100.0
One year or less	29.3	22.4
Over 1 to 2 years	14.1	10.5
Over 2 to 5 years	23.0	20.4
Over 5 to 10 years	15.7	16.8
Over 10 to 20 years	12.2	16.4
Over 20 years	5.7	13.7
Median number of years on current job	2.8 years	4.6 years

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Special Labor Force Report 172, "Job Tenure of Workers," 1973.

Lack of Confidence and
Encouragement

According to the booklet, Adult Female Human Being, the problem for each woman adult seems to be a lack of self-confidence, coupled with a need for help in making decisions.⁶¹ The co-authors, Murray and Erickson, suggest:

The decision-making problems stem chiefly from the societal habit of assuming that decision-making is a "man's work," and the feminine habit of forgetting or denying that there is value in the endless decisions she makes both casually and carefully.⁶²

The authors continue:

A state of inquiry and indecision is often the conundrum of women who have been schooled from childhood, in the home and the classroom, to see themselves as "failures" unless they belong to somebody. They see themselves, in consequence, as appendages of others, supporters of others, dependent of others, helpmates of others, secretaries of others, counselors of others, and teachers and matriarchial protectors of others. Rarely do they see themselves with any steadiness as persons in their own right.

A British author, Barry Turner, suggests in his "Equality for Some: A History of Girls' Education" that women from lower social and cultural strata are less likely to be aware of career prospects open to them or to possess the self-confidence to push for those chances when they occur.⁶³

⁶¹Fran Murray and Mildred Erickson, "You're Not Alone," Adult Female Human Being (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press).

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Barry Turner, "Equality for Some: A History of Girls' Education," in Adventures in Education (London: Allen Lane, 1969).

Commenting on the lack of encouragement of women from men, Nancy Nieboer asserts:

One of the major problems facing the woman who wishes to rise to the top level of her profession is that of leadership image. Traditionally, males have been vested with the leadership roles in our society. Even when a woman fulfills leadership functions, she is seldom judged to be a leader, either by herself or by the men with whom she is associated. Thus she receives little or no positive feedback or reinforcement for her leadership efforts.⁶⁴

Motivation and Assertiveness

Another reason given why there are few women in administrative positions is that women seem to be less motivated to attain leadership roles. Barter (1959) found that 46 percent of men elementary teachers expressed interest in principalships, whereas only 7.8 percent of women elementary teachers expressed some interest.⁶⁵

In her article, "Women in Administration in Higher Education," Mary Ann Carroll assesses the present situation of women administrators in higher education by stating that there are few women who hold high administrative positions, not because they are not suited or qualified for them, but

⁶⁴Nancy A. Nieboer, "There is a Certain Kind of Woman," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 38 (Spring, 1975), p. 100.

⁶⁵A. S. Barter, "The Status of Women in School Administration," Educational Digest, 1959, 25, pp. 72-75.

because women do not seek such positions, and other administrators do not recommend women for such positions.⁶⁶

A study of women who earned their advanced degrees in the field of educational administration from four Michigan universities during 1965-1970 was made to determine what percentage were actually working in administrative positions and why the rest were not working in such positions. Louise Eaton found that half of the respondents were employed as administrators, but only 6.4 percent in colleges. Thirty women were not in administrative positions, seventeen by choice; thirteen of them wanted to work as an administrator, but only three of them had actually applied for a position. It would seem that the women were not motivated enough to seek administrative posts or they were not assertive enough to get into leadership roles.⁶⁷

⁶⁶Mary Ann Carroll, "Women in Administration in Higher Education," Contemporary Education XLIII (February, 1979), pp. 214-218.

⁶⁷Louise L. Eaton, A Survey of Women Graduates in the Field of Educational Administration, Dissertation, Eastern Michigan University, 1970.

Studies cited by Sylvia Lee Tibbetts (1975),⁶⁸ Baumrind (1972),⁶⁹ and Epstein (1974)⁷⁰ have indicated that both men and women equate self-assertive, independent strivings, aggressive thinking, initiating, exploring, and intellectual achievement in women with loss of femininity so extensive that it endangers their heterosexual relationships. Some women who could be successful in career roles are, instead, "blocked by society's trump card: the feeling that one cannot have a career and be a successful woman simultaneously."⁷¹

Matina Horner presented evidence that some women, fearful of appearing "unfeminine" do not develop their talents, abilities and interests because of this fear.⁷² Frazier and Sadker also found that some adolescent girls

⁶⁸Sylvia Lee Tibbetts, "Sex Role Stereotyping: Why Women Discriminate against Themselves," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 38(3) (Summer, 1975), pp. 180-181.

⁶⁹D. Baumrind, "From Each According to Her Ability," School Review, 1972, 80(2), pp. 161-197.

⁷⁰C. F. Epstein, "Structuring Success for Women," The Education Digest, 1974, 39(6), pp. 56-59.

⁷¹S. L. Bem and D. J. Bem, "On Liberating the Female Student," The School Psychology Digest, 1973, 2(3), pp. 10-18.

⁷²Matina Horner, "Why Bright Women Fail," Psychology Today, 1969, 3(6).

avoid challenges.⁷³ Karabenick and Marshall (1974) noted that the fear of success is assumed to be a stable personality characteristic learned early in life as part of female sex-role standards.⁷⁴ It may be inferred that women who are not assertive enough to get into high level administrative roles are unconsciously living by the "standards" acquired during the adolescent stage.

Leadership Models and Sponsorship

Lack of role models, support, or sponsorship may account for the fact that far fewer women are in top level administrative positions in higher education today than appears compatible with their numbers in either the faculty or the student body. Role models or identification models of behavior are essential for the development of a self-concept. Soares and Soares suggest that educators can affect the self-concepts of their students in a number of ways, including providing modeling agents of behavior.⁷⁵

⁷³M. Frazier and M. Sadker, "School Against Boys! School Against Girls!" The Instructor, 1973, 83(7), pp. 92-97.

⁷⁴S. A. Karabenick and J. M. Marshall, "Performance of Females as a Function of Fear of Success, Fear of Failure, Type of Opponent and Performance Contingent Feedback," Journal of Personality 42(2) (1974), pp. 220-237.

⁷⁵L. M. Soares and A. T. Soares, "Test of Self-Concept as Measures of Personality Change," Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED. 076 638, February 1973.

Elliott reports that the occupational aspiration levels of female college freshmen were raised significantly as a result of exposure to videotaped interviews with female career role models and small group discussions.⁷⁶ Nancy Nieboer suggests:

Just as Abraham Maslow sought the best possible models (self-actualizers) for his psychology of the healthy, so might women seek the best possible examples (top level women administrators) for their role models in higher education.⁷⁷

In explaining the effect of lack of role models, Nieboer states:

. . . perhaps because of the scarcity of role models of successful women administrators or the stereotype of the "career woman" which still exists, most women are not ready to contemplate nontraditional high-level administrative positions (those other than Dean of Women, Nursing, or Home Economics) in coeducational institutions. These two problems are clearly interrelated; without role models, an increase in women administrative applicants seems unlikely; without an increase in applications and appointments, the number of women administrators is not likely to increase. A way must be found to break this unproductive [cycle].⁷⁸

Nieboer suggests that in the absence of role models, personality profiles of women administrators in higher education would be useful in attracting more women to top level administrative positions. She adds: "Such a profile would

⁷⁶E. D. Elliott, "Effects of Female Role Models on Occupational Aspiration Levels of College Freshman Woman," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1972.

⁷⁷Nancy Nieboer, op. cit., p. 99.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 99.

indicate whether or not there are characteristics common to all or most women holding such positions."

Sponsorship is as important as role models.

Jennings counsels that one must have a credible source of information within the firm and that in the early stages of his executive career, a subordinate needs to model himself after somebody.⁷⁹ Unless they are carefully coached and counseled by sponsor-type superiors, they will lose their footing.⁸⁰

Evidence of sponsorship has been reported in studies involving eastern metropolitan areas. In five areas, women executives were often found to have been taken under the protection of an influential sponsor who prepared them for responsibility, and then at the critical moment, suggested them for the position that became vacant. Usually the sponsor was a man.⁸¹ Hennig comments on the executive women in her study:

Upon entering the business world they quickly became affiliated with a particular young executive with whom they worked throughout most of their careers.⁸²

⁷⁹Eugene Jennings, op. cit., p. 236.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 27.

⁸¹Margaret Cussler, The Woman Executive (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1958), p. 17.

⁸²Margaret Hennig, "What Happens on the Way Up?" The MBA, March 1971, p. 10.

Jennings provides the criteria for sponsorship. He cites high performance and trustworthiness as examples of characteristics of the executive who is most apt to be sponsored. One must first become a "crucial subordinate" for which the conditions of trust are accessibility, availability, predictability, and loyalty. The root activity of becoming trusted by a sponsor is high interactional frequency on a face-to-face basis.⁸³

Women, however, frequently find themselves in a position where, when something needs discussing, the men get together for lunch, but send a memo to any woman who may have an interest in the matter. Informal communication tends to enhance acquisition of sponsorship. In a study of 673 laboratory scientists, of whom sixty-eight were female, Bernard observed that opportunities for informal communication depended on taking initiative in making contacts or depended on invitation from others and these tended to be less available to women. The women were less aggressive than the men in actively seeking opportunity for such communication, except by mail, and they were less often sought for such communication, even by mail.⁸⁴

⁸³Jennings, Routes to the Executive Suite, op. cit., pp. 147-170.

⁸⁴Caroline Bird, Born Female: The High Cost of Keeping Women Down (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1968), p. 192.

Cultural Attitudes and Socialization

Cultural attitudes and socialization also have been cited as contributing to the lack of women administrators. Coser and Rokoff have noted that women live with a "cultural mandate" that says that women's first responsibility is to the family and that anything else is seen as a "disruption of the social order."⁸⁵ The old misconception that "a woman's place is in the home"--nurturing the babies, cleaning the house, and upkeeping home--discourages the woman right from the age of schooling. Cultural attitudes are also cited by the 1975 Manpower Report of the President to the Congress as the major reason for occupational and pay variance between men and women workers. Such attitudes undoubtedly distress women workers. Another damaging notion inherent in the culture is noted by the Carnegie Commission thus:

A more subtle influence is the feeling of some women that reaching a salary or career status superior to their husbands is something to be avoided--a woman might somehow lose some of her charm and femininity in her husband's eyes if this occurred.⁸⁶

Another factor that affects the presence of women in higher administrative roles is role differentiation. Role differentiation in early life later affects educational and occupational choices, hours and location of work, and other

⁸⁵R. Coser and G. Rokoff, "Women in the Occupational World: Social Disruption and Conflict," Social Problems, 1971, 18(9), pp. 535-554.

⁸⁶The Carnegie Commission, op. cit., p. 121.

factors which relegate women to lower level positions in the lower paying jobs. Mary Verheyden-Hilliard parallels "Women in Administration" with "Evergreen Trees in the Forest."⁸⁷ She feels that as attention is given to how to plant the seeds and nurture young trees in order to grow more and better evergreens in the future, so should the society be willing to "grow" and "nurture" women for administrative positions. Verheyden-Hilliard asserts that the educational setting has traditionally encouraged the belief that boys and girls, males and females, are natural enemies and feel antipathy for each other. The author believes:

This sexual separatism which is the hidden agenda of schooling is the foundation for sex role stereotyping which does the most damage to future aspirations and expectations. Girls learn to accept boys' definitions of where they can play and with whom they can play. Boys learn that they can, with impunity, define the boundaries of what girls can do. Girls learn that educators see them so awful that close proximity to them in a work situation can be viewed as punishment. Boys see their desire to keep girls away from themselves as reinforced by teachers who tell them that being near girls is like being punished.⁸⁸

The fact that at kindergarten separate activities for boys and girls are condoned or encouraged prompted Verheyden-Hilliard to caution:

For every time we condone or encourage separate activities for boys and girls because they "won't" or "can't"

⁸⁷ Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard, "Kindergarten: The Training Ground for Women in Administration," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 38 (Summer, 1975), pp. 151-155.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 152.

play together, we pull another rung out of the success ladder of the woman in administration. We are encouraging a view of females as "different," as strange, a difference based not on reality, but on false views of "proper" sex role behavior.⁸⁹

She concludes that those who are really concerned about women in administration then will have to socialize girls to the belief that they have the right to move, grow, and play with the boys. It would seem appropriate to say that altering the occupational distribution requires not only the legal prohibition of discrimination, but also some fundamental changes in attitudes within the home, the school, and the workplace.

Ruth Hartley's investigation of children's concepts of adults' sex-based roles, with major emphasis on women's roles, supports the contention that children are taught to believe that woman's place is in the home. In her study, 134 children, 41 boys and 93 girls from middle-class, two-parent homes, assigned 68 percent of women's activities to the homemaking area. Hartley concluded:

. . . while men may climb snow-capped mountains, go to sea, or capture tigers, women generally are seen as remaining close to home, serving, comforting, making small decisions, and having coffee in the middle of the afternoon.⁹⁰

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 152.

⁹⁰Ruth E. Hartley, "Current Patterns in Sex Roles: Children's Perspective," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 25 (October, 1961), p. 5.

It is a well known fact to primary grade teachers that children internalize stereotypes about sex roles long before they enter public schools.⁹¹

Awareness of Career Opportunities

Another factor that might have contributed to the lack of women in administrative positions is the lack of awareness of career opportunities.

A person's view of the present and the future is based in part on that person's view of self and of those already sharing the present. Projections on where the future lies for women suggest a need for women to be alert to new job opportunities and to new training programs and get prepared in areas where services will be most needed. The 1969 Handbook on Women Workers makes the following observation about nonworking women:

Only if they are fully prepared by education, training and willingness to learn anew will they be ready for the challenges and demands of tomorrow's society. In this era of rising demand for more skilled workers, it is important women reconstitute their goals, moving away from so much "women's work" into skill areas which permit them to compete successfully for jobs in other occupational areas and levels including higher education.⁹²

Table 7 provides an overview of selected occupations and percentages of workers in 1950, 1970, and 1976.

⁹¹Jean Bernstein, "The Elementary School: Training Ground for Sex Role Stereotypes," The Personnel and Guidance Journal 51 (October, 1972), p. 97.

⁹²1969 Handbook of Women Workers, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Table 7

Employment of Women in Selected Occupations
1950, 1970, and 1976
(Numbers in Thousands)

	Percent of All Workers in Occupation		
	1950	1970	1976
Professional-Technical	40.1	40.0	42.0
Accountants	14.9	25.3	26.9
Engineers	1.2	1.6	1.8
Lawyers-Judges	4.1	4.7	9.2
Physicians-Osteopaths	6.5	8.9	12.8
Registered Nurses	97.8	97.4	96.6
Teachers (except college and university)	74.5	70.4	70.9
*Teachers, College and University	22.8	28.3	31.3
Technicians (excluding medical-dental)	20.6	14.5	13.6
Writers-Artists-Entertainers	40.3	30.1	34.7
Managerial-Administrative (except farm)	13.8	16.6	20.8
Bank Officials-Financial Managers	11.7	17.6	24.7
Buyers-Purchasing Agents	9.4	20.8	23.7
Food Service Workers	27.1	33.7	35.0
Sales Managers-Department Heads- Retail Traders	24.6	24.1	35.4
Clerical	62.2	73.6	78.7
Bank Tellers	45.2	86.1	91.1
Bookkeepers	77.7	82.1	90.0
Cashiers	81.3	84.0	87.7
Office Machine Operators	81.1	73.5	73.7
Secretaries-Typists	94.6	96.6	98.5
Shipping-Receiving Clerks	6.6	14.3	17.3

*Includes college and university presidents.

Source: Adapted from U.S. Working Women: A Data Book, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin, 1977.

The Office of Women's Programs in the U.S. Department of Education recognizes that a large number of women are both keenly interested in and already well prepared for careers in higher education. The Office is therefore building a study-and-action program to increase the number of women administrators. The action aspects are designed to improve the visibility and recognition of women and the study aspects to increase understanding and encourage advancement in higher education administration.

Marital Status

Elizabeth Scott, working for the Carnegie Commission, found that women in graduate school were more likely to be single (41 percent) than men (31 percent), reflecting the problems married women encounter in attending graduate school, especially if they have children.⁹³ An American Council on Education Report also cited similar findings.⁹⁴ It would seem justifiable then to assume that marital status has a bearing on the position of women in the work force. However, Agnes Fecher's study of women in nontraditional positions in public co-education/higher education (1972) reported that

⁹³The Carnegie Commission, Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, op. cit., p. 83.

⁹⁴J. A. Creager, The American Graduate Student: A Normative Description, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1971.

marriage had no bearing on their positions.⁹⁵ The Carnegie Commission noted that salaries of women workers may be lower than the men workers' because married women have less bargaining power than men. The mobility (geographical) constraint was cited as one of the reasons for low bargaining power.⁹⁶

First, and most important, a married woman is not usually in a position to move to another college or university at some distance unless her husband is also negotiating a move to the same area. But men tend to receive their largest salary increases when they receive attractive offers from other institutions. Either the offer is accepted, and the move is accomplished with a sizeable salary increase or a corresponding or even greater increase is negotiated at the individual's present institution. A married woman cannot convincingly negotiate on the basis of another job offer unless it is clear that her husband is also seriously considering a move to the same area. And married women are not particularly likely to receive unsolicited job offers involving a geographical move, because of the assumption that they would not be likely to accept.

The Commission's report added:

It is true that these mobility constraints are changing and may change even more in the future. . . . There are a good many examples of both male and female faculty members who teach at some distance from home.

Another reason for women's lesser bargaining power concerns their status as secondary earners.

As secondary earners in the family, academic women typically do not need to strive for salary increases as vigorously as men. As long as their compensation

⁹⁵ Agnes R. Fecher, "Career Patterns of Women in College and University Administration," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1972.

⁹⁶ The Carnegie Commission, op. cit., pp. 121-122.

represents a comfortable contribution to the family income, they are likely in many cases to be content. Thus, in the economist's terms, secondary earners tend to have different labor supply functions from primary earners.⁹⁷

Some data provide examples of women who resigned as chief executive when they got married. Early women presidents, like M. Carey Thomas, were unmarried. This was so much the tradition that Alice Freeman retired as president of Wellesley in 1887 when she married George Herbert Palmer of Harvard. The situation has changed tremendously. In the more recent years, there has been much emphasis on the college or university presidency as a two-person job, with the president's wife assuming the role of first lady and chief hostess.⁹⁸

Discrimination Against Women

Nearly every report on the status of women at colleges and universities discusses the lack of women in administrative posts in higher education. The question is: "Is there discrimination against women?" To what extent is the discrimination, if any?

Astin and Bayer's findings strongly suggest that there is discrimination against women in some forms.

In virtually all public institutions that have formal salary structures, the discrimination does not take the form of paying a woman a lower salary than a man when she is in the same step in the same rank, but it does

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 122.

⁹⁸J. Bernard, Academic Woman, op. cit., p. 16.

take the form of not moving her up through steps and ranks as quickly.⁹⁹

In her study of graduate education, Ann Heiss interviewed presidents, chancellors, and faculty members in ten leading graduate schools. Her conclusions were that there seemed to be discrimination, though attitudes toward male versus female applicants varied from department to department within the same institution. Heiss wrote:

Department chairmen and faculty members frankly state that their main reason for ruling against women is the "probability that they will marry." Some continue to use this probability as the rationale for withholding fellowships, awards, placement and other recognition from women who are allowed to register for graduate work.¹⁰⁰

Even though Heiss' study was completed only a few years ago, the climate has changed tremendously; graduate and professional schools are now subject to the provisions prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex.

Title IX¹⁰¹ and Affirmative Action programs have contributed a lot to curbing discrimination against women.

The core of the Affirmative Action is that when there is an opportunity for hiring, admitting students, etc.,

⁹⁹H. S. Astin and A. E. Bayer, "Sex Discrimination in Academe," Educational Record, pp. 101-118.

¹⁰⁰Ann M. Heiss, Challenges to Graduate Schools (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970).

¹⁰¹Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. . . ."

give consideration to equal representation. The Affirmative Action does not mean you have to create positions that cannot be funded; it does not also mean that you have to fire people in order to create vacancies for hiring.¹⁰²

Nieboer states: "There is also considerable incentive, as a result of Executive Orders and Affirmative Action programs, for colleges and universities to appoint more women to top level positions in administration."¹⁰³

There appears to be a general pattern of lower salaries for women than for men. For example, salaries of women faculty members were found to be lower than salaries of men faculty. Elizabeth Scott, working for the Carnegie Commission, found that, after controlling all the predictor variables included in her equations, the actual average salary of male faculty members exceeded the average that would have been predicted on the basis of the female equation by nearly \$2,300 (see Table 8).¹⁰⁴ Conversely, the actual average salary of female faculty members was about \$1,400 lower than the average that would have been predicted on the basis of the male equation. The Carnegie Commission report cautioned:

But it requires a complex analysis of appropriate data to determine whether these salary differences suggest

¹⁰²Explanation provided by Dr. Ralph Bonner, Director of the Department of Human Relations, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Spring 1977.

¹⁰³Nancy Nieboer, op. cit.

¹⁰⁴The Carnegie Commission, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

Table 8

Differences Between Actual Average Salaries of Male and Female
Faculty Members and Average Salaries Predicted on the
Basis of the Equation for the Opposite Sex,
by Type of Institution, 1969

Institutional Type	Number of Men*	Difference for Men	Number of Women	Difference for Women
Research Universities I	3,760	+ \$2,729	2,649	- \$2,009
Research Universities II and other Doctoral- Granting Universities I and II	3,151	+ 2,303	2,551	- 1,015
Comprehensive Universities and Colleges	985	+ 1,066	1,066	- 358
Liberal Arts Colleges II and Two-Year Colleges	831	+ 1,886	1,342	- 2,002
Liberal Arts Colleges I	605	+ 1,635	714	- 1,025
	9,332	+ \$2,264	8,322	- \$1,407

*Twenty-five percent random sample of male faculty in survey.

Source: Derived from analysis of Carnegie Commission Survey of Faculty and Student Opinion, 1969.

discrimination against women or are explained by relatively objective factors such as the smaller percentage of women faculty members who have Ph.D.'s.¹⁰⁵

The Commission cited geographical mobility constraints, among other factors, as affecting salaries of married women.¹⁰⁶ In view of these discussions, it may be said:

A substantial proportion of the intellectual talent of women has been and is being lost to society as a result of cultural circumstances. Men are given comparatively more opportunities to use their mental capacities. Women and men have equal intellectual abilities. This is demonstrated by their performances on test scores and in class grades. The supply of superior intelligence is limited, and the demand for it in the society is even greater. The largest unused supply is found among women.¹⁰⁷

The Carnegie Commission suggested strongly that it is exceedingly important for universities and colleges to take vigorous steps to correct imbalances in the immediate future. It is obvious that many changes have occurred since the commission's study, but the number of women academic administrators is still trailing behind men administrators.

Hennig and Jardin have noted that men and women may enter the business world with similar goals, but they have different assumptions and take different approaches to achieving these goals.¹⁰⁸ Assumptions, expectations, and goals which men and women chairpersons had of their jobs before they assumed their present positions have been

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 115.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 121-122.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁰⁸Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardin, op. cit.

identified by this study. That their expectations have been met has provided some clues on how satisfied they are with their jobs.

Retrospective Role Expectations

The literature on the role expectations held by individuals before entering jobs indicates that job satisfaction is viewed as the sum total of an individual's met expectations on the job. It has been proven that there is a positive relationship between met expectations and job satisfaction.¹⁰⁹

Research at an automotive manufacturer (Dunnette, Arvey, and Banas, 1973) examined two groups of employees: those who left within their first four years and those who remained longer than four years. The authors surveyed over 1,000 college graduates who either were currently or had been employed by the company. The study examined what the employees expected at the time that they accepted jobs with the company and what they actually experienced. The expectations of those who left and those who remained were similar. To control other variables, the authors also looked at how well the employees did in high school and college, where they came from, parents' educational levels, and other potentially relevant personal factors. The findings were that those who had left the company did not differ from those

¹⁰⁹Hamner and Schmidt, op. cit., p. 348.

still with the company on these latter variables. However, those who left encountered job situations far less congruent with what they wanted in the company than did those who stayed.¹¹⁰

In another study (Katzell, 1968),¹¹¹ the expectations and experiences of stress and satisfaction of 1,852 first year students in forty-three schools of nursing were assessed by questionnaire. Among the 1,852 students, 1,439 (77.7 percent) returned for the second year; 183 (9.9 percent) withdrew for academic reasons, and 230 (12.4 percent) withdrew for nonacademic reasons. Katzell found low, but significant, negative correlations between withdrawal and (a) confirmation of expectations, especially with respect to satisfaction, and (b) experienced satisfaction. Katzell explained:

. . . a student will be more likely to withdraw if she experiences a large number of unexpected stresses than if she experiences the same number of stresses, but they were expected. It should also be true that expected, but unrealized, satisfaction will tend to cause withdrawal, and that experiencing expected satisfactions will do more to prevent withdrawal than experiencing unexpected satisfactions.¹¹²

¹¹⁰M. D. Dunnette, R. D. Arvey, and P. A. Banas, "Why Do They Leave?" Personnel 50(3) (May-June, 1973), pp. 25-39.

¹¹¹Katzell, op. cit., 1968, pp. 154-157.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 155.

Katzell's conclusions included:

1. Withdrawal was inversely related to experienced satisfaction.
2. Withdrawal was inversely related to the confirmation of expectations, especially in the area of satisfactions.

In Katzell's view, withdrawal is directly related to unmet expectations. This view is consistent with that of Weitz (1956) who discovered that life insurance agents were more likely to remain in their jobs if they had a clear picture of the job duties.¹¹³ Viewing withdrawal within the framework of expectations points to the necessity of focusing on the various factors that make up the employee's expectation set. The intervening variable between fulfillment of expectations and remaining on the job is the concept of job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to a person's affective reactions to his or her work role. It is one of the measures of the quality of life. What happens to people during the work day has profound effects both on the individual employee's life and on society as a whole, and thus, these

¹¹³J. Weitz, "Job Expectancy and Survival," Journal of Applied Psychology 40 (1956), pp. 245-247.

events cannot be ignored if the quality of life in a society is to be high.¹¹⁴

With the advent of the human relations movement, there have been innumerable attempts to measure job satisfaction. Underlying these attempts have been assumptions that a person's job performance, the degree to which the person is absent and the number of employee turnovers are related to a person's job satisfaction. While there does not appear to be a simple relationship between satisfaction with one's job performance, findings support the conclusion that a person's satisfaction is an important aspect of organizational policy, as well as a fundamental part of the quality of working life for the individual. Very little is known, however, about the determinants and consequences of satisfaction.

In higher education, Solmon and Tierney are among the few who have investigated job satisfaction.¹¹⁵ Their study investigated the relationship between certain aspects of job satisfaction and organizational role congruence for selected college administrators. The study focused on nineteen aspects of an administrator's job--salary, fringe benefits,

¹¹⁴Edward Lawler and L. Porter, "The Effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction," Industrial Relations 7 (1967), pp. 20-28.

¹¹⁵Lewis C. Solmon and Michael L. Tierney, "Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among College Administrators," Journal of Higher Education XLVIII (4) (July-August, 1977), pp. 412-431.

status of institution, personal status, autonomy, variety, power, influence, relations with colleagues, competency, opportunities, challenges, visibility, responsibility, relations with students, job security, scholarly pursuits, time with family, and leisure time. Their findings indicate that college administrators are very satisfied with most aspects of their jobs, with senior administrators more satisfied than mid-level administrators. Organizational role congruence may facilitate administrator job satisfaction if the administrator considers the congruence dimension desirable.¹¹⁶

In the analysis of their results, Solmon and Tierney note:

Of the nineteen aspects of job satisfaction, the distribution of responses to all but five items were positively skewed, with a majority in the "very satisfied" category. Thus, a generally high degree of job satisfaction among college administrators is immediately apparent. Even salary, while not positively skewed, is definitely satisfactory for most college administrators; less than 10 percent of the respondents indicated that they are not satisfied.

For the four remaining aspects of job satisfaction, two patterns emerge. First, college administrators generally are less satisfied with both the vertical and lateral transfer aspects of their jobs. Second, over a third are not satisfied with the "opportunity for scholarly pursuits," "availability of time to spend with family," and the "opportunity for leisure time." Thus due to constraints upon their time, college administrators are not satisfied with the opportunity for outside activities.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 412.

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 418.

Determinants of Satisfaction

The research on the determinants of satisfaction has looked primarily at two relationships: (1) the relationship between satisfaction and the characteristics of the job, and (2) the relationship between satisfaction and the characteristics of the person. Not surprisingly, the research shows that satisfaction is a function of both the person and the environment.

Pay, promotion, security, leadership, and work itself appear to be the major sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Hackman et al. (1977) have found that pay satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, and satisfaction with supervision seem to have particularly strong influences on overall satisfaction for most people.¹¹⁸ The research evidence suggests that satisfaction is very much influenced by the actual rewards a person receives.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Various theories have been postulated to explain the determinants of satisfaction. Three of the theories--Equity Theory, Fulfillment, and Discrepancy Theory--are discussed below:

Equity Theory is primarily a motivation theory, but it has some important things to say about the causes of

¹¹⁸Richard J. Hackman, Edward E. Lawler, III, and Lyman W. Porter, Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977).

satisfaction/dissatisfaction. According to Adams' (1963, 1965) equity theory, satisfaction is determined by a person's perceived input-outcome balance.¹¹⁹ Adams explains that the perceived equity for a person's rewards is determined by his input-outcome balance; this equity, in turn, determines satisfaction. Satisfaction results when perceived equity exists and dissatisfaction results when perceived inequity exists. Thus, satisfaction is determined by the perceived ratio of what a person receives from his job relative to what the person puts into his job.

Goodman and Friedman, in an article "An Examination of Adams' Theory of Inequity," explain:

Adams defined inequity as follows: Inequity exists for a Person whenever he perceives that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of Other's outcomes to Other's inputs are unequal. This may happen either (a) when Person and Other are in a direct exchange relationship or (b) when both are in an exchange relationship with a third party and Person compares himself to Other. Outcomes refer to rewards such as pay or job status which Person receives for performing his job. Inputs represent the contributions Person brings to the job, such as age, education, and physical efforts.¹²⁰

According to the equity theory, either under-reward or over-reward can lead to dissatisfaction, although the feelings

¹¹⁹J. S. Adams, "Toward an Understanding of Inequity," Journal of Abnormal Psychology 67 (1963), pp. 422-436; also, J. S. Adams, "Injustice in Social Exchange," in L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2 (New York: Academic Press, 1965).

¹²⁰Paul S. Goodman and Abraham Friedman, "An Examination of Adams' Theory of Inequity," in W. E. Scott, Jr. and L. L. Cummings (ed.), Readings in Organizational Behavior and Human Performance (Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1973), p. 111.

are somewhat different. The theory emphasizes that over-reward leads to a feeling of guilt, while under-reward leads to feelings of unfair treatment.¹²¹

Schaffer (1953) has argued that "job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied are actually satisfied."¹²² Vroom (1964), also a propounder of the Fulfillment Theory, sees job satisfaction in terms of the degree to which a job provides a person with positive valued outcomes. He equates satisfaction with valence and adds:

If we describe a person as satisfied with an object, we mean that the object has positive valence for him. However, satisfaction has a much more restricted usage. In common parlance, we refer to a person's satisfaction only with reference to objects which he possesses.¹²³

Porter, Lawler, and Hackman define valence as:

Valence refers simply to the degree to which the individual desires the outcomes in question. Thus, valence may be either positive or negative, depending upon whether the outcome is one which is sought or avoided by the person. An outcome can become valent for an individual in two ways: (1) It can be directly satisfying of one or more of the person's needs. . . . (2) An outcome can become valent because it leads to other outcomes which satisfy an individual's needs.¹²⁴

¹²¹Hamner and Schmidt, op. cit., p. 331.

¹²²R. H. Schaffer, "Job Satisfaction as Related to Need Satisfaction in Work," Psychological Monographs 67 (1953), 14 whole, No. 364, p. 3.

¹²³V. H. Vroom, Work and Motivation (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964).

¹²⁴Lyman W. Porter, Edward E. Lawler III, and J. Richard Hackman, Behavior in Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 55.

Propounders of Discrepancy Theory maintain that satisfaction is determined by the difference between the actual outcome a person receives and some other outcome level.¹²⁵

The "other outcome level" may be that which the person feels should be received or the outcome level the person expects to receive. What is received should be compared with another outcome level and when there is a difference--when received outcome is below the other outcome level--dissatisfaction results.¹²⁶ In explaining the discrepancy theory, Porter, Lawler, and Hackman note:

In general, it appears that satisfaction is determined by the difference between the amount of some valued outcome that a person receives and the amount of that outcome he feels he should receive. The larger the discrepancy, the greater the dissatisfaction. . . . People seem to balance what they are putting into a work situation against what they feel they are getting out of it and then compare their own balance with that of other people. If this comparison reveals that their outcomes are inequitable in comparison with those of others, then dissatisfaction results.¹²⁷

Consequences of Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction

Originally, much of the interest in job satisfaction stemmed from the belief that job satisfaction influenced job performance. Specifically, psychologists thought that high job satisfaction led to high job performance.

¹²⁵Hamner and Schmidt, op. cit., p. 331.

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 331.

¹²⁷Porter, Lawler, and Hackman, op. cit., pp. 53-54.

This view has been discredited and most psychologists feel that satisfaction influences absenteeism and turnover, but not job performance. A considerable amount of recent work suggests that performance causes satisfaction. Lawler and Porter (1967) explained this "performance causes satisfaction" viewpoint as follows:

If we assume that rewards cause satisfaction, and that in some cases performance produces rewards, then it is possible that the relationship found between satisfaction and performance comes about through the action of a third variable--rewards. Briefly stated, good performance may lead to rewards which in turn lead to satisfaction; this formulation then would say that satisfaction rather than causing performance, as was previously assumed, is caused by it.¹²⁸

The research evidence clearly shows that employees' decisions about whether they will go to work on any given day and whether they will quit are affected by the feelings of job satisfaction. Brayfield and Crockett (1955)¹²⁹ and Herzbert et al. (1957)¹³⁰ both found evidence of a strong relationship between employee dissatisfaction and withdrawal behavior (both turnover and absenteeism).

Vroom (1964) reviewed the literature pertaining to job satisfaction and withdrawal. The result of his analysis generally reinforced the earlier conclusions. Vroom reported that the studies he reviewed showed a consistent negative

¹²⁸E. E. Lawler and L. W. Porter, op. cit., pp. 20-28.

¹²⁹Brayfield and Crockett, op. cit.

¹³⁰F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, R. O. Peterson, D. F. Capwell, Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinions (Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957).

relationship between job satisfaction and the propensity to leave. Vroom postulated that the more satisfied the individual, the greater the force on him to remain in the situation and the less the probability of his voluntarily withdrawing from it. The corollary of this will be: The more satisfied chairpersons are less likely to resign (voluntarily withdraw) from their posts.

Job Difficulty and Frustrations of Department Chairpersons

Role Ambiguity

According to James Brann (1972),¹³¹ "the department chairman or head is the foreman in higher education--the person who sees that the work gets done." While the job might be analogous to that of a blue-collar foreman in a plant, the academic department chairperson's job is often ambiguous and ill-defined.¹³² Roach points out:

Often there is no job description, and when a description does exist, it may be largely seen as a hodgepodge of duties described by some as a "laundry list" of undone duties and responsibilities pulled from throughout the school.¹³³

A look at the "Account of What is Expected of a Chairperson in a Large University (as described in the Penn

¹³¹James Brann, The Academic Department or Division Chairman, op. cit.

¹³²James Roach, op. cit., p. 13.

¹³³Ibid., p. 13.

State Faculty Handbook) indicates how tough the job is (Appendix A). (Also see Appendix B.)

Another view of the ambiguity of the chairperson's role is provided by Albert Smith: "We are neither fish nor fowl" is the way many department chairmen described their roles in a study of Michigan community colleges.¹³⁴ One of the major purposes of the investigation was to determine what the faculty members, chairmen, and upper echelon administrators expected of their chairmen. Twelve public two-year colleges were selected for inclusion in the research by means of a stratified random sampling plan.

A questionnaire was developed which contained forty-six job activity statements that were believed to be important job responsibilities for chairmen to perform. All of the faculty members, department chairmen, and upper echelon administrators were sent a questionnaire in the sampled college. A total of 836 faculty members, 108 chairmen, and 41 upper echelon administrator questionnaires were included in the final analysis. The lack of a clear definition of the chairman's role was the major finding of that study and appears to be a major problem confronting community colleges. Department chairmen want and need role clarification.¹³⁵

¹³⁴Albert B. Smith, "Role Expectations for and Observations of Community College Department Chairmen: An Organizational Study of Consensus and Conformity," Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., University of Michigan, August, 1970.

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 40.

There is enough evidence to suggest that well-defined operational goals are more easily attainable than ambiguous ones.¹³⁶ With goals not clearly defined, the chairperson is bound to find his/her job difficult and frustrating.

Conflicting Roles

The academic department chairperson directly or indirectly is responsive to students, the faculty and staff, and the higher administrators, such as the dean and the provost. The demands on him or her by these three sets of individuals may not be congruent and even may be conflicting. This makes the job of the department chairperson a hard "nut to be cracked." The toughness of the chairperson's job is indicated by Brann thus:

The department chairman is caught between students who want a relevant education and sense they are being short-changed, faculty who believe he should provide them with ever-increasing salaries, decreasing teacher loads and such benefits as secretaries, space, books, and travel funds and above him is a dean and a central administration who want every penny pinched and accounted for and who produce a myriad of rules and regulations which limit the chairman's flexibility and options.¹³⁷

Obviously, the chairperson occupies a "critical" position--a position which has a high probability of exposing him or her to disapproval, censure, hatred, and other attitudinal vices. McKeachie describes the chairperson's

¹³⁶G. F. Lathan and E. A. Yukl, "A Review of Research on the Application of Goal Setting in Organizations," Academy of Management Journal 18 (1975), pp. 824-845.

¹³⁷James Brann and Thomas Emmet, op. cit., p. 6.

vulnerability to criticism in the following sentence: "In many departments the attitude of the faculty toward a colleague who accepts the department chairmanship is much like that of nuns toward a sister who moves into a house of prostitution."¹³⁸ In many departments, two competing forces are omnipresent. On one hand, there exists a vigorous faculty who are continuously proposing new department activities and on the other hand, there are practical resource limitations. Thus, not all activities the department faculty would like to engage in can realistically be undertaken. The chairperson must interpose himself or herself in the faculty dialogue and mediate differences.

Matters of promotion, tenure, and merit raises may also create animosity or bad attitudes on the part of the faculty toward the chairperson. Referring to the "battles" in which the chairperson inevitably finds himself or herself, Roach writes:

The department chairperson is often caught in the middle of academic and territorial battles--caught between reform and faculty conservatives and sometimes caught between what he considers good personnel procedures and union (or other organizational) rules and restrictions.¹³⁹

¹³⁸Wilber J. McKeachie, "Memo to New Department Chairman," in Emmet and Brann (ed.), The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, op. cit., p. 43.

¹³⁹James Roach, op. cit., p. 16.

Brann also observes:

Thus, the seat of the chairman is an uneasy one in an era of societal change. He must make the existing system function while keeping an open ear and mind toward the cries for academic reform. Rushing toward him from one direction is the puzzling and somewhat alarming specter of unionism and from another, the often ill-informed political representatives of a dissatisfied public. Central administrations aided by computers and long overdue applications of management principles are becoming increasingly powerful and efficient, leaving the chairman little room to maneuver or juggle budgetary categories. His faculty is insecure and resistant to change. And his students scream "Relevance" and want to abolish traditional standards.¹⁴⁰

With all these difficulties, role conflicts, and seeming frustrations, the chairperson has relatively little authority.

Erosion of Chairperson's Power and Authority

When department chairmen are asked in interviews or polled on their major gripes, the answer is invariably a lament that their responsibility is accompanied by too little authority. One of the areas where the chairperson's authority is getting eroded is in the area of hiring. The chairperson is accountable for high quality personnel (faculty) in the department. Yet, he or she has no absolute authority to hire; he or she just recommends. After going through the ordeal of selection procedures, the chairperson may only recommend his or her choice to the dean, provost, or the president; he or she has no absolute

¹⁴⁰James Brann, op. cit.

authority to add a faculty to his/her teaching staff without approval from "above."

Attempts to measure the power of the academic chairperson, as perceived by faculty, were made by Hill and French.¹⁴¹ Their study was designed to measure the power imputed to department chairmen by professors in five state-supported four-year colleges and to determine whether variations in such power were associated with variations in the satisfaction and productivity of departmental faculty. The study revealed:

Professors consider departmental chairmen as having less influence than any other groups in the colleges, even less than the professors. Although an authority hierarchy does exist, it is quite "flat." The professors wield almost as much control as the control to which they are subject and . . . when the active and passive control measures are computed for the chairmen, it becomes evident that the chairmen have the greatest amount of influence over their own activities, and only a little less over professors.¹⁴²

The findings reported tend to confirm the impression of a number of students that colleges are unique kinds of organizations. Although, in the professors' eyes, an authority system does exist, it cannot be called a command system. Its aggregate influence is seen by professors to be relatively low. In the discussion of findings, Hill and French note:

¹⁴¹Winston W. Hill and Wendel L. French, "Perceptions of Power of Department Chairmen by Professors," Administrative Science Quarterly (1967), pp. 548-574.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 558-559.

The administrator closest to professors is perceived by them to be the least influential of the various groups in the college. It seems likely that the professors consider their chairman the first among equals, whom they expect to carry their wishes to other administrators, but who is also subject to the demands of other administrative groups.¹⁴³

Thus, the perceived power or influence of the chairperson is relatively low, but responsibilities are many.

Summary

The review of literature related to the study was presented in this chapter. The presentation was organized under the following four sections:

I. Mobility of Men and Women Administrators in Higher Education: Under this section, the labor force and the occupational distribution of women relative to men were reviewed. The discussion on the occupational distribution indicated a lack of women professionals in higher education. Suggested reasons for the lack of women administrators were reviewed and presented under subsections: Relative Ability, Lack of Appropriate Preparation, Work Span--Transitory Nature of Work and Career Interruptions of Women, Lack of Confidence and Encouragement, Motivation and Assertiveness, Leadership Models and Sponsorship, Cultural Attitudes and Socialization, Awareness of Career Opportunities, Marital Status, and Discrimination Against Women.

¹⁴³Ibid., p. 572.

II. Retrospective Role Expectations: The literature pertaining to retrospective role expectations was reviewed and presented. The relatedness of retrospective role expectations and job satisfaction was discussed under this section.

III. Job Satisfaction: This section was discussed under Determinants of Satisfaction, Theories of Job Satisfaction, and Consequences of Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction. The Equity Theory, the Fulfillment Theory, and the Discrepancy Theory have been presented to provide the framework for the discussion of the chairperson's job satisfaction.

IV. Job Difficulties and Frustrations of Academic Department Chairpersons: Under this section, the department chairpersons' concerns have been discussed under subsections: Role Ambiguity, Conflicting Roles, and Erosion of Chairperson's Power and Authority.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study focused primarily on mobility and job satisfaction of the department chairpersons. As a way of examining the chairperson's job satisfaction, retrospective role expectations were identified. Research evidence suggests that there is satisfaction if retrospective role expectations are congruent with reality (Hamner and Schmidt),¹⁴⁴ (Dunnette, Arvey and Banas, 1973),¹⁴⁵ (Katzell, 1968).¹⁴⁶

The study took a comparative approach; it examined chairwomen as a group and chairmen as another group. There was no individual (woman to man) ranking. The study covered a range of concerns peripheral, but related, to the central theme. Significant among those concerns included: reasons why few women are serving in administrative positions, power

¹⁴⁴Hamner and Schmidt, op. cit., p. 348.

¹⁴⁵Dunnette, Arvey and Banas, op. cit., pp. 25-39.

¹⁴⁶Katzell, op. cit., p. 154.

and authority of department chairpersons, and job difficulty and frustrations of the chairpersons.

To investigate the academic department chairpersons with respect to their upward mobility to their present positions, their retrospective role expectations, and their job satisfaction, two methods--descriptive method and statistical method--were used. The two methods were to be supplementary, rather than duplicating.

Topic selection was determined as a result of interest of the investigator and the lack of comparative study on academic department chairwomen and chairmen. From the literature it was found that this study did not duplicate efforts of others. The variables investigated--both dependent and independent variables--and the comparative nature of study all made the study rather unique.

The collection of information for the study was through oral responses in personal interviews and through written responses from questionnaires. This chapter describes the research design and detailed procedures used in the study. The characteristics of the population, the sampling procedures, the instrumentation (procedures for securing the data), and a delineation of the data methodology are presented.

Research Design

This study has two rather discrete intents. One aspect is based on testing the research variables--mobility,

retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction-- statistically. The other aspect is descriptive in nature and covers those aspects of the academic department chairperson's mobility, retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction that could not be presented statistically.

Statistical Analysis

Two statistical analyses were used for testing the hypotheses. These were the t-test and the Pearson Moment Correlation.

The t-test is based on a t-distribution of scores.¹⁴⁷ The "t-distributions" are symmetrical and bell-shaped, but, depending on the degree of freedom, are not exactly the shape of the UND (Unit Normal Distribution).¹⁴⁸

The Pearson Moment Correlation coefficient is based on individual z-scores for each of two observations on each subject in a sample or population.¹⁴⁹

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research questions central to the study are given below. The items on the questionnaire (Appendix C) and the questions for the interview (Appendix D) were constructed to answer the research questions:

¹⁴⁷Herbert Terrace and Scott Parker, Psychological Statistics, Units Ten and Eleven, Individual Learning Systems, Inc., 1971, Vol. V.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 10:42.

¹⁴⁹Terrace and Parker, Vol. III, Unit Fifteen, p. 15:1.

1. (a) What are the important factors which have enhanced the mobility of the academic department chairmen and chairwomen?
(b) What are the important factors which have retarded (slowed down) the mobility of the chairmen and chairwomen?
2. Did the academic department chairmen have less exact expectations for their jobs than did the chairwomen?
3. (a) If they had to do it over again, would the chairpersons choose the same job?
(b) What relationship, if any, exists between the chairpersons' retrospective role expectations and job satisfaction?
4. (a) Is there any difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors enhancing upward mobility?
(b) Is there any difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors that tended to retard (slow down) their upward mobility?
5. (a) Is there any difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of academic department chairwomen?
(b) Is there any difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairmen?

- (c) Is there any difference between academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the expected behavior?
 - (d) Is there any difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior?
 - (e) Is there any difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of all department chairpersons?
6. Is there any difference between the levels of satisfaction of the academic department chairmen and chairwomen?

Research questions (1), (2), and (3) were handled descriptively. The other research questions lent themselves to statistical treatment. Specifically, questions (4), (5c and 5d) and (6) were subjected to a t-test; questions (5a, b, and e) were treated under the Pearson Moment Correlation analysis. To examine the magnitude of the correlation or difference between the chairwomen and chairmen on mobility, retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction, the following hypotheses were developed:

1. (a) There is a significant difference between the chairmen and chairwomen on factors enhancing upward mobility.
- (b) There is a significant difference between the chairmen and chairwomen on factors that have

tended to retard (slow down) their upward mobility.

2. (a) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairwomen.
 - (b) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairmen.
 - (c) There is a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the expected behavior.
 - (d) There is a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior.
 - (e) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of all the chairpersons.
3. There is a significant difference between the level of satisfaction of the academic department chairmen and chairwomen.

An .05 alpha level of significance was used for all statistical measures.

The Descriptive Method

Descriptive analysis was used for that part of the survey which could not be analyzed statistically. Part of

the interview responses and responses to some questions on the questionnaire were subjected to descriptive analysis.

Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh provide the base for descriptive studies. "Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena."¹⁵⁰

One of the objectives of descriptive study is to determine "the nature of prevailing conditions, practices and attitudes--seeking accurate descriptions of activities, objects, processes and persons."¹⁵¹

However, according to John Best, descriptive study is also concerned with:

. . . conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing. It is primarily concerned with the present, although it often considers past events and influences as they relate to current conditions.¹⁵²

Therefore, this method is appropriate to job satisfaction and furthermore, the phenomena "Retrospective Role Expectations" and "Strategies of Upward Mobility" could be appropriately analyzed by the descriptive method.

¹⁵⁰Donald Ary, Lucy Chester Jacobs, and Asghar Razavieh, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972), p. 296.

¹⁵¹Deobold B. Van Dalen and William J. Meyer, Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 203.

¹⁵²John W. Best, Research in Education, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977), p. 116.

The Procedures

Population and Sample

Population

All academic department chairpersons, acting chairpersons, and assistant chairpersons at Michigan State University during the 1979-80 academic year constituted the population for the study. Hereon differentiation was not made between chairpersons, acting chairpersons, and assistant chairpersons; members of the population were simply referred to as "chairpersons." Directors or heads of schools, institutes, centers, and nonacademic departments were not considered part of the population. The entire population for the study number eighty-nine--six women and eighty-three men.

Sample

Twenty-five percent of the population was taken to be the sample. The sample size was, therefore, twenty-two, which was a reasonable number, considering the length of the questionnaire and the in-depth interview (see Appendix C: Questionnaire and Appendix D: Interview Guide).

Since the number of women in the population was small, all six chairwomen were considered in the sample. The sixteen chairmen were selected by random sampling procedures. The Michigan State University Faculty and Staff

Directory (1979-80) was the source for identifying the population. For the chairmen, colleges were randomly selected and a department chairman in each of the selected colleges randomly sampled.

The study examined the chairwomen as a group and the chairmen as another entity; no attempt was made to compare the chairmen and chairwomen on an individual basis--such as a woman to man.

Assumptions about the Sample

In this study, it was assumed that:

- (1) Notwithstanding their busy schedules, the department chairpersons would be willing to participate in the survey project and support the study with their expertise.
- (2) The responding department chairpersons would provide open and honest answers, and anonymity would be maintained by the investigator.

Instrumentation

In order to gather the information needed to answer the research questions and to test the hypotheses and conditions of the study, it was necessary to:

- (1) Prepare a questionnaire that would yield some measure of the chairpersons' mobility strategies, what their role expectations were before taking office, and their satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the job, and

- (2) Conduct an interview with the sample members on their upward mobility, their retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction.

Questionnaire

The Questionnaire (Appendix C) was designed to collect demographic information about the department chairpersons and information about the impact of departments on the chairpersons. It was also designed to obtain information about upward mobility, retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction of department chairpersons. The questionnaire was constructed so that the respondents could answer all of the questions from recall.

Personal Interview

The personal interview was designed to supplement the questionnaire. Van Dalen has observed:

Many people are more willing to communicate information [orally] than in writing and, therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than in a questionnaire.¹⁵³

The interview also provided an index of the chairpersons who would be willing to answer the questionnaire. It was felt that any subject who allowed the investigator to interview her or him would most likely answer the questionnaire. That feeling proved to be true. Furthermore, as Kerlinger has indicated:

¹⁵³Deobold Van Dalen and William Meyer, op. cit., p. 258.

The interview is a face-to-face interpersonal role situation in which one person, the interviewer, asks a person being interviewed, the respondent, questions designed to obtain answers pertinent to the purposes of the research problem.¹⁵⁴

The interview was also expected to promote the interpersonal relationship between the researcher and the interviewees. Bingham et al. cited the interpersonal situation as an element making an interview a valuable tool. They noted:

Sources of unreliability inhere in the interviewer, in the person interviewed, and in the relationship between the two. Paradoxically, it is precisely these same elements which make the interview a valuable instrument. The difference lies in the conduct of the interview and the quality of the relationship.¹⁵⁵

To insure uniformity and structure of the interview, an Interview Guide (for the use of the interviewer) was developed (see Appendix D). The interview guide helped the investigator to follow standardized procedures and ask the same questions at different interviews.

Construction of the Survey Instruments

The content of the Questionnaire and the Interview Guide (Appendix C and D) was based, in part, on the literature reviewed. The work by the following authors was

¹⁵⁴Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 468.

¹⁵⁵Walter Bingham, Moore Van Dyke, Bruch Victor, and John Gustad, How To Interview (New York: Harper and Brothers, Inc., 1959), p. 9.

particularly helpful to the investigator for the construction of the survey instruments: Van Meir,¹⁵⁶ Dressel et al.,¹⁵⁷ The Carnegie Commission,¹⁵⁸ Eldon Clark,¹⁵⁹ Clyde Carnegie,¹⁶⁰ Florence B. Stevenson,¹⁶¹ Ortha Cox, Jr.,¹⁶² and Hamner and Schmidt.¹⁶³

Specifically, the work of Van Meir, Stevenson, and The Carnegie Commission provided leads to questions on women administrators (including women chairpersons) and mobility; Clyde Carnegie's dissertation provided the framework for the questions on retrospective role expectations, and the work of Cox, Clark, Hamner and Schmidt was the source for

¹⁵⁶Van Meir, op. cit.

¹⁵⁷Dressel et al., Confidence Crisis, op. cit., pp. 259-262.

¹⁵⁸The Carnegie Commission, Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, op. cit.

¹⁵⁹Eldon L. Clerk, op. cit., pp. 191-201.

¹⁶⁰Clyde D. Carnegie, "Role Expectations of Community Junior College Department Chairpersons," Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1976, pp. 134-140.

¹⁶¹Florence Byrd Stevenson, op. cit., pp. 197-205.

¹⁶²Ortha P. Cox, Jr., "A Comparative Analysis of Self-Perceived Roles of Black and Non-Black Administrators in Predominantly White Institutions of Higher Education, Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1971, pp. 134-138.

¹⁶³Hamner and Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 131-149.

questions on departments, department chairpersons, and job satisfaction.

Reliability and Validity

A measuring instrument is said to be reliable if it gives closely similar answers when applied more than once under similar conditions to the same person or object whose state is not different on the separate occasions. Maxwell notes:

. . . it should be mentioned that the reliability coefficient of a test can be increased by increasing the length of the test and for this reason most standardized tests have as many as 100 items.¹⁶⁴

To increase the reliability of the questionnaire, more than 100 items were used.

Validity may be defined as the extent to which a measuring instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. The questionnaire and interview guide were shown to two professors who read it and provided suggestions. The questionnaire was further adapted in consultation with a consultant from the Office of Research on Teaching in the College of Education.

Data Collection Procedures

After the approval of the researcher's proposal, the investigator constructed the questionnaire and interview guide.

¹⁶⁴A. E. Maxwell, Basic Statistics in Behavioral Research (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc., 1970).

Endorsement

The researcher requested the endorsement and professional support of his study from Dr. Marylee Davis, Assistant Vice President for Administration and Public Affairs, and Associate Professor, Administration and Higher Education, Michigan State University. The investigator had been in Dr. Davis' graduate course on "Women Professionals in Higher Education," and that course generated some interest in the researcher. That course contributed, in part, to the selection of the topic for this dissertation.

The initial contact with the department chairpersons was by mail during the second week of April, 1980. A mail packet was forwarded by campus mail to each of the chairpersons, acting and assistant chairpersons in the sample. The mail packet consisted of three letters--one from the investigator, one from the Chairman of the Doctoral Committee of the investigator, and one from Dr. Davis (Appendix E: Survey Letters).

The prospective respondents were given a brief description of the research project and they were informed that the data would be collected through a personal interview and a written questionnaire. It was estimated that the interview would take about 45 minutes and the questionnaire about 30 minutes. About a week after the letters were mailed, the investigator made telephone calls as a follow-up to the letters. During each call, the investigator introduced himself, explained what the survey was about, and

attempted to set up an appointment for the personal interview. Strict confidentiality was assured, both in the letters and in the telephone call.

All the sample members expressed willingness to participate in the project, except two chairmen. The department of one of the two chairmen was undergoing evaluation, and the department chairperson explained that he would not have the time to participate. The other chairman was scheduled to go out of the country on a foreign mission and would not return until after six months. A new department from the college of each of the two chairmen was then chosen by simple random selection. Letters were sent to the two new sample members and the other procedures were repeated.

Appointments were kept on time by the investigator. In all cases, the interviews were conducted in the chairperson's office. Before starting each interview, the respondent was asked if he/she cared for a tape recorder to be used. None of the participants objected to using a tape recorder. At the end of each interview, the investigator left a questionnaire with the chairperson, requesting that the questionnaire be returned by campus mail by a specified time.

At each interview, the investigator was well-received; excellent rapport was established between the chairpersons and the investigator. The chairpersons were genuinely

interested in the project; they indicated that the study was valuable and many asked for a copy of the findings.

A day after each interview, the chairperson was called and thanked for participating in the project. Letters of appreciation (Appendix E) were mailed to the chairpersons interviewed. The respondents were assured again that their responses, both in the interview and on the questionnaire, would be treated very confidentially.

Data Analysis

The data collected and analyzed consisted of the written responses of the questionnaire and responses at the personal interview. All the chairpersons who were interviewed returned the questionnaires.

The analysis was done to determine (1) mobility strategies employed by department chairmen and chairwomen; (2) the retrospective role expectations of the department chairpersons and how those expectations have been met, and (3) the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the chairpersons, as indexed by the frustrations, job difficulties, feelings of unfairness in compensation, or confirmation of retrospective role expectations.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to describe the design and procedures of the study. To investigate the upward mobility strategies, the retrospective role expectations, and job satisfaction of the academic department

chairpersons, statistical and descriptive designs were used. The statistical designs employed were the t-test and the Pearson Moment Correlation. An alpha level of .05 significance was used. The descriptive design was used to supplement the statistical analyses; it was more qualitative in nature and meant to present information on aspects of the study that could not be presented statistically.

The population of the study was described and means of selecting the sample were presented. Instrumentation and data collection procedures were described. The instrumentation consisted of a questionnaire and a personal interview with each of the sample members. Finally, the chapter described the analysis of the data and the delineation of the methodology.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study focused on the department chairwomen and chairmen, with respect to their upward mobility, their retrospective role expectations, and their job satisfaction. Specifically, the study:

- (1) Attempted to identify the factors that have enhanced or tended to retard (slow down) the mobility of the chairwomen and chairmen. The views of the chairpersons on factors that have contributed to the mobility of women and men professionals in higher education were elicited and presented.
- (2) Examined whether the expected behavior of the chairpersons has, in their opinion, met the reality of experience.
- (3) Investigated the job satisfaction of the chairpersons and presented the findings using the framework of theories of job satisfaction--equity theory, fulfillment theory, and discrepancy theory.

Both statistical analysis and descriptive methods were used in the presentation and analysis of the data.

Personal interviews and questionnaires were employed to collect information from twenty-two chairpersons. The two methodologies for analyzing the data were supplementary, and overlapping was avoided as much as possible.

This chapter has been organized under five major sections: (1) Introduction, (2) Overview of the Academic Department Chairpersons, (3) Factors of Upward Mobility, (4) Retrospective Role Expectations, and (5) Job Satisfaction of Department Chairpersons.

The presentation of the findings has been given in a comparative way--group information on chairwomen against information on chairmen, with the exception of Section (1) and part of Section (2). Each section is summarized to provide the subject matter of discussion.

Quotations from the respondents in the interview have been presented in the same way as given, regardless of idiomatic expressions and slangs. The quotations from the interviewees are not footnoted.

Overview of the Academic Department Chairpersons

In this section, an overview of the academic department chairpersons is presented. The section has been organized under (1) Personal Information and Opinions about Position, (2) Nature of Previous Position and Reasons for Changing Position, and (3) Summary.

Personal Information and Opinions
about Present Position

Age Category

None of the twenty-two respondents is under thirty years of age. About 60 percent of the chairpersons were fifty and over. It would seem age is a factor for becoming a chairperson.

Table 9
Age Categories of the Chairpersons

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20 - 29	0	0.0
30 - 39	2	9.1
40 - 49	7	31.3
50 and over	13	59.1
Total	22	100.0

Marital Status

A little over 80 percent of the respondents are married. The married chairpersons did not indicate negative effects of the marriage status on the position. Rather, it was cited to be positive; husbands or wives understood the demands of the job on the partner and often were very supportive of the chairpersons. Being single/separated was said to have no effect on the position.

Table 10
Marital Status

Status	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Single (Never Married)	2	9.1	9.1
Married	18	81.8	90.9
Widow/Widower	0	0.0	90.9
Separated/Divorced	2	9.1	100.0
Total	22	100.0	

Years as Chairperson

The number of years that the respondents had been in their present positions ranged from one to seventeen. The twenty-two chairpersons' length of service as academic chairpersons may be found in Table 11. This may be compared with Table 16, which provides differences between length of time of chairwomen and chairmen at present position.

Table 11
Years as Chairpersons for All Respondents

Years	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	9.1
2	3	13.6
3	5	22.7
4	0	0.0
5	1	4.5
6	6	27.3
7	2	9.1
8	1	4.5
9	1	4.5
17	1	4.5
Total	22	100.0

Status or Rank Compared with Previous Position

None of the twenty-two chairpersons considered their present rank or status as lower than their previous

positions. The ratio of the respondents who consider their present position as high to those who consider it as lateral is about 2:1.

Table 12
Rank or Status Compared with
Previous Position

Present Position	Frequency	Percentage
Up	15	68.2
Lateral	7	31.8
Down	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0

Difference in Salary

When the chairpersons were asked to rate the difference between their present salaries and the salary they would have received if they were not department chairpersons, the results in Table 13 were obtained.

Suitability of Position

Individuals who participated in the survey are constantly faced with making such difficult decisions as resource allocation. They are very busy, both institutionally and professionally. When asked to rate the suitability of their positions for themselves, the chairpersons provided the ratings in Table 14. It is interesting that almost half of the sample did not answer the question of their

Table 13

Difference Between Present Salary and Salary
That Would Have Been Received

Difference	Frequency	Percentage
Very High	0	0.0
High	15	68.2
Low	1	4.5
Very Low	1	4.5
No Difference	5	22.7
Total	22	100.0

Table 14

Suitability of Position for Chairpersons

Extent	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	9	40.0
Very Good	1	4.5
Good	1	4.5
About Average	0	0.0
Below Average	1	4.5
Blank	10	45.3
Total	22	100.0

suitability for the position. It would seem that they did so because of the ambivalence they have with their suitability for the position.

Nature of Previous Position and Reasons for Changing Position

Previous Position in Academe

About 75 percent of the chairmen interviewed considered the move from their previous position to chairmanship status as upward mobility. Only 50 percent of the chairwomen, however, consider the movement upward; the other 50 percent consider it lateral.

Most of the chairpersons (women and men) were full-time faculty members in their various departments. Some of the respondents had been in administrative positions previously, while others had been both faculty and administrators before being appointed chairpersons. The years of experience as faculty and/or administrators are shown in Table 15.

The highest percentage for the chairwomen was in the 5-9 year category, whereas that of the chairmen was in the 25 and over category. This relates to the reason suggested by Edward Van Meir on why many women do not secure administrative positions. Van Meir cited "lack of tenure"¹⁶⁵ as one of the reasons that there are not as many women as

¹⁶⁵ Edward Van Meir, op. cit., p. 164.

Table 15

Years of Experience as Faculty Member
and/or Administrator Before
Present Position

Number of Years as Faculty and/or Administrator in Academe Before Present Position	Chairwomen (percentage)	Chairmen (percentage)
0-4	0.0	25.0
5-9	66.6	6.25
10-14	0.0	12.5
15-19	0.0	18.75
20-24	33.3	6.25
25 and over	0.0	31.25
Total	100.0	100.0

men in educational administrative roles. Hypothetically, the women chairpersons would not have been appointed if years of experience as faculty and/or administrators in academe had been over twenty-four years for the job requirement.

An apparent anomaly is the 25 percent of men who had four years or less tenure as faculty and/or administrator in academe before becoming chairmen. Much of this percentage occurred because people came from private practice and/or research agency directly to be administrators, for example, medical school.

Whereas the interviews indicated that most of the chairpersons were drafted or nominated by the faculty, it could be inferred that the chairwomen had to be also talked into accepting the position by the dean of her college or by the outgoing department chairperson. It seemed that the chairwomen needed encouragement from a source in the administrative structure of the university. Furthermore, whereas most of the chairmen's initial appointments were for "chairpersons," the chairwomen accepted the position of the chair on a temporary basis. The initial appointment of most of the chairwomen was for "acting," but sooner or later, they became chairpersons. Referring to when being convinced to accept the position, a chairwoman revealed:

I said I don't want to be chairperson. There are other people, I am sure, that could do this job better. He said "I have talked with the other persons and the dean very much wants you to be the acting chairperson and so do I." So I said could we think of this one year at a time?

The chairwoman indicated that from that year on, she had been a chairperson and not acting. Another chairwoman also said:

There was a sudden resignation by the former department chairman and I was asked if I would finish out the year. And now I have been in here . . . years.

Table 16 gives the number of years the chairpersons have been at their current positions. It is noteworthy that, although they accepted the job temporarily, the chairwomen have not been less than three years on the job; rather 31.2

Table 16

Number of Years in Present Position

Number of Years at Present Position	Chairwomen (percentage)	Chairmen (percentage)
1 - 2	0.0	31.2
3 - 4	33.3	18.8
5 - 6	33.3	31.2
7 - 8	0.0	12.5
9 - 10	16.7	6.3
11 and over	16.7	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0

percent of the chairmen have been less than three years in the position.

Reasons for Changing Positions

More than 80 percent of the respondents had been at Michigan State University as employees (faculty or administrators) before being appointed chairpersons. The few who changed institutions gave the nature of the program, the organizational structure, and the physical environment of this institution as factors affecting their decision to come to Michigan State University.

Virtually all the chairpersons indicated that their predecessors resigned from the position--either very suddenly or with a long notice. There were a combination of personal

and professional reasons for the chairpersons to accept the position. When asked to give reasons for changing positions--changing from the previous job to the present one--a respondent replied:

I guess there are a combination of personal and professional reasons. Professional reasons were that the department needed a leadership and I had had a long time commitment to trying to build my career and the reputation of the department at the same time. My motivation was professional-personal; motivation intertwined at this point because I want to be a part of a fine department. It also has to do with my ego as a professional in my field. I think of myself as a teacher-scholar and I want to be associated with a fine department.

Related to helping to build a "fine department," one chairman said:

. . . my colleagues asked me if I would not take at least a three year appointment to help get the program started in high gear. . . . I have always been interested in innovation, always been interested in something new. This was new, so I looked upon it as a challenge.

"Challenge" and "opportunity to grow professionally" were cited by most chairpersons (men and women) to be the major factors that contributed to their decision to accept the position of the chairperson. One chairman asserted:

It was a challenge. And I spent a lot of time talking to my wife about it before I accepted the position. Thought about it at great lengths. And I understood why I was being offered the position and understood what I could do in terms of the position.

Some of the chairpersons also accepted the position because they felt that it would give them the chance to change the department, and with some, a chance to be in the dual role of administrator and teacher. One chairwoman commented,

"I guess my first reaction was that I do enjoy teaching and I thought that this was probably a better role because it would be interesting to continue teaching." Other chairpersons also indicated that they needed a change in their careers. This is indicated in the following response.

While I was on sabbatical, I received a phone call from the chairman of the search committee here, asking if I would be interested in the chairmanship. It was very timely because I had just made the decision to change career directions. And I said I would be willing to consider it.

Another response given was:

Another reason was that I was ready for a change in activity. As a matter of fact, I was contemplating changing universities. This came up, so I took it. I thought I'd take a crack at it; there's a lot of challenge. I saw in the job a lot of opportunity . . . so I decided to accept the position.

From the responses given, the investigator identified three observations as interesting about reasons for the chairpersons to accept their present positions:

- (1) The chairpersons indicated explicitly or implicitly that at the time of appointment, it was "gambling" to accept the position. They felt they were taking "risks," for they were not sure they would succeed as administrators.
- (2) Increase in income was not a major reason for the department chairpersons to accept the position. Only about 15 percent of the respondents referred to additional income as part of contributing factors in their decision to accept the chairperson's position. Psychological needs such as the need for

challenge, the need to grow professionally, the need for a change in activity or direction, the need to build a better department, and the need to continue teaching were more important than extrinsic rewards such as pay.

- (3) Interestingly, there was no difference between the reasons given by the chairmen and those given by the chairwomen for accepting the position of chairperson. While these reasons for accepting the chairperson's position cannot be classified as goals, the similarity between the chairwomen's reasons and the chairmen's may be paralleled with the observation of Hennig and Jardin. The co-authors have observed that "men and women enter the business world with similar goals. . . ." ¹⁶⁶ That the chairwomen are willing to face "challenge" may indicate that adult women do not shun challenge as did adolescents in Frazier and Sadker's study. ¹⁶⁷

Summary

This section covered: (1) A brief profile of all the chairpersons: Age categories, marital status, and years as chairpersons were presented. The respondents' opinions about differences in salary, status, and suitability for

¹⁶⁶ Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardin, op. cit.

¹⁶⁷ Frazier and M. Sadker, op. cit., pp. 92-97.

the chairpersons were briefly discussed. Most of the chairpersons considered the current position higher in status than their previous position. Similarly, a greater percentage of the chairpersons agreed that their present salary is higher than what they would have received if they had not been department chairpersons. (2) The nature of previous position and reasons for changing positions: Most of the chairpersons had been full-time faculty members at Michigan State University; they were drafted or nominated by their colleagues (faculty members). Whereas the chairwomen accepted the position on a temporary basis, none of them had been in the position less than three years; 31.2 percent of the chairmen had been in the position less than three years.

The reasons for accepting the position of the chairperson were similar for both the chairwomen and chairmen. Most of the chairpersons said they wanted to improve or innovate the department. The chairpersons indicated that they wanted some challenge and perceived that the position would offer them such a challenge.

A number of the chairpersons were quoted to supplement the data presented in this section.

Factors of Upward Mobility of Department Chairpersons

In this section, the responses of the department chairpersons on upward mobility are presented and analyzed under the following sections: (1) Factors affecting the

mobility of the chairwomen; (2) Factors affecting the mobility of the chairmen; (3) Additional factors affecting upward mobility and their statistical analyses; (4) Respondents' opinions on why few women are serving in administrative positions in higher education; (5) Respondents' advice and suggestions for prospective department chairpersons, and (6) Summary.

Factors Affecting the Mobility of Chairwomen

When asked for factors that have enhanced their upward mobility, the chairwomen provided the following factors:

Opportunity to Participate in Many Activities

A chairwoman implied that opportunity to participate in a lot of activities made her seen by others above her. Both in high school and college, she was encouraged to involve herself in a lot of extra-curricular activities. For example, she sang, helped put up a college weekly paper, and wrote articles in the paper. The chairwoman observed:

I was a specially good student that I was never in trouble academically, but I always had my finger in lots of pies...Working with youth groups in my community and participating in high school activities. I was in the cast in the leading role in the senior play and I sang in the glee club.

Another chairwoman also emphasized credentials and interest in academic work.

Credentials and Importance of Academic Work

Realizing that credentials are very important, 33 percent of the chairwomen went for two master's degrees.

One of the double degree holders remarked:

A number of things have enhanced my upward mobility. One is just sheer interest in academic work. . . . Then as I earned other academic degrees, I earned a master's degree and was a faculty member there. I fully realized that I had too little ability, too little preparation to continue. I began to be very interested in research as the result of a master's project. I realized that my limitation in knowledge required that I earn another degree. So I did that. I obtained some experience between those two degrees. . . . And so one of the positions that was available to me upon graduation with a Ph.D. was an administrative post.

Another chairwoman also observed:

Well, I suppose the single major factor is having the degrees--going from bachelor's to master's to Ph.D. Without that, it would be impossible.

She indicated that being a female in college was "a stroke of luck" for her in obtaining her degrees.

Experience and Leadership Ability

Experience was cited by 33 percent of the chairwomen as important for upward mobility. Leadership ability was also seen to enhance mobility.

Support and Encouragement

Support and encouragement were stressed by almost all chairwomen as enhancing their upward mobility. The sources of support and encouragement included the parents, husbands, and superordinates. One respondent remarked:

I had a family who had very high expectations. My father was a very active community member; he participated in all kinds of organizations. My mother was a very well educated woman compared to other women in the community. She had been a teacher, but did not teach after she was married. I had a lot of encouragement from them. I guess I was always led to believe that I could do anything that I wanted to do.

Table 17 gives the relationships of individuals who most encouraged the chairpersons to go to college or seek advance degrees. In work situations, superordinates have done both service and disservice to the chairwomen in their upward mobility; some encouraged the women; others discouraged them. Referring to support and encouragement from a superordinate (boss), one chairwoman said:

He was a good teacher and I think all good administrators are teachers. I learned a lot from him. . . . He was a tremendous good influence in terms of helping people become better than they are. And whenever I was unable to handle the new assignment, he stayed close enough in terms of awareness of how it was going and was helpful. I must really confess that I have been blessed with people like this all along.

Table 17

Relationship of Individuals Who Encouraged
Chairpersons to Go to College or
Seek Advanced Degree(s)

Individuals	Chairwomen (Percent)	Chairmen (Percent)
Parents/Relatives	66.7	81.3
Spouse	33.3	6.2
Friends/Others	0.0	12.5

Just as support and encouragement were instrumental in enhancing the mobility of most of the chairwomen, nonsupport and discouragement tended to work oppositely. An example of discouragement was reported by a chairwoman:

I can remember when I was in high school. I wanted to be a math teacher. I came through high school right at the end of World War II. I graduated top in my class in high school. The superintendent called me one day and wanted to know what I was going to do. I said I would like to be a math teacher. He said "You won't get a job." When I asked "Why?" he said, "All men are coming back from the service and they will be going into math and they will not hire women as mathematics teachers in high school." . . . He really influenced me because I didn't go into mathematics. I really took him very seriously.

Table 18 gives the sources of (a) support and (b) nonsupport where support was expected. As noted in the table, 50 percent of the chairwomen cited males as sources of support and females as sources of nonsupport where support was expected. This may be interpreted in two ways: Either (1) there were no women administratively higher than the chairwomen to provide the necessary support, or (2) as noted in Sylvia-Lee Tibbetts' Sex Role Stereotyping: Why Women Discriminate Against Themselves, the chairwomen have encountered women who might have refused to support their fellow women.¹⁶⁸ Such women, if any, could be characterized as "Queen Bees." Berry and Kushner describe the "Queen Bee" concept:

¹⁶⁸Sylvia-Lee Tibbetts, op. cit., pp. 177-183.

Table 18

Incidents of Support and Nonsupport

Incidents of Support		
Support Source	Chairwomen (Percent)	Chairmen (Percent)
Male	50.0	56.3
Female	33.3	6.3
Those who did not observe support	16.7	37.4

Incidents of Nonsupport Where Support was Expected		
Nonsupport Source	Chairwomen (Percent)	Chairmen (Percent)
Male	16.7	37.5
Female	50.0	6.3
Those who did not observe support	33.3	56.2

The popularity of this stereotype has been about for years and is understood to connote an individual female who glories in her own success within the professional world at the expense of other women. . . . Since she refuses to identify with other women, the Queen Bee identifies with and concedes with those in power, opposes any group approach to success, is solely concerned with her personal success, and is eager to "win" in every phase of her life, including that of wife and mother--a phase of her life that reassures her that she is indeed feminine.¹⁶⁹

The greater percentage of chairmen than chairwomen fell in the category of "those who did not observe nonsupport."

Factors Affecting the Upward Mobility of Chairmen

When the chairmen were asked in the interview to indicate the factors that have affected their mobility, the following factors were cited to have enhanced their upward mobility:

Motivation and Encouragement

Some of the chairpersons said that their upward mobility has been influenced by their achievement orientation, motivation, and encouragement. The response of one chairman reads:

I think it is my own achievement orientation that is probably the most important thing. I suppose everyone needs a certain measure of competence, good education, and training, but I think the motivation has been the key thing.

Referring to encouragement and education, another chairman also said:

¹⁶⁹Jane Berry and Richard Kushner, "A Critical Look at the Queen Bee Syndrome," Journal of National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Summer 1975.

Factors that have influenced how I got here would include, I suppose, the values that were instilled at home by my parents in terms of work ethics and motivation to succeed, good high school education, good college education, association with people who encouraged me and again reinforced the values of success and mobility, and the people I have met and come to know at Michigan State. I think I've been very fortunate in seeing how people operate, in observing people whom I consider successful or unsuccessful, operate and try to emulate the successful parts of them and avoid the unsuccessful.

Good Education, Knowledge of
Subject Area and Training
in Many Areas

As the chairwomen, the responding chairmen also emphasized credentials and knowledge of both subject matter and many areas (disciplines) as very helpful in their mobility. A chairman noted, "I think the major factor which prepared me best for my administrative position is the fact that I have general training in many areas!" Another chairman also said, "I think the first factor is the complete knowledge of your field."

Productivity in Previous Occu-
pations, Experience and
Activism

Productivity, especially in research and teaching, was cited as enhancing the upward mobility of about 20 percent of the chairmen. Experience and performing well on previous assignments have also helped most of the chairmen to get to their present positions. One chairman observed:

. . . the major factor would be research productivity because that's what gives you visibility outside of your own school. And that's why someone here knew to

suggest me. Even if you're doing a very good job within your own school, no one knows you exist.

With respect to performing well in previous roles, one chairman said:

I had been on the Advisory Council in our area and I assume that I performed reasonably well enough to get support. I had been a member of university committees, including Curriculum Committee, which probably gave an indication that I can handle some quasi-administrative post.

This seems to suggest that administrators acquire support and become prospective candidates for major posts if they perform well or are active in relatively minor roles.

Trust, Leadership Qualities, and Good Human Relations

Establishing trust relationships with their colleagues (faculty) has been very helpful for two chairmen in getting to their present positions. Commenting on the importance of trust, one chairman said:

Another thing is that there has been a kind of trust and friendship (with colleagues) and I think this is important. Most people would not support somebody for an administrative position unless there is some kind of trust and friendship.

In addition to good personal relationships with colleagues, willingness to face challenge, tolerance of disorder, and other leadership qualities were emphasized by most of the chairmen to enhance upward mobility. One chairman observed "And I suppose along the line, I had shown some leadership qualities that convinced people to look at me as a possible department chairperson."

It is interesting to note that the chairpersons had been drafted or nominated by their colleagues (faculty) in the department and good relationships between them and the faculty have been eminent. Getting along well with colleagues was also stressed by one respondent in the following words:

I think that almost from the start . . . I've been able to get along with faculty very well. I work with the faculty more than really understanding the administrative functions of the University. It's mainly been that I've been able to work with the faculty. The faculty has supported me all along.

It seems that getting along very well with the faculty provides the chairpersons security and some tenure in that position.

Additional Factors Affecting Upward Mobility and Their Statistical Analysis

In addition to the responses presented above, the chairpersons were asked to indicate the extent to which certain factors, from the review of the literature, had also enhanced their professional or social mobility. The factors were relative ability; participation in games, sports and/or recreation, encouragement from others; informal relationships; awareness of career opportunities, self-confidence, and marital status.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis tested was:

There is significant difference between the chairmen and chairwomen on factors enhancing upward mobility.

The testing of the hypothesis was by t-test and was done on the Michigan State University CDC 6500 computer. The mean scores, variance, standard deviation scores, and confidence interval scores were determined by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program. (Data Report A - Appendix F gives the data related to the computation.)

$$\bar{X} \text{ Chairmen} = 16.25 \quad \bar{X} \text{ Chairwomen} = 12.50$$

where $\bar{X}$ is the mean of the scores.

The value of t-test is 1.08 with $p < 1.00$.

Since $p < 1.00$, there is no significant difference between the chairmen and chairwomen on factors enhancing upward mobility. As in other statistical analyses of the study, an alpha level of .05 was used to determine the level of statistical significance for the data.

The finding was:

There was no significant difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors enhancing upward mobility.

Similarly, a test of significant difference was conducted on the responses of the chairpersons on factors that have tended to slow down their mobility. Factors considered were lack of career awareness; non-participation in sports, games and/or recreation; informal relationships and socialization; discrimination according to sex; marital status; cultural attitudes of the society; relative ability; lack of encouragement from significant others; and lack of self-confidence.

The hypothesis tested was:

There is a significant difference between the chairmen and chairwomen on factors that have tended to retard their upward mobility.

With reference to Appendix F: Data Report A, it may be found that

$\bar{X}$ Chairmen = 1.38 $\bar{X}$ Chairwomen = 3.67

where $\bar{X}$ is the mean of the scores.

The value of t-test is 1.37 with $p < 0.58$.

An alpha level of significance was .05.

It was found that:

There was no significant difference between the chairmen and chairwomen on factors that have tended to retard their upward mobility.

Visibility and Exposure

Visibility and exposure are very essential for upward mobility in business organization. When the chairpersons were asked to indicate the sex of individuals who provided them visibility and/or exposure necessary for upward mobility, two-thirds of the sample members left the question unanswered. Although the concepts "visibility" and "exposure" had been defined in the questionnaire, the chairpersons appeared to have had difficulty with the words or they were ambivalent with the concepts.

Respondents' Opinions on Why Few Women
Administrators Are Serving in
Administrative Posts in
Higher Education

The chairpersons were asked to respond to the question, "What do you think accounts for the fact that there are so few women administrators in higher education?" The investigator suggested that the respondents focus on lack of awareness of career opportunities, marital status, relative ability, cultural attitudes and socialization, lack of encouragement and/or confidence, and the effect of discrimination. A general observation on this question was that most of the department chairpersons started their answers with "I can speak only for this department." Some respondents added, "I don't know much about other departments."

Chairwomen's Opinions

All the chairwomen indicated that relative ability should have no bearing on the number of women in administrative posts in higher education. However, due to the impact of certain factors, such as cultural attitudes, there has been the myth that men are better suited for administration than women. One chairwoman observed:

I suspect that a female has to be super superior to be recognized as someone who has administrative abilities outside of departments where females are in the majority. I think it's always difficult to identify potential administrators who never had the opportunity to be administrators. And I think there is a tendency to think that women are too emotional. . . .

The chairwoman explained that men who tend to think in that way are those who do not know how to communicate with the women in superior positions.

Lack of awareness of career opportunities, lack of encouragement, cultural attitudes of the society, and sex discrimination were cited by the chairwomen as major factors that have contributed to the lack of women in higher administrative positions in education. One chairwoman noted:

If I reflect on my own time, I don't remember anyone ever feeding me the idea that I might be an administrator or a manager or anything like that. Now, I think, that is changing quite a bit from the time I was in school, but I think that lack of awareness of career opportunities probably still contributes to it.

Another chairwoman said:

I think many women do not perceive themselves as administrators. They do not choose the steps that lead logically and directly to administration. They are sometimes not aware of career opportunities. (Also) they do not have "the old-boy relationship" that would help them know about career opportunities. . . . Many women have not perceived the places in which they could strengthen their strong points. Therefore, they are not active competitors at times in situations that require active competition in order to move up the administrative ladder.

Commenting on lack of encouragement, one chairwoman said:

I think that women have not necessarily been encouraged because generally those who might encourage them have been men. However, most studies have shown that all women in management or administrative positions have had mentors. The mentors have been male, I guess. However, the women who advance rapidly are those who outgrow their mentors and are not limited by that initial level. Those who have not had mentors have not been encouraged.

Another comment on mentors reads:

I think that men have adopted what we refer to as a practice of being mentors to their graduate students

and help them to see the rungs on the ladder that would take them to the goals or objectives that they have in mind. Women have not tended to do that as much, perhaps because there are fewer women who are in positions to know how to get from one stage to another.

The need for encouragement was also emphasized by another chairwoman:

I think encouragement is always helpful in getting people on the right track. It's not enough unless there's the mix that goes with the other things. You can be encouraged to the point that you feel this is something you have to do to satisfy your mother, your favorite teacher in high school or whoever. And it still isn't going to fly (you) unless it seems right. Without encouragement today, I think, we lose some good people.

The chairwoman added:

I think that encouragement ties in with confidence, for if somebody is encouraged, he or she is more confident. . . . And I think it's still fair to say that in quite a few cases, the self-confidence (of chairpersons) breeds the ability to spar with others for the dollars. You know, institutions are very political and women are generally socialized not to deal with political situations. Encouragement for women administrators is therefore very essential.

Views on marital status as contributing to the lack of women administrators in higher education varied. Most of the chairwomen felt that marital status used to be a factor, but it is not now. A comment on this was:

In the past, women did not perceive things in exactly the same ways as the younger women are perceiving those things today; women did not desire to accept jobs away from their homes, husbands, and children. Therefore, marital status might not have created restriction within the home, it did indeed restrict their mobility (Geographic mobility).

Another chairwoman also noted:

There was a time that women graduate students said they would go where their husbands had a job. They now say

that they will determine where they would go depending on who gets the best offer first or they will try and work out something. I am married and we have lived and moved three times. I don't think marital status contributes to the lack of women in administration.

All the chairwomen indicated that sex discrimination in one form or another has contributed to the lack of women in higher administrative posts. One chairwoman cited how she was denied a principalship some years ago because of her sex. She reminisced:

There is still an underlying attitude that the higher posts are handled by men and not by women. And I think that there is some discrimination. I have experienced that. When I was in public school at one time, I was being considered for an administrative position. I know for a fact that I was selected by the search committee. The superintendent of the school district would not go ahead with it because I was a woman. And he wanted a man in that position. So I think there is still some discrimination against women at higher level positions.

Another chairwoman also said:

Of course we have a lot of legislation now that deals with discrimination and I suppose that it has made a lot of difference. But believe me, there are still quite a few attitudes that are discriminatory, but people do not express it openly.

A response from another chairwoman was:

I think women have been discriminated against in a variety of ways. They earn smaller salaries for the same work. They are not always considered for promotions on the basis of their own abilities. They have not avoided that discrimination because they have not known how to be positively aggressive. The effects on those discrimination influenced their direction or perhaps kept them from pursuing advanced degrees. The effects of discrimination might have kept them from taking a challenge at a job that didn't seem to be an accepted job for women. I think discrimination among younger women is perhaps causing them to strike out into a new field. I think they are more aggressive; I think they are learning to be positively aggressive. There was a time when female aggression tended to be negative. But

I think women have learned and so I should say the effects of discrimination depends on the time. . . . And I suspect women will have a harder time overcoming remnants of discrimination as resources get diminished because they have to compete stronger.

Chairmen's Opinions

When asked to give their opinions on why there are so few women administrators in higher education, all the chairmen indicated that relative ability has not been a factor for the lack of women in administrative posts in higher education. Most of the male respondents rather added that women are even more competent in certain areas than men. Comparing the relative ability of men and women, one chairman said:

I don't think there is much difference in ability if you assume that each one of them has the same background and the same expectations. In fact, I would say that in our field the women are probably somewhat sharper and more intent on being good students.

Another chairman also noted:

I don't think ability has anything to do with it; I've never seen data, but I would feel that the women in . . . are as competent and as well prepared (as men).

One chairman's response on the lack of women administrators in higher education reads:

It has historical roots; women haven't had as one of their major career goals being an administrator. . . . I don't think it's been lack of ability. I think women have the same abilities that men have and even better in some respects. So it hasn't been a lack of opportunity and a lack of encouragement; perhaps some lack of motivation on the part of women.

Almost all the chairmen referred to the lack of an available pool of women administrators as the major reason why

women are few in administrative posts. The cause(s) of the small pool differed from one respondent to another. Cultural attitudes, lack of encouragement and bias against women were mentioned as contributing to the small pool. One chairman indicated ". . . but the big thing is that there are not many women available to fill positions." Another chairman also observed:

By far, the largest single factor is the availability. . . . Twenty years ago we didn't have any graduate students in our department who were female--none. And now we have over one-third, I am proud to say. So it seems to me that 20 years from now, I would expect a lot of women administrators. I really believe this since it takes 20 years from the time somebody finishes a Ph.D. until he really becomes eligible to be an administrator by virtue of high productivity.

Commenting on the number of women who went to college in the 1950s, one chairman said:

In the 1950s there were very, very few women . . . graduating at that time and even fewer that went on to get a master's and a Ph.D. So there are no women today that have the kind of background qualifications to be chairmen. I think it was probably a cultural thing that . . . was a man's profession and not a woman's profession. Women weren't even encouraged to take science and math. They were encouraged to take home economics, English, and those courses.

One chairman's response on sex bias and cultural attitudes was:

I think cultural attitude is gone now. . . . I see no bias among our faculty right now. In fact, among some of the faculty members, there's bias for having women administrators as much as there would be any bias against it.

However, two chairmen indicated that they think discrimination in one way or another has been a major factor in the

lack of women administrators in higher education. One chairman noted:

Part of it (lack of women administrators) is the general attitudes in terms of women in everything, not just education or job. . . . I think cultural attitude is the most dominant factor. Cultural attitudes lead to lack of awareness of career opportunities and also lead to relative lack of individuals who are in the beginning positions that can lead to advancement. I think there are just very few women who get to the stage of being a full professor with high research productivity, which is what you've got to be doing in order to be ready to become a chairman. And I think that's largely due to cultural attitudes--what people are taught by their parents and what is accepted by the culture in general as being the proper things for women to do. . . . That ties into lack of encouragement.

Another response on the cause of lack of women in higher administrative positions in education reads:

I think it has varied in periods of time. I suppose the cultural attitudes and tradition have had effects over the years, although not as much now as formerly. . . . I am sure that in former years, very few women were encouraged because of the social attitudes; I think that is different now. Women feel more comfortable to accept administrative positions and I think they have the same opportunities.

Another chairman commented:

I think in some places women had a very difficult time of getting into the field because cultural attitudes at that time almost precluded them from entering certain fields. The cultural attitude has changed slowly, changing much more rapidly now. I think it has more to do with the change of attitudes according to what the women want in an attempt to be fair and provide equitable situations. And this had been primarily at the urging of and pushing and threatenings of the women. I think if the women had not taken that attitude, they would still be at where they were.

Some chairmen also felt that career interruptions and lack of role models have been major factors for the lack of women in higher administration. One chairman observed:

I think women tend not to pursue career over extensive periods of time; there is family involvement; there is child-bearing and child upbringing involved. Line administration jobs are promotional and one has to go through a series of stages. I think there has not been that realization on the women's side. It is not that they (the women) are not capable; that has nothing to do at all with that. For example, studies have been made in education over a period of twelve years and the average number of years of teaching is just over one year for women. Most of the time they are involved in marriage, child upbringing, or similar roles. That, to me, is the major factor that accounts for the fact that women do not achieve administrative posts in the same order as men. They do not remain on the same job for a long period of time.

Respondents' Suggestions for Prospective Department Chairpersons

One question in the interview asked the department chairpersons to offer some advice to women and men administrators and/or those who are aspiring to be academic department chairpersons. The following suggestions were offered:

(1) Persons interested in the position of department chairperson may improve their chances if they are specialists in their subject areas, as well as generalists in other areas. One chairperson said:

I would counsel them (aspiring chairpersons) to remain or become generalists in their area of involvement because it seems to me that's best for administering a department.

Another chairperson also observed:

A number of people I have seen are narrowly trained; they don't have the breadth for administrative positions. . . . Those aspiring to be academic department chairpersons need broad exposure both in their own discipline and in related disciplines. Too many people think mainly in terms of their own area. The major problem facing the society are interdisciplinary, but very few people have the vision to see that. I think an administrator

should have knowledge both inside his/her discipline and outside it. . . . If the person aspiring to be a chairperson is programming his/her career, some aspect of business courses are essential; maybe a year's worth of courses in business would help. We have gotten into accountability and all kinds of business world and industrial models that are foreign to education.

One chairperson also said:

It is very important that you have full command of your subject area, but it is equally important that you do not shut off or close any phase of areas that are not your particular interest.

(2) Individuals who are aspiring to be department chairpersons are admonished to do a good job as a professor, be interested in whatever is going on around them that is relevant to administration, and/or gain whatever experience an opportunity brings. This piece of advice to the prospective chairpersons is reflected in the quotations below.

One chairperson said:

I would say that, at least in an institution like Michigan State (University), you have to be successful as a faculty member--in terms of teaching, in terms of research, in terms of public service or service to the University. You don't have to be a star necessarily; as a matter of fact, probably the stars in some of those areas wouldn't make good chairmen. But you have to be reasonably competent and do a reasonably good job.

Another chairperson also added:

I think that what I would say is that you should do a very good job as being a professor. And I think the additional thing that characterizes the people who go on to be chairmen is some interest in what's going on around them, aside from their own work. But even that is something that can happen later. Initially, an instructor, assistant, or professor should do the job as best as he/she can.

Another response reads:

I would also counsel them (aspiring chairpersons) to gain whatever experience they can, both by taking courses

in administration or aspects of it. For instance, I took a six week course in business school at Harvard several years ago, and found that was immensely valuable to me. I think those interested in the position of the chairperson should try their talents on administrative positions that are less demanding, but would give them some experience. Those positions would include heads of committees, as an associate chairman, or as head of a section within the department. This will help them know whether they like administrative positions and whether they can work out administrative details. And also it will give them exposure to people who might be making decisions for a department chairman.

Another chairperson suggested to the aspiring administrators:

I think you must establish yourself in teaching, research, or both. If you've become an administrator without having that credibility and you demand of your faculty that they publish or that they do undertake significant research and you haven't done any, they look at you and say "How can you ask that of me?" It weakens your position.

Another response also reads:

I think you should certainly establish yourself professionally; you should establish yourself as a researcher and/or as a teacher. If you enter administration too soon after your Ph.D. degree, you will not have the opportunity to do that. You'd better believe that you're not going to get time to do very much research or teaching. The nature of the administrative role is one in which you must be available to a wide variety of audiences on short notice; research needs continuity. So an administrative post does not mix very well with other kinds of academic pursuits. (Also) you may not always be an administrator; you may not like it or you may not be successful in it. Usually what people do is return to their role in teaching and research. You want to be able to return; that's one of the reasons why you should establish yourself first. Further, you better understand the unit you're trying to guide as a leader. If you don't understand the nature of research, teaching, as well as administration, you better not count on staying as a chairperson very long. So the advice is: don't go (into administration) too soon.

(3) Some of the chairpersons feel that getting along well with people, good human relations, and service to

people are essential if one is aspiring to be an academic department chairperson.

One chairperson said:

. . . it's been more a matter of working with people than anything. I think that's what is particularly important because we've gotten to the point now where the faculty have large input in terms of selecting chairpeople.

Another chairperson commented:

I think if people want to be chairpersons, they should develop good relationships with students, with faculty, and with administrators.

Another response reads:

If you are aspiring to be a chairperson, one of the things you ought to do is you have to be able to project an image of being able to get along with your colleagues. One of the roles of the chairman, I think, is mediation, peacemaker, keeping things moving and not taking strong positions on political, ideological points, but just keeping your eye focused on getting the job done. So I think that people who come on strong in terms of some positions--political positions, ideological, or whatever--probably create some barriers for themselves in terms of being chairmen because people on the other side of the issues don't want them to be chairmen. It's alright to be strong on the "apple pie," the good things like good teaching and good research. Nobody can oppose you on that. So if you're strong on those issues, you take a stance and insist on everybody performing, then that's good. But if you're arguing on curriculum or approaches to topics or things like that, then it's going to get you into trouble.

(4) Willingness to give up some gratifications and doing one's "homework" were also cited as important in helping prospective administrators get their jobs. One chairman said:

I guess my counsel would be they should be sure that they are willing to give up some of the gratifications of the academic person and exchange them for some of the gratifications that come with being a department chairman

and administrator. That's very important. . . . Also the basic thing is to develop a sense that a good administrator is basically a servant. There ought to be on the part of anyone interested in the position of department chairperson a concept of service--willingness to give to students and other faculty members.

Another piece of advice reads:

I think the person should be willing to give up his time on a number of quasi-administrative activities which the department carries. One aspiring to be a chairman should know the kinds of tasks he/she is going to face, as well as a chance for this person to indicate to other persons around whether or not he/she can do them. . . . I would also say know what is involved in academic department chairpersons' roles and do your "homework."

(5) Women and men administrators and candidates for the position of the academic department chairperson are advised to exhibit patience, understanding, and attention to details; be receptive to all different points of view, and be able to deal with agitation. "If you don't have patience, understanding, and to stay somewhat flexible . . . you'd better develop those characteristics quickly or do not apply for the post of chairperson."

Another chairperson also suggested:

I would say . . . you have to let a lot of things pass beyond you, that you don't take things personally. I guess (in issues) you should be able to respond in some sort of objective manner and not feel that you are being personally attacked. And once in awhile, you would be blamed for all kinds of things. You've to be patient.

Another comment was:

If I had to give advice, it would be something like this: be patient and improve your attention to details. I would encourage you to be organized because, I think, that's the way to operate. You should be receptive to all different points of view in the department.

One chairperson cautioned prospective chairpersons:

It's a little harder to find rewards in terms of administration. You certainly have to be able to deal with a lot of things that don't go well. You have to be able to stay with situations through thick and thin (times).

To women and men administrators, one chairperson suggested:

Learn to develop a rather thick skin and learn to develop a stable temperament. I think you have to recognize that you're there to deal with problems and that they don't go away. And if they do, new ones will come to take their place and so you have to learn to deal with certain agitation--certain instability, certain aggravation--because it is always with you. If you can't learn to live with it, then it will make you ill; you become dissatisfied. In the early (days) of administration with me, I began to find physical symptoms--twitching eye and indigestion--and as I thought about them, these things related back to the problems on the job. So if you go for this kind of position (department chairmanship), understand what goes with it and be prepared to deal with it.

(6) Geographical mobility was also cited as very helpful in getting to the position of the department chairperson. One chairperson noted:

I would say you ought to move around. I don't think it's possible or even desirable to begin your career at one school and move from assistant professor to full professor to chairman. I think you need the exposure to a lot of different types of activities because, as chairman, you will represent your department at many places. You will have to deal with a lot of people; you have to have some experience in administration. And I don't think you'll get that by simply moving through the academic ranks.

Summary

In this section, the factors that have enhanced or tended to retard (slow down) the mobility of the chairpersons have been presented and analyzed. The factors that have enhanced the upward mobility of the chairpersons included:

(1) opportunity to participate in many activities; (2) credentials, academic work and good education; (3) support and encouragement from others; (4) leadership ability and motivation; (5) knowledge of subject area and training in many areas; (6) productivity in previous occupations or assignments; (7) experience and activism; and (8) trust and good human relations.

Factors that have tended to slow down the upward mobility of the chairpersons were (1) nonsupport; (2) direct discouragement; and (3) some form of discrimination.

The t-test was used to test whether there was a significant difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors of upward mobility. It was found that there was no significant difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors that have enhanced mobility and factors that have tended to retard the mobility of the chairpersons.

When asked to give their opinions on why few women are serving in administrative posts in higher education, the chairpersons indicated that relative ability had not caused the lack of women in higher administration. In some cases, women were cited as even better able than men. Some respondents felt that lack of awareness of career opportunities, marital status, cultural attitudes and socialization, lack of encouragement and/or confidence, and the effects of discrimination have contributed to the lack of women in administrative posts in higher education.

The section also contained advice or suggestions for persons aspiring to be academic department chairpersons.

Retrospective Role Expectations

"Retrospective role expectations" have been defined as the expectations which an individual had of his or her roles on a job before starting the job. Reference has been made in this study of research findings which indicate that satisfaction is positively related to the congruence of retrospective role expectations and actual experience on the job (Hamner and Schmidt),¹⁷⁰ (Katzell),¹⁷¹ and (Dunnette et al).¹⁷²

The respondents of this study were given a number of items on the roles of academic department chairpersons and they were asked to think back to the time when they were not chairpersons and then mark how they expected their roles to be. The respondents were also asked to mark how they actually find their job now that they are chairpersons. The statistical analysis of the data is provided after the descriptive analysis of the interview data.

This section is discussed under five subsections. These are (1) Retrospective Role Expectations of the Chairwomen, (2) Retrospective Role Expectations of the

¹⁷⁰Hamner and Schmidt, op. cit., p. 348.

¹⁷¹Katzell, op. cit., p. 154.

¹⁷²Dunnette et al., op. cit., pp. 29-39.

Chairmen, (3) Expected Utilization of Time Versus Actual Use of Time, (4) Statistical Analysis, and (5) Summary.

Retrospective Role Expectations of the Chairwomen

This subsection is presented under (a) Fulfilled and Unfulfilled Expectations of the Chairwomen and (b) Unexpected Roles or Incidents.

Fulfilled and Unfulfilled Expectations

The chairwomen were asked to indicate if their expectations about the roles of the academic department chairpersons have met the reality of experience since the time they assumed office. Much of the response was that they (the chairwomen) wanted to improve their departments and make them more effective, and that this has been achieved. One chairwoman said:

Well, I think that I had one major goal. And that was that the department would increase in effectiveness and stature. And it has worked that way.

Another chairwoman indicated:

I perceived the leadership role--that you do lead a group of people and help them work cohesively toward some type of goal. I also had some research responsibility expectation. I guess I really thought also of establishing . . . a quality program and teaching in my subject area.

Responding to a question on whether her expectation has been fulfilled, the chairwoman said:

Certainly, the cohesive faculty group--that has worked very successfully. And I suppose if I look at where I feel very successful as a leader, it is in that--to get people to work together and enjoy each other.

She lamented on the lack of funds for programs. Her comment on resources was:

Another expectation that has not been fulfilled, and just very difficult here, is to get adequate facilities and resources to support programs. I still want to get more outside funding to get the faculty to support their research; we have a limited research program.

Though it is difficult to get funds, the chairwoman will not give up. This is expressed in her statement, "I'm not going to be able to accomplish them all as quickly as I would have liked to have. To say that I've given up on them, no, I don't think that's true. It's a delay." Another chairwoman said she did not expect resources to be so scarce. She expected the chairpersons to be more "powerful" than they are. She commented:

Oh, I think before you are a department chairman, you have an idea that the chairman has a great more power than he or she really has. And even more power, I think, than what most chairmen want to assume today.

Another chairwoman also indicated that she expected to do much teaching, but because of the work demands on her, she cannot teach. She wished she had the time to teach.

Unexpected Roles or Incidents

The things the chairwomen never expected, but have taken place are both positive and negative. One chairwoman expressed amazement at the amount of support she has received from the staff in her department. Referring to the early days of her appointment, she said:

I guess the most pleasant experience I have had was the difference in the amount of support you have on the

job. . . . The secretary came in to me and when I looked at the stack, she said, "If you don't know what to do with anything, just put it back in the box and I'll take care of it."

The chairwoman pointed out that she never got any help of that sort when she was faculty and never expected it before she became chairwoman. About 50 percent of the chairwomen expressed concern about the amount of paperwork the chairpersons have to do. One chairwoman reported:

It is much more consuming of my time and energy than I ever anticipated. And it's growing in this institution.

Another chairwoman indicated that the amount of paperwork is taking too much of the chairperson's time. She observed:

I do think that in the period of time I have been in this role, there is no doubt in my mind that the amount of paperwork--demands of things to be filled out--has increased significantly and has continued to take my time.

Retrospective Role Expectations of the Department Chairmen

Fulfilled and Unfulfilled Expectations

When the chairmen were asked to indicate whether the expectations which they had of their roles before they took office had been fulfilled or not, their responses showed that, in most cases, their expectations had been fulfilled. The centrality of the chairmen's expectations was to build a relatively "better department" in terms of improving the quality of programs and the quality of the faculty. Good

working relationships between the chairmen and the faculty have been instrumental to the fulfillment of the expectations.

In responding to the researcher's question on the fulfillment of his retrospective role expectations, one chairman said:

I think my expectation had been to be able to provide leadership, to get faculty to produce their best in terms of interest and competence, to work together, to help the department be one of the strongest . . . departments possible. I think in terms of increasing cooperation and effort toward that goal, we have made progress. But because of the huge amount of paper-work that's involved, frankly, I don't find the time to work with faculty as much as I'd hoped to be able to work with them in developing the ideas. . . .

Another department chairman also observed:

As I look at the chairman's role, the things that got me excited or most interested in being chairman were issues concerning moving the department in a direction to make it better. One of those primarily is people--the acquisition of new faculty (senior people or junior people) who would be very good. That would obviously add to the quality of the department. I guess that's one of my highest expectations. Yes, I think we've been successful in adding people.

With respect to recruiting and retaining quality faculty, one chairman noted:

My highest expectations were with regard to recruiting and retaining an excellent faculty. We have gone from a faculty that was quite unproductive in many ways to a faculty in which every member is somebody that I would be proud to say "he is a colleague." There is no single faculty member that I am not proud to say "he is a colleague" in some way.

The same department chairman lamented:

But still the restrictions in a variety of ways that I have to operate under have not permitted the development of the level of excellence that I would like to see.

Limited resources for faculty development was cited as one of the restrictions. Referring to expectations to build quality programs and the budget restrictions as impeding fulfillment of expectations, one chairman also said:

Well, my expectations were to develop research and education programs of excellent quality--to be able to contribute in the scientific field of my interest and express this by helping the people in my department develop their programs. I think a department chairperson--the first thing he has to think about is that he begins to forget about his research and his own professional aspirations to try to translate those by his expression in other people's commitment. . . . Budget restrictions have curtailed the development of the department much more than I had anticipated. This started immediately when I came and then we went through a little better cycle and now we're back into another budget-cutting cycle. So this has been the major trauma for my own department.

Another chairman responded:

I think that my idea was that a department chairperson had a great deal of responsibility over the quality of the academic programs, research, and teaching in the department, and that the major benefit of being a chairperson is that you have a more direct control over those factors--over your own environment. I think that, to a large extent, I believe that those expectations have been fulfilled. I do have more control than anyone else in the department in teaching and research.

Responding to the expectations that had declined since he took office, one chairman said:

Well, I think there was a time when I felt I would like to move up the administrative ladder. But after viewing administration, I find that probably the place where you can be most effective is in the department level. And when you go above the department, then many times you are making decisions without a hell of a lot of information; these decisions, many times, are not particularly accurate. Particularly, I find higher administrators who close themselves with kind of a small little group who makes all the decisions. I find that you become isolated.

Due to this observation, the chairman said he did not want to move higher than the department level.

Apart from the fulfilled and unfulfilled expectations and the expectations that had declined since assuming office, the chairmen commented on roles that they never expected or for which they had had very low expectations.

Unexpected Roles or Incidents

All the chairmen, except one, indicated that they never expected their job to involve so much paperwork. One chairman said:

. . . but I guess I was not aware when I took this job of the tremendous amount of paperwork--just general sort of uncreative work that's put on us by the higher administration, not because they really want to, but because everybody wants a piece of paper to look at numbers analyzed. So we spend a great deal of time worrying about that fact. Of course, right now, in the State of Michigan, there's tremendous problems with budget and that's a big worry.

Another response was:

An area, an inverse kind of thing, where I had low expectations or didn't expect was all the paperwork. That seems to be more and more at Michigan State anyway. There's just so much of it; it's hard to see the purpose of all of it.

Lack of resources was also cited as something some of the chairmen never expected to be so acute. One respondent indicated:

The resources available have been somewhat disappointing because of, partly, the economy, and I expect for the next 2 or 3 years to have difficult economic times. And therefore, I will find it frustrating not to be able to do some of the things I had hoped.

Expected Utilization of Time Versus
Actual Use of Time

The chairpersons were asked to estimate the percentage of time they EXPECTED to spend in (a) teaching, (b) research, and (c) administrative duties, and the percentage of time they ACTUALLY spend in these three roles. The investigator assumed that student advising and thesis directing would be done in addition to each of the roles.

The time the chairpersons expected to spend in teaching, research, and administrative duties varied widely. They ranged from 5-40 percent for teaching, 10-30 percent for research, and 40-60 for administrative duties. The percentage of time the chairpersons actually spent in the three roles did not vary very much between individuals. But the chairpersons generally expected to spend less time in administration and more time teaching than is actually the case. The percentage of time the chairpersons actually spent in teaching and research was generally far less than the percentage of time they spent in administrative duties. The average percentage of time which the chairpersons expected to spend and the percentage of time they actually spent may be found in Table 19.

Both the chairwomen and the chairmen had expected to spend more time in teaching and research than they actually spent. Administrative duties took more time than the chairpersons expected. This unfulfilled expectation and the unexpected use of time were reflected in the concerns of

Table 19
Average Percentage of Time in Three Roles

Roles	Chairwomen		Chairmen	
	Percentage of Time		Percentage of Time	
	Expected to Spend	Actually Spent	Expected to Spend	Actually Spent
Teaching	15	5	30	14
Research	25	10	25	16
Administrative Duties	60	85	45	70
Total	100	100	100	100

the department chairpersons. Too much time used on paper-work (administrative duty) and less time left for research and/or teaching were cited as one of the concerns for chairpersons in general.

In reference to Table 19, it may be noted that the chairwomen spent a greater amount of time in administrative duties than the chairmen. While both the chairwomen and chairmen expected to spend 25 percent of their time for research, the chairmen actually spent a greater amount of time in research than the chairwomen.

Perception of Role

When the chairpersons were asked to indicate how they perceived their role, a greater percentage of chairwomen than chairmen said they perceived themselves as a teacher (see Table 20). Yet, in terms of the time actually spent in the roles of teaching, research, and administration, the least percentage of time is spent in teaching (Table 19).

It would seem that chairpersons in general, or the chairwomen in particular, never got the time they would want to spend in teaching.

Comments on Expected and Actual Use of Time

Some of the comments on expected and actual utilization of time of the chairpersons may be found below.

Table 20
Perception of Role of Self

Self-Perceived Role	Chairwomen (percentage)	Chairmen (percentage)
Teacher	33.3	25.0
Administrator	16.7	37.5
Both teacher and administrator	50.0	37.5
Other	0.0	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0

One chairwoman said:

I had some expectations that I would probably teach one or two courses a year (25% of time), carry out some research projects for 20% of time, and do administrative duties the rest of my time. When I came into the role, I did continue to do the teaching for a while, but it just got to the point when I couldn't handle it at all; I could not get the time for it. I have been able to carry out two projects and I figure I can continue to do that . . . majority of my time is spent in administration.

One chairwoman's response on the use of time was:

Well, I thought I would continue to operate pretty much as I had before, except with perhaps half of my time for administration, 25% research, and 25% teaching. What has happened is that I have taught a class a year, so I guess it's about 90 percent administration and 10 percent teaching.

These two comments reflect how the administrative time expected has gained at the expense of research and teaching time. Commenting on how his teaching time has "suffered," one chairman noted:

I had hoped to spend at least 50% of my time teaching; I had hoped that I could spend 10-20% in research, and I had hoped that with a small department, do the rest in administration. From the standpoint of growth and development, because of the tremendous time it takes me with curriculum development . . . it's probably been just the reverse. I probably spend 50-60% in administration; probably I've still gotten my 10-20% in research, but my teaching has suffered.

Another comment from a chairman was:

Well, before becoming chairman, I thought it would perhaps be about 40% for administration and that I would be able to teach one course which may take 20-30% of my time, and the rest to tie into keeping an active research program, along with some public service activities of the kind that I had been accustomed to earlier. I found as an actual matter that there were times that I had to spend as much as 70-80% on administration.

Another chairman indicated, "I think I expected to spend about 40% of my time in administrative duties, about 40% in research, and 20% in teaching. I think I spend more, like probably 60% in administrative duties, 30% in research, and 10% in teaching. One chairman also observed:

Before I became the chairman five years ago, I expected to teach 10%, research 20%, and administer about 70% of my time. I have realized that I cannot do as I expected. I have phased out teaching; I do not do in-class teaching or do research. I spend all my time on administrative duties and duties like curriculum development, writing research proposals, and that kind of activities with no personal hand in involvement in teaching, except in guest lecture.

Explaining why the 10 percent teaching time had to be given up, the chairman said:

It is now almost an impossibility for me to do teaching. . . . I believe in quality teaching and if I am not prepared, I better not do it. Time and time again, I set up a couple of hours to prepare and something gets in the way--something for the good of the whole department. In such cases, the teaching gets the back seat. I have to stand in front of the class unprepared and unable to give the students what they deserve.

While a substantial number of chairpersons considered teaching as part of their role, lack of time for quality teaching appears to have been a major setback for performing that role.

Statistical Analysis

The hypotheses under the section "Retrospective Role Expectations" were tested by means of the Pearson Moment Correlation and the t-test. The hypotheses were:

- (1) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairwomen.
- (2) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairmen.
- (3) There is a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the expected behavior.
- (4) There is a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior.
- (5) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and actual behavior of all the chairpersons (chairmen and chairwomen together).

Data Presentation

Using the questionnaire, the investigator asked the chairpersons to indicate how they, before becoming

chairpersons, expected any chairperson to perform on some suggested duties, and also to indicate how they themselves performed those duties when they became chairpersons. Each chairperson's responses were two mutually exclusive answers from each of the following categories:

<u>Expected Behavior</u>	<u>Actual Behavior</u>
1. Always Performs	1. Always Performs
2. Generally Performs	2. Generally Performs
3. May or May Not Perform	3. May or May Not Perform
4. Usually Does Not Perform	4. Usually Does Not Perform
5. Never Performs	5. Never Performs

The frequencies of responses are reported for (1) the chairwomen alone (Table 21); (2) the chairmen alone (Table 22); and (3) all the chairpersons (Table 23).

Where a blank space was recorded, the frequencies will not sum to N.

Hypothesis Testing A

Hypotheses (1) and (2):

- (1) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairwomen.
- (2) There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairmen.

When the Pearson Moment Correlation was applied to the chairwomen's total scores on expected behavior and actual behavior, the two sets of scores were positively correlated.

The correlation coefficient (r) was 0.7043 (at $p = .059$).

The trend of computation was (a) responses ($N = 6$) on each of the items V_{61} to V_{86} were added; (b) responses on each of the items V_{87} to V_{112} were also added, and (c) total scores on expected behavior and scores on actual behavior were computed for Pearson Moment Correlation statistics.

The finding was:

There was no significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairwomen.

Similarly, when the Pearson Moment Correlation was applied to the chairmen's total scores on the expected behavior and scores on the actual behavior, the two scores were positively correlated.

The correlation coefficient was 0.3826 (approximately 0.4) with $p = 0.072$. The finding was:

There was no significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairmen.

The correlation between the expected behavior and the actual behavior was stronger in the case of the chairwomen than the chairmen.

Correlation coefficient (r):

Chairwomen: $r = .7043$
 $= .7$ (approximately)

Chairmen: $r = .3826$
 $= .4$ (approximately)

Table 21

Frequencies of Responses for Chairwomen
(N = 6)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
3	1	2			Prepares and makes faculty assignments	2	3	1		
		3	2	1	Involves department faculty in determining allocation of the department budget	3	3			
3	3				Consults with faculty in determining class assignments	4	2			
4	1	1			Works cooperatively with faculty in evaluating instructors for tenure	6				
3	3				Facilitates the orientation of new faculty members	5	1			
3	3				Communicates to faculty changes in administrative policy	5	1			
		4	1	1	Works cooperatively with faculty in developing departmental goals and objectives	4	2			
3	2	1			Recommends the appointment, promotion, or dismissal of faculty based on merit and performance alone	2	2	1	1	
3	1	2			Provides a means for open communication between faculty and department chairman	5	1			
3	3				Recruits, interviews, and hires full and part-time faculty	2	4			

Table 21 (continued)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
4		2			Consults with faculty about filling vacancies in the department	4	1	1		
5	1				Complies with guidelines for reviewing initial grievance requests by faculty	5	1			
	1	3			Reviews trends on student characteristics within the department and college	3		1		
1	2	3			Provides for student input in developing departmental goals and objectives	2	2	2		
2	4				Works effectively to resolve student/instructor conflicts within the department	4	2			
1	2	1	2		Manages the resolution of student problems arising out of scheduling conflicts, late registration, drop and add card requests, etc.	2	2	1	1	
3	2	1			Participates effectively as a member of the divisional academic councils and college committees	3	2	1		
3	3				Works cooperatively with faculty and deans in developing long and short range plans for curriculum	4	2			
3	3				Complies with guidelines for class size in making class assignments	3	3			

Table 21 (continued)

Expected Behavior					Actual Behavior				
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2	4				3	2	1		
Conducts departmental self-studies to determine faculty and departmental needs									
3	3				5	1			
Allows for faculty input in departmental decision-making concerning instructional planning									
3	3				5	1			
Cooperates with researchers who are attempting to advance knowledge in the field									
4	1	1			5	1			
Encourages faculty to attend professional meetings, seminars, and workshops to facilitate professional growth									
2	3	1			2	3	1		
Initiates and reviews new development in curriculum for the departments									
Other									

Key: *1 = Always Performs
 2 = Generally Performs
 3 = May or May Not Perform
 4 = Usually Does Not Perform
 5 = Never Performs

Table 22

Frequencies of Responses for Chairmen
(N = 16)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
8	6	2			Prepares and makes faculty assignments	7	6	3		
4	2	8	2		Involves department faculty in determining allocation of the department budget	4	3	8	1	
7	7	2			Consults with faculty in determining class assignments	8	5	2	1	
8	6	1	1		Works cooperatively with faculty in evaluating instructors for tenure	10	4	1	1	
9	5	2			Facilitates the orien- tation of new faculty members	7	5	3		
11	4	1			Communicates to faculty changes on administra- tive policy	9	6	1		
8	6	2			Works cooperatively with faculty in developing departmental goals and objectives	7	6	3		
10	5				Recommends the appoint- ment, promotion, or dis- missal of faculty based on merit and performance alone	10	5			
11		3	1		Provides a means of open communication between faculty and department chairman	10	5			

Table 22 (continued)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
11	4			1	Recruits, interviews, and hires full and part-time faculty	9	5	1		1
9	3	3			Consults with faculty about filling vacancies in the department	11	2	2		
12	3				Complies with guidelines for reviewing initial grievance request by faculty	13	2			
2	5	7	1		Reviews trends on student characteristics within the department and college	4	4	7		
1	2	6	7		Provides for student input in developing departmental goals and objectives	1	3	6	6	
4	6	5	1		Works effectively to resolve student/instructor conflicts within the department	7	7	2		
3	3	5	4	1	Manages the resolution of student problems arising out of scheduling conflicts, late registration, drop and add card requests, etc.	3	5	3	4	1
5	5	4	2		Participates effectively as a member of the divisional academic councils and college committees	3	6	2	5	
6	7	1	2		Works cooperatively with faculty and deans in developing long and short range plans for curriculum	5	7	3	1	

Table 22 (continued)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
4	6	4		2	Complies with guidelines for class size in making class assignments	3	3	6	2	2
7	4	5			Conducts department self-studies to determine faculty and departmental needs	7	4	4	1	
8	4	4			Allows for faculty input in departmental decision-making concerning instructional planning	12	3	1		
6	7	3			Cooperates with researchers who are attempting to advance knowledge in the field	7	5	4		
9	4	3			Encourages faculty to attend professional meetings, seminars, and workshops to facilitate professional growth	9	6	1		
5	4	5	2		Initiates and reviews new developments in curriculum for the departments	6	3	6	1	
	1				Other	1				
1					Other	1				

Key: *1 = Always Performs
 2 = Generally Performs
 3 = May or May Not Perform
 4 = Usually Does Not Perform
 5 = Never Performs

Table 23

Frequencies of Responses for All Chairpersons
(N = 22)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
11	7	4			Prepares and makes faculty assignments	9	9	4		
4	2	11	4	1	Involves departmental faculty in determining allocation of the departmental budget	4	6	11	1	
10	10	2			Consults with faculty in determining class assignments	12	7	2	1	
12	7	2	1		Works cooperatively with faculty in evaluating the instructors for tenure	16	4	1	1	
12	8	2			Facilitates the orienta- tion of new faculty members	12	6	3		
14	7	1			Communicates to faculty changes of administrative policy	14	7	1		
12	7	3			Works cooperatively with faculty in developing departmental goals and objectives	11	8	3		
13	7	1		1	Recommends for appoint- ment, promotion, or dis- missal of faculty based on merit and performance alone	12	7	1	1	1
14	1	5	1		Provides a means for open communication between faculty and department chairman	15	6			

Table 23 (continued)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
14	7			1	Recruits, interviews, and hires full and part-time faculty	11	9		1	1
13	3	5			Consults with faculty about filling vacancies in the department	15	3	3		
17	4				Complies with guidelines for reviewing initial grievance requests by faculty	18	3			
4	6	10	1		Reviews trends on student characteristics within the department and college	7	6	8		
2	4	9	7		Provides for student input in developing departmental goals and objectives	3	5	8	6	
6	10	5	1		Works effectively to resolve student/instructor conflicts within the department	11	9	2		
4	5	6	6	1	Manages the resolution of student problems arising out of scheduling conflicts, late registration, drop and add card requests, etc.	5	7	4	5	1
8	7	5	2		Participates effectively as a member of the divisional academic councils and college committees	6	6	4	6	
9	10	1	2		Works cooperatively with faculty and deans in developing long and short range plans for curriculum	9	9	3	1	

Table 23 (continued)

Expected Behavior						Actual Behavior				
1*	2	3	4	5		1*	2	3	4	5
7	9	4		2	Complies with guidelines for class size in making class assignments	6	6	6	2	2
9	8	5			Conducts department self-studies to determine faculty and departmental needs	10	6	5	1	
11	7	4			Allows for faculty input in departmental decision-making concerning instructional planning	17	4	1		
9	10	3			Cooperates with researchers who are attempting to advance knowledge in the field	12	6	4		
13	5	4			Encourages faculty to attend professional meetings, seminars and workshops to facilitate professional growth	14	7	1		
7	7	6	2		Initiates and reviews new developments in curriculum for the departments	8	6	7	1	
1	1				Other	1				
1		1			Other	1				

Key: *1 = Always Performs
 2 = Generally Performs
 3 = May or May Not Perform
 4 = Usually Does Not Perform
 5 = Never Performs

Hypothesis Testing B

Hypotheses (3) and (4) were tested by t-test. The test was statistically significant at the .05 level. The hypotheses were:

- (3) There is a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the expected behavior.
- (4) There is a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior.

With reference to Appendix F: Data Report B, it was noted that:

$$\bar{X}_1 \text{ chairmen} = 47.75 \quad \bar{X}_1 \text{ chairwomen} = 44.1667$$

$$\bar{X}_2 \text{ chairmen} = 43.1250 \quad \bar{X}_2 \text{ chairwomen} = 35.3333$$

where $\bar{X}_1$ = mean of scores on TOT (expected behavior) and $\bar{X}_2$ = mean of scores on TOT actual behavior).

The value of t-test for hypothesis (3) was 7.29 with $p = .039$. Since $.039 p < .05$, there was significant difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on expected behavior.

However, the value of t-test for hypothesis (4) was 1.12 with $p = .781$. Since $p < .781$, there was no significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior.

Results of the hypotheses testing:

- (3) There was a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on expected behavior.

- (4) There was no significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior.

Hypothesis Testing C

Hypothesis (5) was tested by means of Pearson Moment Correlation. The hypothesis tested was:

There is a significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of all the chairpersons.

When the Pearson Moment Correlation was applied to scores of the chairpersons ($N = 22$) on the expected behavior and the actual behavior, the two sets of scores were correlated, the correlation positive.

The correlation coefficient (r) was .4241 with $p = .025$.

The results of the hypothesis testing was:

There is no significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of all the chairpersons.

From the above analysis of data, it was noted that with the chairwomen ($N = 6$), the chairmen ($N = 16$), and the chairpersons (chairmen and chairwomen together, $N = 22$), the expected behavior was not significantly different from the actual behavior. It was inferred that the chairpersons were satisfied with their jobs. This conclusion was based on "theory" put forth by Hamner and Schmidt, Katzell, and Dunnette et al., that there is satisfaction when

retrospective role expectations are congruent with the actual experience on the job (discussed in the review of literature).

Summary

This section presented the analysis of data on retrospective role expectations. Fulfilled and unfulfilled expectations and unexpected roles of the chairpersons were reported from the interviews. Most of the expectations of the chairpersons had been fulfilled. The few areas where their expectations had not been fulfilled included funding for departments and utilization of time. Some of the chairpersons indicated that they did not expect to encounter much difficulty in getting funds for their departments' programs. However, that is what it had turned out to be. Virtually all the chairpersons indicated that they expected to spend more time in teaching and research than what they actually spent, and they expected to spend less time in administrative duties than they actually spent (see Table 19).

The Pearson Moment Correlation and the t-test were applied to scores on the expected behavior and the actual behavior to test the hypotheses on retrospective role expectations. It was found that there was no significant difference between what the chairpersons expected their roles to be and what they actually experienced. The correlation between expected behavior and actual behavior

was higher for chairwomen ($r = 0.7043$) than for chairmen ($r = 0.3826$). This suggested that chairmen had less exact expectations of their roles than did the chairwomen.

Job Satisfaction

The review of literature in this study restated the findings of research that job satisfaction is related, rather negatively, to withdrawal (turnover) and absenteeism.¹⁷⁰ Therefore, the more satisfied chairpersons are, the less likely they will be to resign from their post. To examine the satisfaction-dissatisfaction of the chairpersons, direct and indirect questions were asked. Responses to the questions are presented and analyzed under seven subsections. These are (1) Challenges of the Job of Chairperson; (2) Theories of Job Satisfaction in Relation to the Chairpersons' Satisfaction; (3) Power, Authority, and Influence of the Department Chairpersons, (4) Job Difficulty and Concerns of the Department Chairpersons, (5) Overall Job Satisfaction, (6) Statistical Analyses, and (7) Summary.

Challenges of the Job of Chairperson

All the respondents considered the position of the chairperson challenging, very challenging, and extremely challenging. Table 24 compares the chairwomen and chairmen on how they rated the job of department chairperson. The highest percentage of chairwomen (50 percent) rated the job

¹⁷⁰Brayfield and Crockett, op. cit.; and F. Herzberg et al., op. cit.

Table 24

Ratings of the Job, Department Chairperson

	Chairwomen (percentage)	Chairmen (percentage)
Extremely challenging	16.7	25.0
Very challenging	33.3	43.8
Challenging	50.0	31.2
Less challenging	0.0	0.0
Least challenging	0.0	0.0

challenging, while the highest percentage of the chairmen (43.8 percent) rated it very challenging. None viewed the job less or least challenging.

Challenges of the Chairwomen

When asked to indicate the areas of greatest challenge, the chairwomen cited lack of enough time, administrative duties, teaching and research, and too much paperwork. One chairwoman observed:

The role is very time consuming . . . meeting teaching and research commitments--finding time to do that is virtually impossible and balancing the requirements to conduct research with other obligations I have. In other words, I simply do not have the time to take a day that I am going to be in the laboratory. . . . And because the accumulation of paper here is so overwhelming, it is a challenge keeping up with it. Being able to respond in the expected time interval is a very great challenge.

Referring to the lack of time to teach, do research, and administer, one female respondent said:

I would say it is difficult . . . teaching and researching at once. Although all of us are involved in teaching and I think . . . classroom is the high point of our day. It is hard to find time to do it. Some of us are involved in developing programs--in developing new techniques and I suspect, we get a great deal of joy from that--it is hard to meet teaching and research commitments and administrative duties.

Another chairwoman asserted that it is not the administrative responsibilities, but it is the time factor that poses a challenge to her. One response also reads:

Well, I would say it's simply the business of excessive paperwork; the administrative responsibilities certainly is a very great challenge because you dare not blow it in terms of budgeting, wrong recommendations, and it's really an important kind of spot to be in because if you do blow it, then the buck does stop here.

Another chairwoman said:

Well, I think managing is probably the most challenging aspect of this job. Things come in so fast and you don't get a chance to really study them. Sometimes you might respond in a way which is not appropriate.

She added that the chairpersons try to respond appropriately at all times.

Challenges of the Chairmen

Like the chairwomen, the chairmen cited lack of time and funds, and administrative duties as major areas of challenge. As in the case of the chairwomen, family responsibilities and behavior variables were not seen as challenges. Some responses from the chairmen are quoted below.

One chairman said, "I guess, quite frankly, I do think time--being able to budget your time, schedule your time--is probably the most challenging of the chairperson's

job. Indicating that the position leaves him no time for his personal work, one chairman noted:

I have a manuscript on my basement desk, for example, that was promised in September (six months from now) and I actually haven't touched it since seven months ago. I have been thinking about it, but I have not had the time to get back into it--to get deeply into it.

Another comment on "challenge" was:

Well, the biggest challenges are in administration. There is no question about that, particularly with the lowering of the budgets and so on. It is very difficult. Managing to live within the budget that we have for the year is the biggest challenge of all.

On lack of funds, one chairman observed:

I think the greatest challenge presently, and I think will be in the future, is adequate financing to both provide the kind of program and services that the department thinks we ought to provide and to give adequate rewards--at least monetarily--to faculty. So it would have to do with planning and budgeting, I guess.

One response also reads:

By far, the largest challenge that I have is selecting highly qualified faculty--new faculty and developing those faculty in their skills in teaching, research and public service. The second most important challenge is the interrelationships--developing strong interrelationships among faculty so that they'll be more productive together than they would be separate. That includes office assignments, graduate assistantships, all of the resources that we have, assigning those to the faculty, committee assignments, so as to enhance their ability to work together to produce.

The challenges of the chairwomen and the chairmen were all centered around budgeting time to do various duties and lack of funds or resources in meeting responsibilities and administrative duties.

Most of the chairpersons had indicated that one of the reasons for accepting the positions was the need for

challenge. It would seem, then, that they were not dissatisfied by the challenges imposed by the position.

Theories of Job Satisfaction in Relation to the Chairpersons' Satisfaction

Equity Theory

Equity theory of job satisfaction suggests that satisfaction is determined by a person's perceived input-outcome balance. Outcome denotes the results of input. If "input" is considered an investment, then the returns of the investment may be said to be the "outcome." Outcome may be intrinsic or extrinsic rewards. It includes pay or salary, fringe benefits, and other compensations.

When the chairpersons were asked to compare the input and outcome of their duties, the results, as in Table 25, were obtained. The highest percentage of both chairwomen and chairmen considered their outcomes equal to their inputs. Outcome was considered to be less than input by 33.3 percent of chairwomen and 37.4 percent of the chairmen.

Fulfillment Theory

Under the Fulfillment Theory, job satisfaction is seen in terms of the degree to which the job provides a person with positive valued outcome.¹⁷¹ The chairpersons indicated that they valued challenge and felt their job was going to provide them challenge. When they were asked to

¹⁷¹Vroom, op. cit.

Table 25

Comparison of Outcome of Duties and Inputs

Outcome Versus Input	Chairwomen (percentage)	Chairmen (percentage)
Outcome far more than input	0.0	0.0
Outcome more than input	0.0	6.3
Outcome equal to input	50.0	43.7
Outcome less than input	33.3	37.4
Outcome far less than input	16.7	6.3
No response	0.0	6.3
Total	100.0	100.0

rate their job on the continuum of extremely challenging to least challenging, all the chairpersons rated the job challenging, very challenging, and extremely challenging; there was no rating for least challenging or less challenging (Table 24). From the standpoint of the fulfillment theory, it was noted that the chairpersons were satisfied with their jobs.

Discrepancy Theory

By discrepancy theory, satisfaction is determined by the difference between the actual outcomes a person receives and the other outcome level. The other outcome level may be that which a person feels he/she should get and that is determined by a comparison with how much another person in similar responsibility areas receives.

When asked how they perceived what they received (such as pay, fringe benefits, and so on), relative to what their colleagues--faculty or other administrators in academe--receive, all the chairpersons indicated that what they received was equitable. Commenting on this, one chairwoman said, ". . . I have never felt in any way that I was treated unfairly." Another chairwoman also noted, "I don't have any complaints now, but I must admit that I started out at a very low level." Comparing administrators with faculty, one chairwoman also said:

Academic administrators are twelve month employees; most faculty members are ten month employees. . . . The non-administrative people have more time to do the sort of things that are rewarded by the University (such as) more time to do research and more time to do publishing. . . . Overall, I think, chairpersons are paid favorably compared to their colleagues (faculty).

Over 60 percent of the chairpersons had turned down jobs in industry, government, or in private organizations. None of the respondents indicated that he/she was interested in working outside academe. The question was "Why is that the chairpersons did not want to work in business, government, or private organizations, where financial compensation would be higher?" The basic reason was centered around quality of work and flexibility with work schedule. One chairman referred to "psychic compensation" as keeping him at the University. The psychic compensation was explained to include academic environment, flexibility with work schedule, good relationship with faculty and other colleagues, and overall quality of work. The following comments shed light

on why the chairpersons prefer working at the University to working in business, government, or private organizations. Admitting that the financial compensation is better outside academe, one chairperson said:

Their financial rewards and fringe benefits are much larger than mine. If I wanted, I could do that (go to industry, government, or private agency). But I have other kinds of rewards other than financial rewards. Working with students, working with clientele, and public services are valued more than money. (Intrinsic) rewards that I get are enormous. So I much more prefer to work at the University. I don't want to work in private organizations or industry. . . . So these rewards that those of us who enjoy the freedom of doing research on what we want to do, working with clientele in public service can be equated with salary. They make my job much more rewarding.

Another chairperson commented:

I think there's a tremendous amount of variety in academic life--not just for chairmen, but also professors. They can determine to a large extent what they do every day. If you want to be heavily involved in research, you can be, and if you want to be heavily involved in teaching, then you can be. If you want to spend a lot of time consulting with the government, you can. So that freedom to do what interests you is a major factor.

Another response was:

I suspect administrators who are outside academic institutions get more, but their jobs are more difficult in a lot of respects. I don't think that they have a good working situation to work in as the University. The University is a much nicer place to work. You don't have the pressures like regular hours forced on you.

Referring to the intrinsic rewards, one chairperson said,

". . . The reward system (at the University) is greater too. Just like the atmosphere of being around a university is adequate." He added, "So the fact that I'm here instead of someplace else must mean that I like it."

The results of the discussion were that (a) the chairpersons valued "psychic compensation" or intrinsic rewards more than extrinsic rewards, like financial compensation; (b) they preferred working at the University to working in business, government, or private organizations.

Power, Authority, and Influence of the Department Chairpersons

When the chairpersons were asked in the interview to comment on their power and authority relative to their responsibilities to students, faculty, staff, and other administrators at this university, 50 percent of the chairpersons seemed more comfortable with the use of the concepts "influence" and "authority," than the use of the concept "power." This is reflected in a statement from one chairperson, "I think the word, power, is a little nervous; maybe we can concentrate on influence and authority."

Most of the chairpersons indicated that they had less power and authority with the administrators above them. Some argued that the line of power and authority between chairpersons and the upper administrators is often one-way. One chairperson observed:

With administrators at the university, I think we have too much of one-way direction; I think other administrators tend to dictate what goes on, rather than discuss what goes on with the chairman. I don't think we have enough influence on policies at higher levels.

Another chairperson also commented:

I do have the authority to make some decisions. . . .
As far as other administrators in the University beyond

me, I suppose my power depends very much on my persuasive ability and my performance. If I do that well and they perceive that, then I have some power. Otherwise, I do not.

Some of the department chairpersons said that, apart from other administrators at the University, their power, authority and influence were generally adequate. One comment reads:

. . . I've been at several universities and I think the chairperson's authority on this campus is quite strong. I think chairpersons have a great ability to influence programs. However, the funding format is such that there's not very much you can move in the way of money. Most of it is in salaries; most of it is in tenured faculty, and the amount of money that I can move from one place to another is not very large. But I feel that the amount of authority the chairperson has is adequate.

One chairperson asserted:

I think the department chairperson is still one of the most significant administrators at the college and university level. . . . There is a lot of power and authority in the department chairperson's position. To reach the basic decisions in the university in terms of the faculty, the students and keeping teaching going, I think (there) is a lot of power. On the other hand, I think we have reached a point that the faculty are supposed to have a lot of input.

It is implied that delegation of responsibility takes away part of the chairperson's power or authority. One chairperson rated the faculty very high in terms of power. He said:

I don't feel that I have any power with the faculty or the other administrators at Michigan State University. I feel that our faculty hired me for a five year period of time. At the end of that period of five years, if they don't like me, they can fire me. And so if I have power or authority, it's only invested entirely in my ability to persuade them on my points of view and to truly lead the faculty.

One response on power, authority, and influence differed sharply with the above. The respondent said:

I think the place where I see my power and authority being most effective is the faculty. The faculty are most sensitive to my wishes and to my assessment of what's needed. Students are a little farther away; the faculty are between them and me, unless that's my class. And so they don't really care too much that I'm the chairman. That doesn't make much difference to them, as far as I can tell.

Comparing the chairperson's responsibilities and power/authority, one chairman said:

I would say it's reasonably well in balance relative to students, faculty, and staff. That is, I think the chairman has what authority he needs to carry out his responsibility on the academic program. These are kind of limited because the faculty themselves should and do decide on curriculum matters, but I think that's appropriate, so I don't see any imbalance there.

Another response reads:

All the chairpersons at Michigan State are relatively powerful. . . . I have a budget to administer; I have a role in recruitment and a say in who's going to be fired and who's going to be promoted. And I do all of the scheduling for the department. I hire the secretarial staff out here, and I have a large say on admissions to the doctoral program and the curriculum. The faculty perceives the chairman to be in a powerful position; our interactions, it seems to me, are such that they perceive me having a lot of power. . . . When they come in, they don't say, "We're going to do this and we're going to do that." They say, "What do you think about this?"

From these discussions, it appears that chairpersons felt they had less power and authority with the upper administrators, but had adequate power and authority with faculty, staff, and students.

Influence in Decision-Making

When the chairpersons were asked to indicate the extent to which they influenced the decision-making process, with regard to certain activities, the responses in Table 26 were obtained. The responses are in percentages. With reference to the table, it was found that chairpersons had a great deal or a considerable influence on faculty appointment, faculty promotion, faculty tenure, faculty and staff evaluation, and preparation of budgetary requests. The influence of the chairpersons was relatively little on faculty negotiations, institutional policy-making, quality of teaching at the department, and moderate influence on instructional methods.

It is interesting to note how the chairpersons perceived their influence in faculty negotiations. Fifty percent of the chairpersons indicated that "faculty negotiation" was not applicable. The responses of the chairpersons on the quality of teaching were also interesting. The faculty has a high degree of autonomy and the chairpersons' influence in their teaching was said to be very minimal.

Job Difficulty and Concerns of the Department Chairpersons

Job Difficulty Based on Sex

Each chairperson was asked whether being a male or female made his or her job as a department chairperson difficult or easier. In a predominantly female department,

Table 26

Percentages of Chairpersons on Perception
of Influence in Decision-Making
(N = 22)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Faculty Appointments	59	27	14			
Faculty Promotions	41	36	18	5		
Faculty Tenure	41	36	14	9		
Faculty and Staff Evaluation	64	23	13			
Instructional Methods	27	36	14	23		
Quality of Teaching at the Department		36	41	23		
Faculty Negotiations	4	4	14	23	4	50
Institution Policy-Making		5	18	18	50	9
Preparation of Budgetary Request	46	27	14	4	9	

Key: 1 = A Great Deal 4 = Some
 2 = Considerable 5 = Little or None
 3 = Moderate 6 = Does Not Apply

the chairperson indicated being female made her job probably easy. One chairwoman who had a different opinion wrote:

Being a female, there are still a few cases where I am not taken seriously. Sometimes, if I go to a meeting of other administrators where there are primarily males, when I offer suggestions or make a statement, I have the sense that it's taken a little more lightly or not well understood. That isn't always the case.

The chairpersons in the predominantly male departments said that being male made the job easier. In all other departments, being one sex or another did not have much effect on the job. The chairpersons indicated that differences in departments were not based on chairpersons per se, but differences depended on programs offered and size of the department. One chairman, however, observed:

I guess there's no question that the male aggressiveness gives one better chance at certain opportunities. I think there is no question about that.

To answer the question, "In what way(s), if any, has being a male made your position as a chairperson difficult or easy," one chairman said:

I can't think of any way it's made it difficult, just being a male. I think it's made it easier, being a male, because people are more accustomed to dealing with a male in the position. I think it's easier, and it makes the establishment of relationships easier with other administrators in the University and probably with faculty. . . .

Other Difficulties

Some department chairpersons report to two or three deans. Each superordinate expected the chairperson to report or react to him or her as though the chairpersons reported to no one else.

Some of the chairpersons indicated that the administration expected 100 percent productivity. The demands on the chairperson by the administrators and faculty make the job difficult.

Clarity of directions from "above" and compatibility of leadership were difficulties for the job of the department chairpersons. One chairman said:

Well, clarity of directions from the dean is probably the most important one of all. "Clarity," I mean discrepancies between my knowledge of what is going on at the level above him and what I get from him. . . . The other biggest problem is one of leadership. And compatibility of leadership and philosophy of education.
 . . .

When the chairpersons were asked to indicate how they made known areas of concern to the dean, provost and/or other administrators, almost all the chairpersons indicated that their concerns are made to the dean and not to the provost or any other administrator. Only in rare and special cases would a chairperson contact the provost directly. The department chairpersons made areas of concern known to the dean through memos, telephone discussion, and most importantly, through formal or informal meetings with the dean. Important decisions arrived at during telephone calls or in informal meetings are documented by most of the chairpersons.

Major Gripes of Department Chairpersons

When the chairpersons were asked in the interview to indicate their major gripes about the position of the chairperson, they cited (a) excessive paperwork; (b) multiple

responsibilities and lack of time, (c) the shrinking budget, and (d) inability to make certain independent decisions.

The amount of paperwork was cited to be too much, too phenomenal and exponential, and too excessive. This was the view of both chairmen and chairwomen. In one chairman's words, "I just question the value of it." One chairwoman also said:

My major gripe is the excessive paperwork. I sometimes wonder what is done to those papers that you send out there.

Another chairwoman also commented:

The amount of paperwork that comes across this desk to be looked at and dealt with is tremendous. (My major gripe) is the amount of paperwork that I sometimes wonder who looks at it and whether it's worth all the time I am spending.

One chairman also said:

My major gripes are the constantly increasing reports and amount of paperwork that is required. It's becoming increasingly more demanding.

Another chairman's response was:

I think that sometimes it's the system. It's just difficult in moving the system. Sometimes you have the feeling that there are people in the central administration who have forgotten what the university is for. (University) is for students, teachers, and researchers. There really isn't any other reason for it to be here. So I get very angry or upset with these people who have us spending all of our time filling out forms or who are blocking our wish to do things which, in some ways, don't take resources, just take permission. They are rigid for reasons I can't understand.

On multiple responsibilities and the lack of time, one chairman observed:

I guess (my major gripes are) the multiple responsibilities. . . . Everybody often wants a piece of the

chairperson; they don't want somebody else. I have to be in so many places; sometimes a week goes by where all I have to do is run by my desk and drop one folder and pick up another. It's the division of my effort into a variety of things. . . . And I'm expected to participate fully in committees, social activities, and so on.

Another chairman commented:

The department chairperson is pulled here and there. The administration regards you 100 percent administrator and the faculty wants you to be 100 percent faculty member. The chairperson has to wear two hats; he/she has to take the middle ground position. . . . Things that are asked of us (from above) are not well thought out properly. (For example) somebody needs information and will not look for it anywhere but from the department chairman. Many times the information may be on the University computer.

A response from one chairwoman reads:

I feel that we are too involved in the reporting and the business of administration. We don't get to spend enough time in planning and giving leadership in the developmental programs. And we have programs that desperately need attention. . . . I would like to see department chairpersons have enough time to think ahead and plan to improve our programs.

Citing the shrinking budget as a major gripe, one chairperson said:

Well, our shrinking budget is a major constraint, given the fact that in the department like ours, we have phasable expenses that we have to take care of. And those expenses inflate proportional to the real rate of inflation of this country. . . . But our support from the University is running out.

Some of the chairpersons felt that there are certain decisions they are not "permitted" to make independently. One chairwoman commented:

I guess (my gripe) is the inability to independently make decisions sometimes. I am going to have to depend on what the dean or some other upper administrative person says.

She cited the incident in which the department's faculty worked out curriculum and it had taken a very long time to be approved by the administration. The chairwoman noted, "You have some decision-making power, but you don't have quite enough sometimes to get the job done." One chairman added:

Another gripe is that we have no control over the destiny of our clerical and technical staff. They are University staff and we have to treat them like (that). Our hands are tied and we cannot give merit increases to people.

Overall Job Satisfaction

The discussion on theories of satisfaction indicated that the chairpersons were satisfied with their jobs. Though they would earn more than what they earned at the university if they had gone to business, government, or private organizations, most of the department chairpersons indicated that they would not like to work outside of the university. The chairpersons valued intrinsic returns of their job or what was referred to as "psychic compensation" more than financial compensation.

When the chairpersons were asked in the questionnaire to indicate whether they would apply for the same job if they had to do it again, a larger percentage (50 percent of the chairwomen and 68.8 percent of the chairmen) said they would apply again. Table 27 compares the responses of the chairwomen with those of the chairmen.

Table 27

Percentages of the Chairpersons Who Would
Apply for the Job

Intention to Apply for the Same Job	Chairwomen (percentage)	Chairmen (percentage)
Would certainly apply for job	0.0	25.0
Would apply for job	50.0	43.8
Not sure; might or might not	33.3	25.0
Would not apply for the job	16.7	0.0
No way; would never apply for job	0.0	6.2
Total	100.0	100.0

When the chairpersons were asked in the interview whether they would accept the position of chairperson if they were offered the position right now, more than 60 percent of the respondents said they would accept it. About 20 percent of the chairpersons said they would give a second thought to the offer before accepting or refusing it. In one chairman's words:

Well, I would if the offer were the same as it was at the time I was offered it. Probably, they couldn't offer me enough right now, because of the budget, to get me to come.

One chairwoman also observed:

. . . because I would have a look at the budget. If I knew that the constraints were really so severe, I would not have to take it. . . . I would not be able to conduct the sort of leadership that I would like to.

Taking an ambivalent stand, another chairperson said:

If I were offered the position again now, knowing what I know, I don't know what I'd do. It's much more difficult than I ever expected it to be in a lot of ways.

Reminiscing how he reacted the first time the offer was made to him, one chairman said:

I was very pleased--particularly pleased that the recommendation came from a faculty group and the people that I'd be working with. . . . I suppose that if it were offered to me (now), I would still accept it. I still think it is a challenge; I think there are still opportunities that we can improve in-service and pre-service education and make a better program for youngsters.

Another chairman also told of the first time that the position was offered to him and how he would react to the offer now:

I think I was flattered the first time because I was an associate professor at that time, and it was flattering to be considered for a chairman. And I looked at it as an opportunity to do some things I wanted to do. So it was kind of a challenge. . . . If I were offered the position right now, I probably still would (accept it), because even though the biggest challenge has to do with the time and the gripe has to do with the paperwork, being chairman, at least, allows you to schedule your own time more freely than some positions. If you're going to meet your commitments and schedule your time, I think it's better to have that flexibility.

It appears that the "psychic compensation" and the flexibility the chairpersons have are valued more than financial compensation, and they provide the chairpersons some job satisfaction.

Statistical Analyses

The t-test was used to test the hypothesis of job satisfaction. The hypothesis was:

There is significant difference between levels of satisfaction of academic department chairmen and chairwomen.

Satisfaction was measured by two scales. The first scale utilized measures on the expected behavior and actual behavior. Satisfaction is defined here as the difference between the actual behavior and the expected behavior (see Table 23 for Frequency Scores of Expected and Actual Behavior).

$$\text{Actual Behavior} - \text{Expected Behavior} = \text{Level of Satisfaction}$$

The smaller the difference, the higher the level of satisfaction. This is based on the theory that satisfaction is determined by the congruence of retrospective role expectations and actual experience on the job (Katzell),¹⁷² (Hamner),¹⁷³ and (Dunnette et al.).¹⁷⁴

The trend of computation was:

$$\text{TOT} - \text{TOL} = \text{NEW}$$

Where TOT were actual scores (V_{87} to V_{112}) and TOL were the expected scores (V_{61} to V_{86}).

The "NEW" scores for the chairmen and chairwomen were tested by means of the t-test. An alpha level of .05 was used.

The value of the t-test was 3.17, with $p = .208$ (Appendix F: Data Report C). Since $p < .208$, there was no

¹⁷²Katzell, op. cit.

¹⁷³Hamner, op. cit.

¹⁷⁴Dunnette et al., op. cit.

significant difference between the level of satisfaction of chairmen and chairwomen.

The second scale was applied on V_{113} to V_{123} . The direction of V_{114} , V_{115} , V_{116} , V_{120} , V_{121} , and V_{122} was changed to make the direction of the items uniform. The analysis was subjected to a t-test.

$$\bar{X} \text{ Chairmen} = 30.75 \quad \bar{X} \text{ Chairwomen} = 31.67$$

where $\bar{X}$ is the mean of scores.

The value of the t-test was 1.79, with $p < .539$. Since $p < .539$, there was no significant difference between the levels of satisfaction of the chairmen and the chairwomen.

The finding was

There was no significant difference between levels of satisfaction of academic department chairmen and chairwomen.

Summary

In this chapter, job satisfaction-dissatisfaction of the department chairpersons was examined, presented, and analyzed. The discussion covered (1) Challenges of the Job of Chairperson; (2) Theories of Job Satisfaction in Relation to the Chairpersons' Satisfaction; (3) Power, Authority, and Influence of the Department Chairpersons, (4) Job Difficulty and Concerns of the Department Chairpersons, (5) Overall Job Satisfaction, and (6) Statistical Analyses.

The chairpersons found their jobs extremely challenging, very challenging, and challenging. They

anticipated that the job would be challenging. They valued the challenge and upon that, they seemed satisfied with their jobs.

Based on equity theory, fulfillment theory, and discrepancy theory, the academic department chairpersons were satisfied with their jobs. They valued intrinsic rewards and "psychic compensation" more than extrinsic rewards, such as financial compensation. They preferred working at the University to going to work in business, government, or private organizations.

The power, authority, and influence of the chairpersons were cited as less adequate with the upper administrators, but adequate with students, faculty, and staff.

Excessive paperwork, multiple responsibilities with lack of time, a shrinking budget, inability to make certain independent decisions, and lack of clarity of direction from upper administrators were cited as gripes and difficulties with the job. However, overall, the chairpersons were satisfied with their jobs. This was confirmed by the statistical analysis of data on job satisfaction. The chairpersons enjoyed the flexibility in the work schedule of their positions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
RECOMMENDATIONS AND
REFLECTIONS

Summary

Introduction

The central theme of this study was to examine the academic department chairwomen and chairmen with respect to their upward mobility, their retrospective role expectations, and their job satisfaction. The study was a comparative one in that the women as a group were treated against the men as another group on the variables considered.

The impetus of this study was a personal interest by the investigator in departments, the department chairmanship, and studies on women administrators in higher education. Literature indicated that very few studies have been made on department chairpersons in large universities and also very few studies on women professionals in higher education. The personal interest, generated through some courses related to this study, plus the need for a study of department chairpersons in a large university and for study of women chairpersons led to this study.

The purposes of this research were stated in terms of the benefits which may be obtained from this study. The purposes are restated below:

- (1) To provide additional information on department chairpersons and thereby contribute to the body of knowledge on administrators in higher education.
- (2) To provide mobility strategies (academic, vocational, or otherwise) adopted by the chairpersons to get to where they now are in their careers.
- (3) To identify the retrospective role expectations of the chairpersons and the reality--their actual experience on the job.
- (4) To examine whether or not academic department chairpersons are satisfied with their jobs.

Overall View of the Study

To achieve the purposes of this study, answers were sought to the following questions:

- (1) What are the important factors which have enhanced the mobility of the academic department chairmen and chairwomen?
- (2) What are the important factors which have retarded (slowed down) the mobility of the chairmen and chairwomen?
- (3) Did the academic department chairmen have less exact expectations for their jobs than did the chairwomen?

- (4) If they had to do it over again, would the chairpersons choose the same job?
- (5) What relationship, if any, exists between the chairpersons' retrospective role expectations and job satisfaction?
- (6) Is there any difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors enhancing upward mobility?
- (7) Is there any difference between the chairmen and the chairwomen on factors that tended to retard their upward mobility?
- (8) Is there any difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of academic department chairwomen?
- (9) Is there any difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of academic department chairmen?
- (10) Is there any difference between academic department chairmen and chairwomen on expected behavior?
- (11) Is there any difference between chairmen and chairwomen on actual behavior?
- (12) Is there any difference between expected behavior and actual behavior for both chairmen and chairwomen?
- (13) Is there any difference between the levels of satisfaction of academic department chairmen and chairwomen?

The methods used to attempt to obtain answers to these questions were (1) in-depth interviews with the chairpersons and (2) written questionnaires completed by the chairpersons within a couple of weeks after the interview.

The items on the questionnaire (Appendix C) and the interview guide (Appendix D) were developed, in part, from the review of literature relating to the factors for the study. The literature review focused on the (1) Mobility of Men and Women Professionals in Higher Education, (2) Retrospective Role Expectations, (3) Job Satisfaction, and (4) Job Difficulty and Frustrations of the Department Chairpersons. The literature review was presented in Chapter II.

Chapter III, on "Research Design and Procedures," discussed the population and sample for the study, instrumentation, and how data was to be presented and analyzed. The design of the study was two-fold: (1) descriptive and (2) statistical. The descriptive and statistical methods of analysis were to be supplementary; the descriptive analysis covered the aspect of the analysis that could not be presented statistically.

The data was presented and analyzed in Chapter IV. Research questions (1) through (5), listed above, were handled descriptively, and questions (6) through (12) statistically. The Michigan State University Computer CDC 6500 was used to assemble the data quantitatively and to analyze the data statistically. An .05 alpha level of significance was used for the statistics. Quotations from

the chairpersons provided additional information to the analysis. The fourth chapter was organized to cover (1) the Overview of the Academic Department Chairpersons, (2) Factors of Upward Mobility, (3) Retrospective Role Expectations, and (4) Job Satisfaction of the Department Chairpersons. Under the "Overview of the Academic Department Chairpersons," demographic information of the chairpersons, the respondents' opinions about the position of the chairperson, the nature of their previous positions, and the reasons for accepting their current position were presented.

The section on "Upward Mobility" presented and analyzed (1) Factors Affecting the Mobility of Chairwomen, (2) Factors Affecting the Mobility of Chairmen, (3) Additional Factors Affecting Upward Mobility and their Statistical Analyses, (4) Respondents' Opinions on Why Few Women are Serving in Administrative Positions in Higher Education, and (5) Respondents' Advice and Suggestions for Prospective Department Chairpersons.

The analysis of the retrospective role expectations was presented under (1) Retrospective Role Expectations of Chairwomen, (2) Retrospective Role Expectations of Chairmen, (3) Expected Versus Actual Utilization of Time, and (4) the Statistical Analyses of the Retrospective Role Expectations. The Pearson Moment Correlation and t-test were used for the statistical analysis of the data in this section. As evidenced by Katzell and Dunnette et al., job satisfaction is positively related to the congruence of role expectations

and actual experience on the job. The fulfillment of retrospective role expectations provided an index to measure the chairpersons' satisfaction.

The satisfaction-dissatisfaction of the department chairpersons with their jobs was further investigated, presented, and analyzed in relation to (1) Challenges of the Job of the Chairpersons, (2) Theories of Job Satisfaction, (3) Power, Authority, and Influence, (4) Job Difficulty and Concerns of the Chairpersons, and (5) Overall Job Satisfaction of the Department Chairpersons. The t-test was used for the statistics in this section.

A summary at the end of each section provided the main trend of discussion of the section.

In this final chapter, (1) A Summary of the Study, (2) Findings and Conclusions emanating from the study, and (3) Recommendations and Reflections, are presented.

Findings of the Study

The findings of the study are presented below.

Age Category

More than half the sample were fifty years and over; no chairperson was below 30 years of age.

Marital Status

The respondents did not perceive marital status as negatively affecting their position. Some married chairpersons rather indicated that the marriage status was

positive; husbands or wives of the respondents were cited as very supportive of the chairpersons' position.

Acceptance of Position

Almost every chairperson was nominated or drafted by the faculty. Findings indicated that the chairpersons perceived the acceptance of the position as "gambling"--implying that they had a fifty-fifty chance for succeeding in the position. Further, the data showed that most of the chairwomen were given encouragement from the dean or the outgoing chairperson(s). It would seem that encouragement played a large role in the chairwomen's decision to accept the "chair."

Reasons for Accepting Position

The chairwomen and chairmen were similar on the central reasons for accepting the position. Reasons were both personal and professional. The chairpersons said they needed some challenge and felt the position would provide them with a challenge. Another reason that was uniform with both groups (chairmen and chairwomen) was that they wanted to improve the department through quality faculty, innovations, and other developmental programs.

Factors Enhancing Upward Mobility

The chairwomen cited opportunity to participate in many activities, credentials and importance of academic work, support and encouragement, leadership qualities, and

experience as factors that have enhanced their upward mobility. Similarly the chairmen's mobility had been enhanced by motivation and encouragement, good education, knowledge of subject area, training in many areas, productivity in previous occupations, experience and activism in previous assignments. Trust, leadership qualities, and good human relations were also given as enhancing the upward mobility of the chairmen.

Factors That Have Tended to
Retard Chairpersons'
Upward Mobility

The chairpersons considered lack of career awareness, lack of self-confidence, lack of encouragement from significant others, and the lack of participation in sports, games and/or recreation while growing up as the factors that have tended to retard their upward mobility.

Statistical Analysis Involving
Retrospective Role Expectations

The significant findings on retrospective role expectations are discussed below.

- (1) There was no significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairwomen.
- (2) There was no significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of the academic department chairmen.

Findings (1) and (2) imply that the chairwomen and chairmen were satisfied with their jobs. Reference has been made in Chapter IV that, although the chairwomen accepted the position on a temporary basis, none had been in the position for less than three years. It would seem appropriate to conclude that the overall satisfaction on the job had been an instrument in keeping them on the job. Also, when the chairpersons were asked to indicate whether they would apply for the same job, a total of 68.8 percent of the chairmen said they would apply for the same job if they had to do it again.

Other findings were:

- (1) There was a significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on expected behavior.
- (2) There was no significant difference between the academic department chairmen and chairwomen on the actual behavior.
- (3) There was no significant difference between the expected behavior and the actual behavior of all the chairpersons. It was found that the chairwomen had less exact expectations than the chairmen.

Job Satisfaction: Statistical Analysis

The chairpersons indicated that most of the expectations they held had been fulfilled. It was also found

that there was no significant difference between the levels of satisfaction of the academic department chairmen and chairwomen.

Two approaches were used to arrive at this finding. The first approach utilized differences between expected behavior and the actual behavior as an index of the level of satisfaction. The smaller the difference between the actual and expected behavior, the more satisfied were the chairpersons.

The second approach tested some factors related to job satisfaction. Both approaches were subjected to the t-test. A .05 alpha level of significance was used for all statistical measures.

Conclusions

Analysis of the data provided the basis for the following conclusions appropriate to the study:

- (1) The amount of paperwork attached to the job of the chairperson is overwhelming. This leaves the chairperson less time for other responsibilities.
- (2) There is no difference in factors of upward mobility, actual behavior, and job satisfaction between chairwomen and chairmen.
- (3) The chairpersons value the quality of work, "psychic compensation," and intrinsic rewards of their job more than financial compensation. Although they may receive far less pay than they would receive if

they went to business, government, or private organizations, the chairpersons would not like to leave the University to go to business organizations, government, or private enterprise.

- (4) The position of the department chairperson is a difficult one. The handling of personal matters is very complex; nothing is simple with the role. However, being chairperson allows one to schedule his/her time more freely than in some other jobs.

Recommendations

The following recommendations, based on the results and conclusions of the study, are offered for higher echelon administrators, researchers, and prospective chairpersons of large departments and/or large universities.

- (1) Almost all respondents indicated that the previous chairperson had resigned. There is a need for a study of former chairpersons who resigned their positions to identify and examine the factors that led to their resignations.
- (2) Higher level administrators should try to reduce or alleviate restrictions on the department chairpersons for effective operations.
- (3) Higher level administrators should really re-evaluate the specific need of paperwork demanded of the chairpersons. The administrators should make use of other sources of information, such as the computer.

- (4) Prospective chairpersons should anticipate less time for teaching and research together than administration.
- (5) Persons interested in the position of chairperson should not go into administration immediately after the Ph.D. degree. The person should establish himself or herself by means of research and teaching. This would enable the person to go back into teaching or research when the administrative position is not just as he/she wanted.
- (6) The administration should give more control to departments and chairpersons; the chairpersons should be given the opportunity to reward good behavior.

Reflections

The respondents did not indicate the feeling of being threatened in their responses. Their responses were assumed to be honest and with no reservation.

The chairpersons were very busy administrators. The demands on them by the students, faculty, staff, and other administrators in terms of time is very great. In spite of the time demand, the chairpersons were willing to give me part of their time for the interview and to respond to the questionnaire. That the chairpersons gave some time for the survey, in spite of their busy schedules, is a demonstration of a high degree of professionalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arvy, Donald; Jacobs, Lucy Chester; and Razavieh, Asghar. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. The New American Library, Inc., 1964.
- Best, John W. Research in Education, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Bingham, Walter; Van Dyke, Moore; Victor, Bruce; and Gustad, John. How to Interview. New York: Harper and Brothers, Inc., 1959.
- Bird, Caroline. Born Female: The High Cost of Keeping Women Down. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1968.
- Brann, James. "The Chairman: An Impossible Job About to Become Tougher." In The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, Emmett and Brann (Eds.). Detroit: Balamp Publishing, 1972.
- Corson, J. J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Curti, Merle, and Carstensen, Vernone. The University of Wisconsin 1848-1925: A History, Vol. 1. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.
- Cussler, Margaret. The Woman Executive. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1958.
- Department of Elementary School Principals. "The Elementary School Principal." Thirty-Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958.
- Dressel, Paul L.; Johnson, Craig; and Marcus, Philip M. The Confidence Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

- Featherstone, Richard L. The Development of Management Systems for the Academic Department. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1972.
- Goodman, Paul S., and Friedman, Abraham. "An Examination of Adams' Theory of Inequity." In Readings in Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, W. E. Scott, Jr. and L. L. Cummings (eds.). Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1973.
- Hackman, Richard J.; Lawler, Edward E. III; and Porter, Lyman W. Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.
- Hamner, Clay W., and Schmidt, Frank L. Contemporary Problems in Personnel. Chicago: St. Clair Press, 1974.
- Heimler, Charles. "The College Department Chairman." In The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, Emmet and Brann (eds.). Detroit: Balamp, 1972.
- Heiss, Ann M. Challenges to Graduate Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.
- Hennig, Margaret, and Jardin, Anne. The Managerial Woman. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.
- Herzberg, F.; Peterson, R. O.; and Capwell, D. F. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinions. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Hollis, Ernest V. Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- Jennings, Eugene. Routes to the Executive Suite. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Koontz, E. D. 1969 Handbook of Women Workers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Maxwell, A. E. Basic Statistics in Behavioral Research. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc., 1970.

- McKeachie, Wilber J. "Memo to New Department Chairmen." In The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, Emmet and Brann (eds.). Detroit: Balamp Publishers, 1972.
- Murray, Fran, and Erickson, Mildred. "You're Not Alone." Adult Female Human Being. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- 1969 Handbook of Women Workers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1969.
- Oltman, R. M. Campus 1970: Where Do Women Stand? Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women.
- Porter, Lyman W.; Lawler, Edward E. III; and Hackman, Richard J. Behavior in Organizations. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Rashdall, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (eds.). London: Oxford University Press, 1958, Vol. 1.
- Roach, James H. L. The Academic Department Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities. Educational Record, Winter, 1976.
- Storr, Richard I. Harper's University: The Beginnings. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Taylor, H. A. "Women in Administration." In An Introduction to School Administration, M. C. Nottle (ed.). New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.
- Terrace, Herbert, and Parker, Scott. Psychological Statistics, Units Ten and Eleven. Individual Learning Systems, Inc., 1971.
- The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973. "Women and Faculty Members and Academic Administrators." Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, Their Current Participation, Prospects for the Future, and Recommendations for Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., September, 1973.
- Trow, Martin. "Departments as Context for Teaching and Learning." In Academic Departments, Dean E. McHenry and Associates (eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

- Van Dalen, Deobold, and Meyer, William I. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1962.
- Veryse, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Vroom, V. H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Webster, Noah. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. Springfield, Massachusetts: G and C Merriam Company.

Journals, Periodicals, Etc.

- Adams, J. S. "Toward an Understanding of Inequity." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 67 (1963).
- Adams, J. S. "Injustice in Social Exchange." In Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2, L. Berkowitz (ed.). New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Anderson, Kay J. "The Ambivalent Department." Educational Record XLIX (Spring, 1968).
- Astin, H. S., and Bayer, A. E. "Sex Discrimination in Academe," Educational Record.
- Barter, A. S. "The Status of Women in School Administration." Educational Digest 25 (1959).
- Baumrind, D. "From Each According to Her Ability." School Review 80(2) (1972).
- Bem, S. L., and Bem, D. J. "On Liberating the Female Student." The School Psychology Digest 2(3) (1973).
- Bernstein, Jean. "The Elementary School: Training Ground for Sex Role Stereotypes." The Personnel and Guidance Journal 51 (October, 1972).
- Brayfield, A. H., and Crockett, W. H. "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance." Psychological Bulletin 53 (1955).
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. Special Labor Force Report 1972. "Job Tenure of Workers." 1973.
- Carroll, Mary Ann. "Women in Administration in Higher Education." Contemporary Education XLIII (February, 1979).

- Coser, R., and Rokoff, G. "Women in the Occupational World: Social Disruption and Conflict." Social Problems 18(9) (1971).
- Creager, J. A. The American Graduate Student: A Normative Description. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Dressel, Paul L., and Reichard, Donald J. "The University Department: Retrospect and Prospect." Journal of Higher Education XLI(5) (May, 1970).
- Dunnette, M. D.; Arvey, R. D.; and Banas, P. A. "Why Do They Leave." Personnel 50(3) (May-June, 1973).
- Epstein, C. F. "Structuring Success for Women." The Educational Digest 39(b) (1974).
- Frazier, M., and Sadker, M. "School Against Boys! School Against Girls!" The Instructor 83(7) (1973).
- Grobman, H., and Hines, U. A. "What Makes a Good Principal?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 40 (1956).
- Hartley, Ruth E. "Current Patterns in Sex Roles: Children's Perspective." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 25 (October, 1961).
- Harmon, Lindsey R. "The High School Backgrounds of Science Doctorates." Science (March 10, 1961).
- Harmon, Lindsey R. "Doctorate Production in the United States Universities, 1920-1962." Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 1963.
- Hennig, Margaret. "What Happens on the Way Up?" The MBA (March, 1971).
- Hill, Winston W., and French, Wendel L. "Perceptions on Power of Department Chairmen by Professors." Administrative Science Quarterly 11 (1967).
- Horner, Matina. "Why Bright Women Fail." Psychology Today 3(6) (1969).
- Karabenick, S. A., and Marshall, J. M. "Performance of Females as a Function of Fear of Success, Fear of Failure, Type of Opponent, and Performance of Contingent Feedback." Journal of Personality 42(2) (1974).

- Katzell, M. E. "Expectations and Dropouts in Schools of Nursing." Journal of Applied Psychology 52 (1968).
- Kreyche, Gerald F. "Apologia for the Department Chairman." Intellect 101(2343) (October, 1972).
- Lathan, G. F., and Yukl, E. A. "A Review of Research on the Application of Goal Setting in Organizations." Academy of Management Journal 18 (1975).
- Lawler, E. E., and Porter, Lyman W. "The Effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction." Industrial Relations 7 (1967).
- Mattes, Linda, and Watkins, Foster. "Women in Administration in Schools of Education." Intellect C11 (November, 1973).
- Nieboer, Nancy A. "There is a Certain Kind of Woman." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 38 (Spring, 1975).
- Norman, B. "A Study of Women in Leadership Positions in North Carolina." The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin 36 (1970).
- Ryan, Doris W. "The International Organization of Academic Department." Higher Education 43 (June, 1972).
- Schaffer, R. H. "Job Satisfaction as Related to Need Satisfaction in Work." Psychological Monograph 67 (1953), 14 whole, No. 364.
- Solmon, Lewis C., and Tierney, Michael L. "Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among College Administrators." Journal of Higher Education XLXIII(4) (1977).
- Tibbetts, Sylvia Lee. "Sex Role Stereotyping: Why Women Discriminate Against Themselves." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 38(3) (Summer, 1975).
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. "U.S. Working Women: A Databook.: Bulletin 1977, Washington, D.C., 1977.
- Van Meir, Edward J. "Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities." Journal of National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors--Special Issue: Women in Administration, Part 3, Vol. 38, No. 4, Summer 1975.

Verheyden-Hilliard, Mary Ellen. "Kindergarten: Training Ground for Women in Administration." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors 38 (Summer, 1975).

Weitz, J. "Job Expectancy and Survival." Journal of Applied Psychology 40 (1956).

Dissertations

Carnegie, Clyde D. "Role Expectations of Community Junior College Department Chairpersons." Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1976.

Clark, Eldon Lavern. "A Study of Art Department Chairpersons of the Big Ten Universities: Their View of Their Role." Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1978.

Cox, Otha P., Jr. "A Comparative Analysis of Self-Perceived Roles of Black and Non-Black Administrators in Predominantly White Institutions of Higher Education." Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1971.

Eaton, Louise L. "A Survey of Women Graduates in the Field of Education and Administration." Dissertation, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, 1970.

Elliott, E. D. "Effects of Female Role Models on Occupational Aspiration Levels of College Freshman Women." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia, 1972.

Fecher, Agnes R. "Career Patterns of Women in College and University Administration." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia, 1972.

Smith, Albert B. "Role Expectations for and Observations of Community College Department Chairmen: An Organizational Study of Consensus and Conformity." Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., University of Michigan, August, 1970.

Stevenson, Florence Byrd. "Women Administrators in Big Ten Universities." Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1973.

Van Meir, Edward J. "Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Elementary Principals." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1971.

Talks, Papers Presented, and ERIC Documents

McConnel, T. R. Notes for a Talk on Departmental Organization. Talk presented at the Workshop for Department Chairmen, sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Institute for College and University Administrators, Salishan, Oregon, November, 1967.

Piffer, A. "Women in Higher Education." A paper presented at a meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Miami, Florida, November, 1971.

Soares, L. M., and Soares, A. T. "Test of Self-Concept as Measures of Personality Change." Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Document ED-076-638, February, 1973.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

AN ACCOUNT OF WHAT IS EXPECTED OF A
CHAIRPERSON IN A LARGE UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX A

AN ACCOUNT OF WHAT IS EXPECTED OF A CHAIRPERSON IN A LARGE UNIVERSITY

(Taken from Penn State Faculty Handbook)

A. Administrative

1. To organize the department and serve as the chief administrative officer responsible for programs of resident education, research, and continuing education.
2. To assume the initiative in developing departmental policies, coordinating them with those of the College and University.
3. To administer the departmental budget.
4. To organize, develop, and supervise programs of continuing education in the academic fields represented in his department.
5. To supervise the department's secretarial and service staff.
6. To take the initiative in establishing an approved list of textbooks for classroom use and to recommend their adoption to the Dean.
7. To prepare schedules of course offerings and teaching assignments and, in the process, maintain liaison with other academic department heads of the College, officers of the Graduate School, and other officers of the University.
8. To administer, under present University policy, the departmental programs of instruction and research at the Commonwealth Campuses and Centers.

9. To supervise and manage the physical facilities under the jurisdiction of the department.

B. Faculty

1. To recruit a capable faculty, with the concurrence of the appropriate administrative officers.
2. To encourage excellence in teaching and to develop and administer department programs of teacher improvement.
3. To make recommendations to the Dean relative to promotions, salary adjustments, tenure, and leaves of absence for department members.
4. To serve as a channel of communication between the faculty and the administrative or executive committee, Dean, and general University officers.
5. To nominate to the Dean section heads for the major areas within a department.
6. To recommend department members for membership on the faculty of the Graduate School.
7. To encourage research, writing, and other creative endeavor on the part of department members.
8. To organize and supervise the operation of appropriate faculty seminars and convocations.
9. To recommend and approve staff members for continuing education assignments.
10. To recommend and approve staff members for the Commonwealth Campuses and Centers.

C. Students

1. To set up appropriate arrangements for advising undergraduate students majoring in the department.
2. To set up appropriate arrangements for the supervision and approval of graduate theses and dissertations, and for the advising and guidance of graduate students within the department.
3. To encourage the organization and operation of appropriate student seminars, convocations, student groups, and clubs within the department.

D. Promotion and Liaison

1. To cooperate with and assist:
 - a. the Associate or Assistant Dean for Research in stimulating research and writing on the part of department members.
 - b. the Associate or Assistant Dean for Continuing Education in formulating and staffing programs; and
 - c. the Associate or Assistant Dean for Resident Education in evaluating and promoting the further development of the undergraduate and graduate programs of instruction.
2. To develop and maintain contacts with:
 - a. research organization and foundations, both on and off campus; and
 - b. business, labor, professional, and public groups.
3. To serve as a liaison between the department and other academic departments of the College and University and with the Graduate School.

E. Committees

1. To serve as a member of the administrative or executive committee of the College.
2. To serve as an ex-officio member of the University Senate.

F. Professional Standing

The department head is expected to participate in teaching and research, whenever it is feasible, and to maintain appropriate relationships with the technical, scientific, and scholarly organizations in his field.

APPENDIX B

**DUTIES OF A DIVISIONAL CHAIRMAN AT
HARRISBURG (PA) AREA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE**

APPENDIX B

DUTIES OF A DIVISIONAL CHAIRMAN AT HARRISBURG (PA) AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Editor's Note:

The following list illustrates the wide range of responsibilities born by divisional Chairmen in Community Colleges. Neither the length nor the specificity of the list is unusual for public two-year colleges.

1. General Responsibilities

- a. In May of each year, prepare an annual report of the activities of his division, for use by the President and other administrative officers of the College.
- b. Represent his division in relationship to the community and in rendering service to the community.
- c. Represent his division in relationship to other divisions within the College and in relationship with other colleges.
- d. Arrange with the College bookstore for the availability of those texts, reference books, and general supplies needed for courses in his division.
- e. Maintain official records of the work of his division and of those college-wide developments that are of concern to his division.
- f. Maintain the security of confidential matters entrusted to the division, including standardized tests, locally prepared tests and examinations, etc.

- g. Prepare, review, and revise materials for the College Catalog related to his division.
- 2. Responsibilities for Instructional Services
 - a. Responsibility for Faculty
 - 1. Initiate action for recruitment of faculty.
 - a. Search
 - b. Review credentials
 - c. Check credentials
 - d. Interview applicants
 - e. Make recommendations to Dean of Instruction
 - 2. Share responsibility for orientation of new faculty.
 - a. To the institution
 - b. To colleagues
 - c. To administration
 - d. To community
 - 3. Supervise evaluation of divisional faculty.
 - a. Salary
 - b. Promotion
 - c. Tenure
 - d. Dismissal
 - 4. Assign teaching load and other responsibilities related to instruction.
 - 5. Assist and support divisional faculty through counseling and professional advice.
 - 6. Through the Division Counselor, assign responsibility for student advisees and academic counseling (see 3, A).
 - 7. Encourage the professional growth of divisional faculty.
 - a. Through professional society membership
 - b. Through travel
 - c. Through additional formal study
 - b. Responsibility for Programs and Courses
 - 1. Supervise the design and maintenance of instructional programs and courses within that part of the curriculum to which his division is assigned.

2. Recommend library purchases of books, periodicals, and other study materials related to the curriculum of his division.
3. Prepare schedules for courses and sections within his division.
4. Prepare schedules for instructional spaces that may be assigned to his division.
5. Assign faculty representatives for programs, subjects, and courses.
6. Recommend to the Dean of Instruction persons to be asked to serve on curricular advisory committees.
7. Prepare proposals for special projects related to the instructional program of his division (see 4, G).

C. Teaching

1. Develop and maintain teaching and grading standards and a common understanding of these standards within his division.
2. Encourage the appropriate and effective use of all media for instructional purposes within his division.
3. Encourage responsible innovation and controlled experimentation in instructional methods within his division.

3. Responsibilities for Student Personnel Services

- a. Through the Division Counselor, assign responsibility for student advisees and academic counseling (see 2, a, 6).
- b. Take an active part in the recruitment of students for the College and for the specific programs and courses assigned to the division.
 1. Provide information to prospective students directly and indirectly by word of mouth.
 2. Prepare copy for brochures and other printed materials within the general administrative plans and policies for recruitment of students.

3. Assist students and graduates in finding appropriate employment related to their program of studies.
 4. Share with the Director of Counseling Services in the supervision of counselors assigned to the division.
 5. Coordinate the scheduling of students for courses and programs within the division, and for divisional advisees in all courses.
- c. Responsibilities for Advising and Counseling
1. Advising and Counseling
 - a. Provide advising and counseling service
 - b. Provide for scheduling courses for new students
 - c. Keep divisional faculty informed about registration procedures, etc.
 - d. Interpret students to faculty
 - e. Help to evaluate division counselors
 - f. Help to establish course placement and admission criteria
 2. Record Keeping
 - a. Report grades and grade changes
 - b. Certify for graduation
 - c. Handle change of roster forms
 - d. Cooperate in academic registration of students
 3. Recruiting and Placement
 - a. Visit high schools and businesses to meet with appropriate personnel
 - b. Hold orientation sessions on campus for prospective students
 - c. Conduct follow-up
 - d. Meet with professional groups
 4. Responsibilities for Administrative Services
 - a. Assign, supervise, and evaluate clerical personnel and student help within the division, in accordance with established board College policy.
 1. Salary
 2. Promotion

3. Working schedule
 4. Dismissal
 5. Professional Development
- b. Initiate divisional budget requests.
 - c. Administer approved budget, including expenditures for professional travel within his division.
 - d. Prepare requisitions for supplies and equipment.
 - e. Maintain inventory of equipment assigned to his division.
 - f. Prepare reports related to absence of personnel:
 1. Vacation
 2. Emergency leave
 3. Sick leave
 4. Payment of substitutes
 5. Work-related accidents
 - g. Initiate action for securing funds for special projects related to the work of his division (see 2, B, 7).

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

This is a survey to study the academic department chairpersons at Michigan State University, with respect to their upward mobility to their present position, their retrospective role expectations, and their job satisfaction. The analysis of the survey will take a comparative approach--comparing department chairmen and chairwomen on the above variables.

Your responses to this questionnaire and the preceding interview will be kept strictly confidential; the responses will be available only to the investigator. In NO way will any participant, department, or college be specifically identified in this study.

General Directions

1. Please try to answer all questions.
2. The questionnaire has four parts, namely:
 - I. Biographical and Institutional Data
 - II. Mobility of Men and Women Professionals in Higher Education
 - III. Retrospective Role Expectations
 - IV. Job Satisfaction

Specific instructions are given under each part.
3. Please return your questionnaire by mail in the attached self-addressed envelope.

4. Your cooperation and assistance in this study will be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Godfred Tiboah Ansah
c/o 420 Erickson Hall
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
Telephone: 355-2927

PART I. BIOGRAPHICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL DATA

Directions: You are kindly requested to place a check indicating the appropriate category for some items and/or complete other items by filling in information requested.

1. Age category: ___ (a) 20-29 ___ (b) 39-39
 ___ (c) 40-49 ___ (d) 50 and over
2. Sex: ___ (a) Male ___ (b) Female
3. Marital Status: ___ (a) Single (never married)
 ___ (b) Married ___ (c) Widow/Widower
 ___ (d) Separated/Divorced
4. How long have you been a department chairperson/acting chairperson? ___ years
5. Educational history since high school graduation:
(List chronologically, beginning with the most recent. Include earned Doctorate, Master's, Diploma's Bachelor's and/or others if applicable).

Institution	Major	Minor	Degree	Year Awarded

6. (i) How is this rank or status compared with your previous position?

This rank is: ___ (a) Up ___ (b) Down
 ___ (c) Lateral (not much different)
7. How would you rate the difference between your present salary and the salary you would have received if you were not a department chairperson?
___ (a) Very high ___ (b) High ___ (c) Low
___ (d) Very low ___ (e) No difference

8. (i) Who encouraged you most to go to college or to seek advanced degrees?
- ____ (a) Parent ____ (b) Other relative(s)
- ____ (c) Friend ____ (d) Spouse
- ____ (e) Other (please specify) _____
- (ii) Sex of the individual(s)
- ____ (a) Male ____ (b) Female
- ____ (c) Both (if more than one)
9. Did you have administrative experience in academe before you became the department chairperson?
- ____ (a) Yes ____ (b) No
- (i) If yes, how long? ____ years
- (ii) In what capacity? _____
10. Have you been an instructor/faculty/professor in your department before?
- (i) ____ (a) Yes ____ (b) No
- (ii) If yes, how long? ____ years
11. Do you usually think of yourself primarily as
- (a) ____ a teacher (b) ____ an administrator
- (c) ____ both (a) and (b) Other _____
(please specify)
12. What were the major reasons for your accepting the position of chairperson of your department? (Please, indicate reasons in order of importance using the numbers 1, 2, 3, etc. in the spaces provided, with 1 being the most important, 2 second most important, 3 the third most important reason, etc.). Rank order as many as are important to you.
- ____ (a) Exert greater influence on the department faculty.
- ____ (b) Exert greater influence on the university administration.
- ____ (c) Increase personal income.

- ____ (d) Personal growth and professional advancement.
- ____ (e) Improve departmental administration.
- ____ (f) Release time from teaching.
- ____ (g) Improve quality of teaching in the department.
- ____ (h) Exert greater influence in the control of the budget.
- ____ (i) Other (please specify) _____
- ____ (j) Other (please specify) _____

13. Please, rate suitability of this position for you (please check):

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| ____ (a) Excellent | ____ (b) Very good |
| ____ (c) Good | ____ (d) About average |
| ____ (e) Below average | |

PART II. MOBILITY OF MEN AND WOMEN PROFESSIONALS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

14. Using the corresponding numbers:

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. MOST IMPORTANT | 4. LESS IMPORTANT |
| 2. MORE IMPORTANT | 5. LEAST IMPORTANT |
| 3. IMPORTANT | |

Indicate at the appropriate spaces the extent to which the following factors have enhanced your mobility--professional or social. (A number may be used more than once or twice.)

- ____ (a) Relative ability (academic capability).
- ____ (b) Games, sports and/or recreation.
- ____ (c) Encouragement from others.
- ____ (d) Informal relationships.
- ____ (e) Awareness of career opportunities.
- ____ (f) Self confidence.
- ____ (g) Marital status.

Others (please specify)

____ (h) _____

____ (i) _____

15. Can you recall a specific incident of support for you as a professional person beyond that generally given? (please check)

____ (a) Yes ____ (b) No

If yes, by whom? (no name necessary)

____ (a) Male ____ (b) Female

16. Can you recall a specific incident of nonsupport where you felt support should have been given? (please check)

____ (a) Yes ____ (b) No

If yes, by whom? ____ (a) Male ____ (b) Female

17. Using the letters for the factors, list in order of importance three factors (if any) that have tended to retard your upward mobility.

(a) Lack of career awareness.

(b) Sports, games and/or recreation.

(c) Informal relationships and socialization.

(d) Discrimination according to sex.

(e) Marital status.

(f) Cultural attitude of the society.

(g) Relative ability.

(h) Lack of encouragement and significant others.

(i) Lack of self confidence.

(j) Other (please specify) _____

(1) _____ (Most important)

(2) _____ (More important)

(3) _____ (Important)

18. Visiposure is the acronym (combination) of visibility and exposure with visibility being the condition or capability of position-aspirant to "see" those at the top and exposure the condition of the aspirant been seen by men and women above.

(i) Who provided you the visibility to get to your present position?

- ____ (a) Male ____ (c) Both (where more than one)
 ____ (b) Female ____ (d) Nobody

(ii) Who provided you the exposure necessary for your mobility to this position? (please check)

- ____ (a) Male ____ (c) Both (where more than one)
 ____ (b) Female ____ (d) Nobody

19. In my judgment the reasons why women administrators are few in higher education include the following: (Check as many as you wish; rank if more than one are applicable.)

- ____ (a) They have had interrupted career spans.
 ____ (b) They have not been sponsored by those above them.
 ____ (c) They have not been assertive.
 ____ (d) Sex bias against women.
 ____ (e) Other (please specify) _____

20. Using the letters by the factors, list in order of importance your relationship to the three individuals who had been very significant in helping you get to where you are.

- (a) Parent/Relative (b) Spouse
 (c) Personal friend (d) Previous professor/
 (e) Superordinate teacher/instructor
 (f) Subordinate
 (g) Other (please specify) _____

- (1) _____ (Most important)
 (2) _____ (More important)
 (3) _____ (Important)

PART III. RETROSPECTIVE ROLE EXPECTATIONS

The purpose of this section is to determine the retrospective role expectations of the department chairpersons. "Retrospective role expectations" refers to the expectations which an individual had of his/her roles on a job before starting the job.

21. Directions: Please, reflect back to the time when you were NOT department chairperson. To the left side of each item CIRCLE the number corresponding to the expectations you had of the role of the academic department chairperson before you took up this position; i.e., the extent to which you expected the chairperson to be involved in each of the duties listed. To the right side of each item, CIRCLE the number corresponding to what you now think or experience as the role of the chairperson, i.e., the extent to which you think the chairperson takes up the role.

EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

Always Performs	Generally Performs	May or May Not Perform	Usually Does Not Perform	Never Performs	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	Always Performs	Generally Performs	May or May Not Perform	Usually Does Not Perform	Never Performs
1	2	3	4	5	1. Prepares and makes faculty assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. Involves department faculty in determining allocating of the department budget.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. Consults with faculty in determining class assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. Works cooperatively with faculty in evaluating instructors for tenure.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5. Facilitates the orientation of new faculty members.	1	2	3	4	5

EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

EXPECTED BEHAVIOR					QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	ACTUAL BEHAVIOR				
1 Always Performs	2 Generally Performs	3 May or May Not Perform	4 Usually Does Not Perform	5 Never Performs		1 Always Performs	2 Generally Performs	3 May or May Not Perform	4 Usually Does Not Perform	5 Never Performs
1	2	3	4	5	6. Communicates to faculty changes on administrative policy.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. Works cooperatively with faculty in developing departmental goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. Recommends the appointment, promotion or dismissal of faculty based on merit and performance alone.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. Provides a means for open communication between faculty and department chairman.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. Recruits, interviews and hires full and part time faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. Consults with faculty about filling vacancies in the department.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. Complies with guidelines for reviewing initial grievance requests by faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. Reviews trends on student characteristics within the department and college.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. Provides for student input in developing departmental goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5

EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

					QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS					
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Always Performs	Generally Performs	May or May Not Perform	Usually Does Not Perform	Never Performs		Always Performs	Generally Performs	May or May Not Perform	Usually Does Not Perform	Never Performs
1	2	3	4	5	15. Works effectively to resolve student-instructor conflicts within the department.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16. Manages the resolution of student problems arising out of scheduling conflicts, late registration, drop and add card requests, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17. Participates effectively as a member of divisional academic councils and college committees.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	18. Works cooperatively with faculty and deans in developing long and short range plans for curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	19. Complies with guidelines for class size in making class assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	20. Conducts department self-studies to determine faculty and departmental needs.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	21. Allows for faculty input in department decision-making concern instructional planning.	1	2	3	4	5

EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

					QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS					
Always Performs	Generally Performs	May or May Not Perform	Usually Does Not Perform	Never Performs		Always Performs	Generally Performs	May or May Not Perform	Usually Does Not Perform	Never Performs
1	2	3	4	5	22. Cooperates with researchers who are attempting to advance knowledge in the field.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	23. Encourages faculty to attend professional meetings, seminars, and workshops to facilitate professional growth.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	24. Initiates and reviews new developments in curriculum for the departments.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	25. _____	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	26. _____	1	2	3	4	5

PART IV.

JOB SATISFACTION

22. For statements (a) - (k), insert the corresponding numbers which express your feeling about each of the statements.

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1. STRONGLY AGREE | 4. MODERATELY DISAGREE |
| 2. MODERATELY AGREE | 5. STRONGLY DISAGREE |
| 3. UNCERTAIN | 6. DOES NOT APPLY |

____ (a) The person to whom I report seems to have a clear picture of my administrative role.

- ____ (b) My role as the department chairperson is ill-defined and sometimes appears ambiguous.
- ____ (c) I function in more than one administrative capacity.
- ____ (d) I do experience role-conflicts in my duty.
- ____ (e) I frequently have to make decisions which affect institution wide policy.
- ____ (f) The authority I have been assigned is commensurate with my assigned responsibilities.
- ____ (g) My recommendations are usually acted upon favorably.
- ____ (h) I do not know what is going on in the upper levels of administration.
- ____ (i) Some student leaders seem to have more influence in campus matters than I have.
- ____ (j) Some faculty members seem to have more authority in campus matters than I have.
- ____ (k) I like the administrative details and clerical tasks associated with my position.

23. Please, INSERT the corresponding numbers expressing your influence in decision-making with regard to each activity:

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1. A GREAT DEAL | 4. SOME |
| 2. CONSIDERABLE | 5. LITTLE OR NONE |
| 3. MODERATE | 6. DOES NOT APPLY |

My influence with respect to decisions affecting the following may be expressed as:

- ____ (a) Faculty appointments (recruitment and hiring).
- ____ (b) Faculty promotions.
- ____ (c) Faculty tenure.
- ____ (d) Faculty and staff evaluations.
- ____ (e) Instructional methods.
- ____ (f) Quality of teaching at the department.

- ____ (g) Faculty negotiations.
- ____ (h) Institution policy-making.
- ____ (i) Preparation of budgetary requests.

24. Following are a number of statements concerning resignation of academic department chairpersons. Please, INSERT at the appropriate spaces provided the corresponding numbers to indicate your opinion about why department chairpersons at Michigan State University would resign.

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. VERY TRUE | 4. FALSE |
| 2. TRUE | 5. VERY FALSE |
| 3. SOMEWHAT TRUE, SOMEWHAT FALSE (UNCERTAIN) | |

- ____ (a) Heavy administrative responsibility without commensurate influence and authority.
- ____ (b) The lack of administrative time and assistance to handle the position in accordance with his/her expectations.
- ____ (c) The status that administration has on campus relative to teaching, research and scholarship.
- ____ (d) An unwillingness to bear the burden of responsibility for the development and success of the department's program.
- ____ (e) The greater degree of freedom and personal time associated with a full-time teaching assignment.
- ____ (f) The lack of an administrative frame of reference; administrative tasks and responsibilities incompatible with chairperson's basic values, self-concept and academic commitment.
- ____ (g) The belief that there is no future in college/university administration.
- ____ (h) A dislike of the administrative details and clerical tasks associated with the position.
- ____ (i) The frustrations associated with the administration of a department through existing personnel procedures, e.g., on faculty tenure, promotions, hiring, etc.

25. How would you compare the outcome of your duties (intrinsic and extrinsic rewards you receive) to how much you put into your job? (please, check one space only)
- ____ (a) Outcome far more than input.
- ____ (b) Outcome more than input.
- ____ (c) Outcome equal to input.
- ____ (d) Outcome less than input.
- ____ (e) Outcome far less than input.
26. How would you rate the job of the department chairperson? Please, check one.
- ____ (a) Extremely challenging
- ____ (b) Very challenging
- ____ (c) Challenging
- ____ (d) Less challenging
- ____ (e) Least challenging of jobs I have had
27. If you had to do it over again, would you like to apply for the same job? Please, check one.
- ____ (a) Sure, I would certainly apply for it.
- ____ (b) Yes, I would apply for it.
- ____ (c) I am not sure; I might or might not.
- ____ (d) I would not apply for it.
- ____ (e) No way; I would never apply for it.
28. Please comment, if you wish, on any aspect of this survey. Your remarks, responses, etc. will be treated confidentially.

NB: Thank you very much for your participation in this project. THANKS A LOT!

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What was your previous position?
2. What were the reasons for changing positions?
3. How did you get to this position?
4. What factors have enhanced your upward mobility? (You may trace from high school.)
5. (a) In what way(s), if any, has being a female made your position as a chairperson difficult?/easy?

(b) In what way(s), if any, has being a male made your position as a chairperson difficult?/easy?
6. The literature indicates that very few women are serving in administrative posts in higher education. What do you think accounts for the fact that there are so few women administrators in higher education. Please focus on:
 - (a) Lack of awareness of career opportunities.
 - (b) Marital status.
 - (c) Relative ability.
 - (d) Cultural attitudes and socialization.
 - (e) Lack of encouragement and/or confidence.
 - (f) Effect of discrimination.
 - (g) Others (please specify).
7. Have you any advice for women or men administrators? Or those aspiring to be academic department chairpersons?

8. (a) Before you took up this job, what were your highest expectations of the role of the academic department chairperson.
- (b) Which expectations have been fulfilled?
- (c) Which of the expectations have not been met?
- (d) Which expectations have declined since the time you took the office?
9. Please, estimate the percentage of time you EXPECTED to spend in
 - (a) teaching, (b) research, (c) administrative duties--
planning, budgeting,
holding meetings, etc.
 AND the percentage of time you ACTUALLY spend in the three roles.
10. As an academic department chairperson, what unique situations (problems) do you have?
11. How do you make areas of concern about your (a) department, (b) faculty, (c) staff, (d) students and (e) facilities, known to the dean, provost and/or other higher administrators?
12. How do you perceive what you receive (pay, fringe benefits, etc.) relative to:
 - (a) Your qualification for the position and the time and energy you put into the job?
 - (b) What your colleagues (faculty) in your department receive?
 - (c) Administrators of similar qualification and experience who are outside of academe (in government, business enterprises, private agencies, etc.).
13. Being a member of the university community, do you achieve status and credibility among university administrators and university faculty members generally because you are a department chairperson or because of your contributions in research and teaching? Please focus on:
 - (a) Profession: status from colleague group.
 - (b) Organization: status from organization within the hierarchy.

14. As a department chairperson, what are your greatest challenge(s)? Please make reference to:
 - (a) Family relationships and responsibilities.
 - (b) Meeting teaching and research commitment.
 - (c) Administrative responsibilities--planning, budgeting, reporting, staff and faculty development, evaluation, etc.
 - (d) Behavior variables (requirements) such as self control, consideration, cooperation, problem solving, change, communication and management ability.
15. What are your major gripes about the position of the academic department chairperson?
16. How did you react the first time this position (department chairperson) was offered to you? If you were offered the position right NOW, would you accept it? Why or why not?
17. Please, comment on your power and authority relative to your responsibilities to students, faculty, staff and other administrators at this university.
18. What would tempt you to leave this position?
19. What other comments do you have on
 - (a) your mobility to this position.
 - (b) met and unmet expectations you had of your position, and
 - (c) job satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

NB: Thank you very much. I would like to emphasize that your responses and comments will be treated confidentially. Thank you!

APPENDIX E

SURVEY LETTERS

APPENDIX E

SURVEY LETTERS

April 9, 1980

Department Chairperson's Name	c/o 420 Erickson Hall
Address	Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824

Dear Dr. _____:

I am a doctoral student in Administration and Higher Education and I am working on my dissertation. My dissertation title is, "A Comparative Study of the Academic Department Chairmen and Chairwomen at Michigan State University with Respect to Their Upward Mobility to Their Present Position, Their Retrospective Role Expectations, and Their Job Satisfaction."

This topic has been chosen because the department chairperson has a unique role in academic institutions. The academic department chairperson is the individual upon whom the success of the department may largely depend. Undoubtedly, he or she is one key to the successful achievement of the school's primary mission. Yet very little in the way of dissertations has been written on department chairpersons. Worse still, research on female academic chairpersons is almost nonexistent. Thus the study is taking a comparative approach.

It is hoped that the findings of this study will provide additional information on department chairpersons and thereby contribute to the knowledge on administrators of higher institutions of learning.

A random-sampling of department chairpersons identified you as a participant in this study. I am fully aware of how busy you and other department chairpersons are and it is with every humbleness that I ask the time and thought required of you to contribute to this research. The survey will be in two parts--a short interview and completion of a

questionnaire. The interview may take about forty-five minutes and responding to the questionnaire may take about thirty minutes. Thus, I am earnestly requesting about an hour and half of your time. An appointment for the interview will be scheduled through a telephone call in the next week or two and the questionnaire will be delivered to you at the interview. The questionnaire may be returned at your convenience but, hopefully, not later than May 15th in a self-addressed envelope attached to the questionnaire.

It should be mentioned emphatically that participation in this project will be kept strictly confidential. In no way will participating department chairpersons, the departments or colleges be identified. Highest degree of confidentiality is assured.

Thank you very much in advance for your time, ideas and any other way by which you may contribute to this study and consequently to the body of knowledge on academic department chairpersons. Thanks a lot.

Yours sincerely,

Godfred Tiboah Ansah
(517) 355-2927

April 9, 1980

Dear Chairperson:

I know you have too much to do, and not enough time to do it! And you undoubtedly get many questionnaires to respond to. I hope, however, you'll take time to let Godfred Tiboah-Ansah interview you and to respond to his questionnaire. He has randomly sampled all department chairpersons and you are a lucky winner! Because his sample is small, we need your input.

I believe you'll find the experience to be rewarding, and further you'll be contributing to our knowledge of the role of department chairpersons at MSU. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence, and will not be in any way identifiable in the dissertation.

Sincerely,

Howard Hickey
Chairman of Doctoral Committee

April 9, 1980

Dear Colleague:

One of the most fundamental activities in which a university academic administrator can engage is participation in scholarly research in one's administrative area as well as one's academic discipline.

Godfred Tiboah Ansah is inviting your participation in this study because of your role as a department chair at MSU. Mr. Tiboah Ansah is interested in gaining a greater understanding of the mobility patterns of male and female department heads as well as gaining greater insight about the responsibilities of their positions.

Several years ago Mr. Tiboah Ansah was a student in one of my graduate classes and not only earned my respect for his high academic accomplishments, but he also earned my respect as a young professional.

He will not be sampling all individuals in the population; therefore, it becomes even more important that you take the time to assist him with this project.

You can be assured that he will handle the data with professionalism and confidentiality. I would like to thank you in advance for your participation in his efforts and support of your profession.

Sincerely,

Marylee Davis, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice President

Associate Professor
Administration & Higher Education

MD/ng

Date

c/o 420 Erickson Hall
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
May 2, 1980

Department Chairperson's Name
Address

Dear Dr. _____:

I am writing to thank you very much for your participation in the survey for my dissertation. Though, like other academic department chairpersons, you are very busy you did give me some time to interview you. I very much appreciate your interest and willingness to take part in the project, the time you gave in support of the project, and any form of assistance you have provided to make the study a success. I am glad I had the opportunity to interview you and I thank you immensely for your ideas.

I hope you will complete the questionnaire at your convenience and drop it in the campus mail-box to reach me by the date indicated on the questionnaire. Please, disregard this paragraph if you have mailed the questionnaire already.

I would like to assure you again that your responses in the interview and on the questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. Participating department chairpersons, departments, and colleges will NOT be identifiable in the dissertation.

I thank you very much for your support and input in the study.

Yours sincerely,

Godfred Tiboah Ansah

APPENDIX F

DATA REPORTS

APPENDIX F

DATA REPORTS

Data Report A

Mobility, Expectation, Job Satisfaction

File Noname (Creation Date = 08/05/80)

Group 1 - V₃ EQ 1.

Group 1 - V₃ EQ 2.

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	F Value	2-Tail Prob.	Pooled Variance Estimate				Separate Variable Degrees of Freedom
							T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.	T Value	
ENH Group 1	16	16.2500	7.611	1.903	1.08	1.000	1.4	2.0	.311	1.06	9.37
Group 2	6	12.5000	7.314	2.986							

RET Group 1	16	1.3750	2.335	.584	1.37	.580	-196	2.0	.064	-1.82	7.91
Group 2	6	3.6667	2.733	1.116							

Data Report B

File Noname (Creation Date = 08/05/80)

Group 1 - V₃ EQ 1.

Group 1 - V₃ EQ 2.

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	F Value	2-Tail Prob.	Pooled Variance Estimate			Separate Variance Estimate		
							T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.	T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.
TOT Group 1	16	47.7500	11.252	2.813	7.29	.038	.75	20	.461	1.09	19.97	.289
Group 2	6	44.1667	4.167	1.701								

TOL Group 1	16	43.1250	7.890	1.972	1.12	.781	2.03	20	.056	1.98	8.58	.079

Group 1 - Chairmen
Group 2 - Chairwomen

TOT - Expected Behavior
TOL - Scores on Actual Behavior

Data Report C

Mobility Expectation, Job Satisfaction

File Noname (Creation Date = 07/31/80)

SPSS V8.0

.16.17.07.

Page 150

T-Test

Group 1 - V₃ EQ 1.

Group 2 - V₃ EQ 2.

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	F Value	2-Tail Prob.	Pooled Variance Estimate			Separate Variance Estimate		
							T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.	T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.
TOT Group 1	16	4.6250	10.996	2.749	3.17	.208	-.88	20	.390	-1.13	16.28	.276
Group 2	6	8.8333	6.178	2.522								