2-2002

Department Chair Faculty Development Activities and Leadership Practices: University Libraries Faculty Perceptions

Dana Wayne Rippy Boden
University of Nebraska - Lincoln, dboden1@unl.edu

DEPARTMENT CHAIR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICES: UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

by

Dana Wayne Rippy Boden

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Interdepartmental Area of

Administration, Curriculum and Instruction

Under the Supervision of Professor John W. Creswell

Lincoln, Nebraska

February, 2002

DISSERTATION TITLE

DEPARTMENT CHAIR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICES:

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

BY

Dana Wayne Rippy Boden

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED	DATE
Signature: John Creswell	2/8/02
Typed Name: John W. Creswell	
Signature: Joan R. Giesecke	2/8/02
Typed Name: Joan R. Giesecke	
Signature: Ellen Weissinger	2/8/2002
Typed Name: Ellen Weissinger	
Signature: Miles Bryant	2/8/2002
Typed Name: Miles Bryant	
Signature: Marilyn Grady	2/8/02
Typed Name: Marilyn Grady	
Signature:	
Typed Name:	

GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

DEPARTMENT CHAIR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICES: UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

Dana Wayne Rippy Boden, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2002

Advisor: John W. Creswell

This survey study determined university library faculty perceptions of their department chair's leadership practices and role in faculty development. Literature on library department chairs has traditionally focused on supervisory and/or management issues. The main focus of the library leadership literature has been deans or directors. Roles of chairs of postsecondary teaching departments have been researched for many years. Academic library faculty differ from teaching department faculty in that: nearly two thirds are female; they enter the profession at an older average age; are employed on a twelve month basis, while being required to meet criteria for a successful bid for tenure and/or promotion; and their accepted terminal degree is a Masters degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association.

Questions addressed were: 1) What institutional characteristics, 2) chair characteristics, and 3) library faculty demographic characteristics significantly effect library faculty perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices? Non-administrative faculty in the libraries of research universities in the United States completed a survey instrument consisting of three parts: (1) a demographics section; (2) a researcher-developed survey of faculty perceptions of

the department chairs' role in faculty development; and (3) the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer (LPI-O).

Significant factors in library faculty perceptions of the chair's leadership practices were chair's location prior to promotion, faculty member's number of years at the institution, and faculty member's education completed. None of the characteristics considered were significant factors in library faculty's perceptions of the chair's faculty development activities. Ratings of the department chairs' use of activities to enhance faculty development were extremely moderate. The ranking of items on both instruments suggests library faculty consider themselves primarily responsible for their own professional growth and development. The top-ranked leadership practices categories were "enabling others to act" and "modeling the way". Both the most-observed leadership practices and activities to enhance faculty development indicate library faculty perceive their department chair as a passive, but supportive, encourager.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Advanced education is a personal and professional growth process that goes well beyond the required courses and the dissertation research. At times I, as well as I'm sure many who know me, wondered if the end would ever be in sight. Persistence, and the help of many people, has finally brought me to the acquisition of this long-time goal. I have countless people to thank. Naming them all would be an impossible task, yet I hope each one knows they occupy a special place in my heart.

Gratitude is extended to friends, colleagues and classmates without whose encouragement the doctoral program, and dissertation project, would have been unbearable. Your caring, interest, and supportive prayers, comments and e-mails at opportune times were a source of comfort and renewed strength. Sincere appreciation goes to the participants, my colleagues at the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium University Libraries, who found time to complete yet another survey. Also, thanks go to the Mountain Plains Library Association for the award of a professional development grant to assist with the survey expenses.

Thank you to John W. Creswell, Chair, Joan R. Giesecke and Ellen Weissinger, Readers, Marilyn Grady and Miles Bryant for agreeing to serve on my doctoral committee. At the NEAR Center Sara Finney, and then Mike Toland, were invaluable in the analysis phase of the project. To Anita Leininger, Bill Long and Beth McNeil, goes appreciation for their willingness to, and honesty in acting as, proofreaders and grammatical editors.

It is impossible to adequately thank my family. To my sister, Darlene, who was my first "classroom" teacher and prepared me well: you had no way to know I would stay a student so long! Thanks for the support, the hugs and the flowers. To my brother, David, who is a walking, talking miracle in our lives: you don't realize how your pursuit, and attainment, of your goal to fly planted seeds in me. For a time you were "hovering over the world" and only a small number can say that. I'm glad I was able to join you a

couple of times – and have video to prove it! To my parents: I may be about to don the robes and hood of the Doctorate, but Mama & Daddy, the fact you never made me feel I could not accomplish whatever I decided to go after got me to this day. Your emotional support was instrumental in the accomplishment of this, and every, goal I have pursued. Thank you for teaching me the things that are most important. I love you all.

To the most important three men in my life, words cannot express what your always being there, encouragement, love, understanding, and tremendous support continue to mean to me every single day. Thank you for understanding when I could not participate in family activities, for providing quiet times, letting me rant and rave, and talk on about aspects of a project you didn't always understand. Thanks for being close by even though you were often neglected. Dathan, you have grown from a pre-schooler bringing Dr. Seuss books to "study with Mommy" to a fine, gifted, six-footer during the course of this journey. Clayton, you are the most marvelous and precious reason for an interruption in the residency requirement anyone could have. I am so proud of you both! Craig, my love, very best friend, and spouse, over half our years together I have been working toward this goal. You hold my world together. I thank the Lord I pointed at that dance floor and you nodded your head almost twenty years ago. I chose well.

Last, and most importantly, I thank God for showing me His awesome love everyday, through everything, from the largest events to the most minute detail. I celebrate His provision of salvation through His son, Jesus Christ. I praise Him for His wonderful blessings and marvel that He should be mindful of me.

D.W.R.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Instrument Scores

Factor Analysis Results

Institutional Characteristics Effects

Chair Characteristics Effects

Faculty Characteristics Effects

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Harvard University established the first college departments early in the nineteenth century. Since that time the decentralization of decision-making has made the position of the department chair more and more influential. The department chair's responsibilities are quite varied. As a middle manager, the chair must deal with both faculty and administrators on a daily basis. The influence, varied responsibilities, and middle position of the chair make research regarding departmental chairs' perceptions of their administrative role, as well as research on faculty and administrators' perceptions of the chairperson's role important (Heimler, 1967).

Research on perceptions of the department chair's roles has concentrated on academic teaching departments. A number of research works focused on department chairs' perceptions (Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, 1990; Gmelch & Burns, 1994; Jennerich, 1981; Kremer-Hayon & Avi-itzhak, 1986; Lee, 1985; McLaughlin, Montgomery, & Malpass, 1975; Miles, 1983; Mitchell, 1986; Roach, 1976; Smart, 1976; Wilhite, 1987). The administrative supervisor's perceptions of the chair's practices and role were highlighted by Jeffrey (1985), and Moxley and Olson (1990). Other studies researched perceptions at three levels: 1) the chairs themselves; 2) their administrative supervisors; and 3) the faculty (Cohen, Bleha, and Olswang, 1981; Falk, 1979; Jones & Holdaway, 1995; Siever, Loomis, and Neidt, 1972; Smith, 1972; Weinberg, 1984; Whitt, 1991). Faculty perceptions of the chair's role were addressed in Daly and Townsend (1992, 1994), Gordon, Stockard, and Williford (1991), Hirokawa, Barge, Becker, and

Sutherland (1989), Moses (1985), Neumann and Neumann (1983), and Watson (1979, 1986).

A wide variety of institution types were represented in these works. Some studies researched more than one institution type. Creswell et al. (1990) researched doctoral-granting institutions, comprehensive colleges, and liberal arts schools. Gmelch and Burns (1994) focused on research universities and doctoral-granting institutions. Jones and Holdaway (1995) researched an urban university, a community college, and a technical institute. Lee (1985) researched a large state university, a small state institution, and a private urban university. Other studies concentrated on one type of institution. These included: research universities (Whitt, 1991), doctoral-granting institutions (Daly & Townsend, 1994), land-grant institutions (McLaughlin et al., 1975; Siever et al., 1972; Wilhite, 1990), liberal arts schools (Hirokawa et al, 1989), state universities (Falk, 1979), community colleges (Coats, Lovell & Franks, 1996; Cohen et al., 1981; Harnish & Wild, 1994; Samuels, 1983; Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller & VanHorn-Grassmeyer, 1994), and two-year colleges (Smith, 1972).

Many works cover the chairperson's entire responsibilities, but a recurrent theme within the literature has been the department chair's role in enhancing faculty development (Eble, 1990; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; McKeachie, 1990; Seagren, Creswell, & Wheeler, 1993; Tucker, 1992) or acting in a leadership role (McLaughlin et al., 1975). These cited works are chapters which address these specific roles of the department chair. There has also been research (Creswell & Brown, 1992; Seagren, Wheeler, Mitchell, & Creswell, 1986; Wilhite, 1990), literature review (Scott, 1990), and administrator opinion articles (Sorcinelli, 1990; Thompson, 1990; Wheeler, 1992)

specifically addressing the chair's role in faculty development.

Both the faculty development role and leadership practices have each sometimes been viewed as one activitiy, and sometimes multiple activities, in which a department chair may engage. The terminology and focus have varied by researcher. The "leader" as one of several roles assigned to chairs appeared in Jennerich (1981), Miles (1983), and Tucker (1992). Leadership as a major role with specific multiple tasks related to it was the argument of McLaughlin et al. (1975), Seagren et al. (1994), and Gmelch & Miskin (1993,1995). Some considered a specific leader type, i.e. academic leader (Creswell et al., 1990; Hirokawa et al., 1989; Jones & Holdaway, 1995) or intellectual leader (Jeffrey, 1985; Watson, 1979). Others perceived leadership as the overarching function of the chair, which takes into account all the skills, competencies, functions, roles, or activities undertaken to guide the department's way (Coats et al, 1996; Gordon et al., 1991; Mitchell, 1986).

This literature supported the premise that the chair's role in faculty development, and as a leader, can be influential in the life of a faculty member. As the faculty member interacts with the chair of their department, roles are communicated and practices are observed. The faculty member's perceptions of the department chair's professional development role and leadership practices determine their professional relationship, which in turn can determine the career, or at least institutional, success of the faculty member.

Specific actions chairs may use in their role in faculty leadership or development may include: placement of faculty on committees (Weinberg, 1984); "encourage faculty to participate in conventions, conferences, professional associations, etc."; inform the

dean or immediate supervisor of departmental accomplishments (Smith, 1972); commend faculty achievement (Moses, 1985); delegate authority to a faculty member (Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak, 1986); and "develop the potential of . . . junior faculty" (McLaughlin et al., 1975). All of these actions were identified in articles on the overall role of the chairperson in academic, teaching departments.

While research and literature exist on faculty perceptions of the chair's role in academic departments in various institution types across the United States and Canada, little research has addressed faculty perceptions of the department chair's role in non-teaching departments at the university level. Boice (1992) noticed libraries within the university setting include members who have faculty status, but do not teach courses on a regular basis. His experience with researching new library faculty led him to observe that they, "more than any group... suffered from unclear expectations" (p. 276).

Library faculty are rather unique among their university colleagues. Nearly two thirds of library faculty, at research institutions, are female (Kyrillidou, Blixrud & Green, 1999), while only 28.3% of all faculty at doctoral granting institutions are female (Benjamin, 1998, http://www.aaup.org/Wsaltab2.htm). Unlike faculty in other departments across campus, library faculty are usually employed on a twelve month basis. Yet as with any tenure track position, participation in professional development activities is a requirement for library faculty to meet the criteria for a successful bid for tenure and/or promotion (Leysen & Black, 1998; Lowry, 1993). A large majority of university library faculty positions require the Master of Library Science degree from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, thus most university library faculty share this disciplinary background (Lowry, 1993). The disciplines represented by

their other degree(s), however, are widely varied.

Department heads in academic libraries have often been most concerned with personnel and operations management, rather than faculty development. Library directors or deans have been credited with key responsibility for faculty development in the past. With the myriad of changes taking place in academic libraries the role of the department head has been going through a time of transition (Bloss and Lanier, 1997). Sullivan (1992) observed the transition of the focus of participants in the Association of Research Libraries' Office of Management Services Library Management Skills Institute from the 1980s to the 1990s. Participants' focus shifted from management for the sake of advancement and higher salaries, to the desire to be effective as leaders in their new role. Bailey (1987) highlighted the need for more research regarding the leadership in library/information services, which chairs as middle managers, may provide.

During the 1990s, limited research was conducted in this area. Boden's research (1991, 1994) on university library faculty perceptions of the chair's role in enhancing professional activities of faculty was groundbreaking. It was limited to only one research university library. Research on library faculty perceptions regarding department chairs' leadership practices was done by Olive (1991) and Kazlauskas (1993). Olive's work involved all library staff members, not specifically the professional faculty. The focus was Liberal Arts I institutions. Kazlauskas' research surveyed both non-supervisory and supervisory academic librarians regarding their supervisors, excluding only the library directors. It was limited to institutions in one state university system.

More research on library faculty and their department chairs in academic libraries is needed. Learning the perceptions of library faculty regarding the activities in which

their department chair engages related to faculty development, and their perceptions of the chair's leadership practices, will increase understanding of the role academic library department chairs may fulfill. Carnegie Research institutions are an easily identified group of institutions where research is emphasized and tenure and promotion are granted to library faculty based on specific criteria.

Library faculty represent a different and unique discipline and group of faculty. Research based on teaching department faculty cannot be depended upon to hold true for library faculty. Understanding the perceived roles of the department chair in research libraries, as held by library faculty, can enhance the planning and support for the professional growth of both groups. Chairs will be better aware of the activities and practices their faculty perceive them providing, and so, able to pursue with more confidence development training for themselves to further enhance that provision. The faculty will further benefit from that enhancement by having stronger leaders as chairs and chairs that strive to enhance their faculty's development.

Institutional characteristics, such as department size and type of university, as well as chair characteristics, such as type of appointment and years at chair, are the independent variables in this study. Characteristics of the faculty are considered as mediating variables in determining library faculty perceptions of the role of the chair in faculty development and the chair's leadership practices. The variables in the study will be considered within the context of a theory of role dynamics, as set out by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964).

Another audience this study may benefit is the library and information science higher education community. The results from this research could be highlighted during

the program of studies for students enrolled in accredited Master's programs in Library and Information Science. Those preparing to enter positions in academic libraries would then be more aware of the potential role of the department chair in their professional lives and how their role may be impacted should they become a department chair.

A secondary audience for this study is the higher education community. The study adds to the body of research on faculty perceptions of the department chair's leadership practices and role in faculty development formerly undocumented for library faculty. This adds to the general body of knowledge in the area.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this survey research was to test role theory by (1) surveying university library faculty perceptions of the department chair's faculty development activities and leadership practices and (2) analyzing the relationship between the correlates (institutional characteristics, chair characteristics, and faculty characteristics) and the faculty's perceptions of the chair's faculty development activities and leadership practices. Participants in the study were randomly selected from a sampling frame of 1060 non-administrative faculty members in the libraries of the research universities of the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium.

The independent variables were defined as the institutional characteristics and the chair characteristics. The institutional characteristics included the institution type, number of faculty (or equivalent) in the university libraries, the number of faculty in the department, and the organization structure. The chair characteristics were type of appointment, whether the chair was promoted to the position from within the department or from outside, gender, years at chair, tenure status, educational level, rank, and location

in relation to the faculty member.

The dependent variables were defined as the activities the chair may engage in to enhance faculty development and chair leadership practices. Mediating variables were defined as the faculty characteristics, which are the faculty member's (respondent's) gender, position rank, tenure status, service area within the libraries, years in the profession, years at the institution, education, age, and library station.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed:

Descriptive Questions

1. What are the institutional characteristics of the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium institutions and their libraries?
2. What are the demographic characteristics of the department chairs in the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium libraries?
3. What are the demographic characteristics of library faculty/librarians in the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium libraries?
4. What activities to enhance faculty development, and leadership practices, do library faculty perceive their department chairs using most?

Relationship Questions

1. What institutional characteristics significantly effect library faculty perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices?
2. What chair demographic characteristics significantly effect library faculty perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and

b) leadership practices?

3. What library faculty demographic characteristics significantly effect their perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices?

Theoretical Perspective

Role theory provides the framework within which this study was developed. Role theory had its beginnings in the study of human conduct across several disciplines in the first half of the twentieth century. Bridging sociology, psychology, and anthropology, role theory's early proponents were: George H. Mead in psychology, at the University of Chicago; Jacob Moreno, founder of the *Sociometric Review* and *Sociometry*; and Ralph Linton, an anthropologist (Biddle & Thomas, 1966). Role theory has been addressed by a number of writers (Rommetveit, 1954; Sarbin, 1954; Sarbin & Allen, 1968; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Zurcher, 1983). Even they themselves acknowledged variances in thought as to the singular place of role theory, and noted its use by multiple disciplines and helping professions as a single discipline to study the encompassing area of human behavior (Biddle, 1979)

Biddle (1979, p. 4) described role theory as "a science concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristic of persons within contexts and with various processes that presumably produce, explain, or are affected by behaviors". He listed four factors common to roles: 1) roles are behavioral and involve observable actions; 2) roles are performed by person(s); 3) roles are normally limited by context and do not represent all behaviors of the person(s) studied; and 4) roles consist of those behaviors characteristic of a set of persons and a context. The role episode envisioned by Kahn et al. (1964, p. 26)

was "a complete cycle of role sending, response by the focal person, and the effects of that response on the role senders."

These factors are included in the model of the role episode and considered within the context of organizations by Katz and Kahn (1966). This theoretical model lent itself to the subject of this research (See Figure 1, p. 11). Library faculty members, as role senders, were surveyed to ascertain their perception of the role behavior of the department chair (focal person) in Block I. Within this model it can be seen that those perceptions, when expressed as sent role by faculty (Block II) and received by chairs (Block III), impact chair behavior (Block IV) and the episode begins again.

Considering factors involved in the taking of organizational roles, Katz & Kahn (1966) extended the model to include the "enduring states" of organizational factors, attributes of the person, and interpersonal factors as additional classes of variables. Those may influence the role episode and make the sequence of events in the role episode more understandable (See Figure 2, p.12). Organizational factors are independent of persons in the model. Persons may come and go, but the organization and its traits remain. In the present research, organizational factors included the institutional characteristics, an independent variable. Attributes of the person were "all those variables which describe the propensity of an individual to behave in certain ways" (Katz & Kahn, p. 187). Those include both the faculty (role senders) demographic characteristics, the mediating variable, and the chair (focal person) demographic characteristics, another independent variable, which may have influenced the faculty members' perceptions.

Copyrighted materials used on these pages (11–12) have not been included in this published version.

These materials are available from the author:

Dana W Boden
Associate Professor, University Libraries
C. Y. Thompson Library
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
Lincoln NE 68583-0717
USA

(402) 472-4412
dboden1@unl.edu

While most chair and faculty demographic characteristics are considered attributes of the person, some characteristics may be appropriate to consider as interpersonal factors. In the present research those are the chair's number of years in the position, the chair's location prior to promotion, and the faculty member's number of years at the institution. Katz & Kahn (1966) noted interactions between persons over time effect role behavior, perceptions and expectations. The length of time the chair or faculty member has been in their position, or they have been in the same department, may influence patterns of interaction and perceptions between the chair as focal person and the faculty member as role sender. Interpersonal factors are distinguished by patterns of interaction between persons in the role episode; in this research the faculty member(s) and the chair.

Certain characteristics may effect perceptions. One of the variables of influence in organizations may be that of size. Biddle (1979) supports the view that the overall size of the organization (total library faculty) is a significant factor in the role episode, while Pfeffer & Salancik (1975) believe the number of persons the focal person supervises (size of the department) is a significant factor. For interpersonal factors to be of significant impact it can be argued the persons interacting must have been influencing each other for an extended period of time (DeVries, 1972).

As related to Biddle's (1979) four factors common to roles and applied to this study, I would expect my independent variables, institutional characteristics and chair characteristics, to influence the dependent variable, library faculty perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development and the chair's leadership practices, because: 1) chair faculty development activities and leadership practices are behavioral and involve

observable actions; 2) department chairs perform a role; 3) the role observed in this study is limited to the context of the department and the institution; and 4) the role consists of the behaviors faculty observe the chair performing within that context. Within Katz and Kahn's (1966) model (See Figure 2, p.12), library faculty (role senders) perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development and the chair's leadership practices may be significantly impacted by: organizational factors, namely the overall number of library faculty in the institution and/or the number of faculty in the department the chair supervises; interpersonal factors, namely the number of years the faculty member has been at the institution, the number of years the department chair has been in that position and/or the location of the chair prior to promotion; or attributes of the persons, namely chair characteristics or faculty member characteristics.

This research was of importance since "research related to the duties and responsibilities of the chairperson is extensive with respect to how chairpersons perceive their various functions, but is very limited with respect to faculty members' perceptions of how chairpersons do ... in that position" (Gordon et al., 1991, p. 179). Dependent upon the results of this research that revealed library faculty members' perceptions of the chairs' roles in professional development and leadership practices, chairs may respond by modifying their role behavior.

Definitions

Institutional characteristics. One of two sets of independent variables in the study. They are institution type, number of library faculty, number of faculty in the department, and organization structure.

Chair characteristics. The second set of independent variables in the study. They

are department chair's type of appointment, location prior to promotion to chair, gender, years at chair, tenure status, education, rank, and location in relation to the library faculty member.

Department chair. The designated person charged with the management of a department. This individual reports to an assistant or associate dean or director, or directly to the dean or director. For the purpose of this study, no distinction is made among the titles department head, department chairperson, department chairman, and department chair (Mitchell, 1986, p. 4; Wilhite, 1987, p. 6). Due to variations in university libraries, and for the purpose of this study, equivalent position levels may be unit or division chair, head, etc.

Role. Those behaviors characteristic of one or more persons in a context (Biddle, 1979, p. 58).

Role theory. A science concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristic of persons within contexts and with various processes that presumably produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviors (Biddle, 1979, p. 4).

Faculty development. Activities, programs, and procedures, which assist faculty in gaining knowledge, training, skills, attitudes, and insights that improve their ability to be more effective in all functions of their professional lives (Tucker, 1992, p.267-8; Wilhite, 1987, p. 6). Areas included may be: professional development, instructional development, personal development, and service enhancement (Tucker, 1992, p. 277-8). For university library faculty this also includes general enhancement of job performance.

Leadership practices. Behaviors of an administrator, supervisor, or manager, which involve challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act,

modeling the way, or encouraging the heart in the organizational context. Kouzes & Posner's (1995) research has identified these five activities, along with two supporting strategies to carry out each one, as essential components of the programs of successful leaders. The ten supporting strategies are: search for opportunities, and experiment and take risks; envision the future, and enlist others; foster collaboration, and strengthen others; set the example, and plan small wins; and recognize contributions, and celebrate accomplishments.

University library faculty. Professional library employees in the university setting. The recognized terminal degree required of such employees is the American Library Association accredited Master of Library Science, though other degrees are often held as well. These employees are in positions having criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion comparable to teaching faculty. They also have the right to participate in the campus faculty governance structure (Hersberger, 1989). For the purpose of this study, the term "faculty" is used whatever the actual term(s) used at a particular institution for the equivalent, or comparable level of employment, to faculty status (i.e. academic status, continuing appointment, university librarian ranks, professorial ranks). These faculty are not employed in teaching/degree awarding departments of Library and Information Science.

Faculty characteristics. The mediating variables in the study. They are the faculty member's gender, rank, tenure status, service area, years in the profession, years at the institution, education, age range, and library station.

Service area. Area in which the university library faculty member has their primary assignment. Designated as either public services or technical services.

Public services. Areas within libraries where the employees' main position responsibilities are to serve the library patrons' needs.

Technical services. Areas within libraries, often unseen by patrons, where the technical functions such as ordering, acquiring, record-keeping, marking and labeling, repairing, and cataloging of library materials takes place.

Delimitations

1. This study was primarily concerned with the perceptions library faculty hold regarding the leadership practices and role of the department chair in faculty development.

2. This project surveyed the non-administrative faculty members in the university libraries of the member institutions of the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium.

Limitations

1. The institutions in this study employ faculty from throughout the country. These faculty members' views are representative of the views of university library faculty throughout the nation.

2. This study was subject to weaknesses inherent in survey research such as influences of the respondents' feelings at the time the questionnaire was completed.

Significance of the Study

This study differed from previous research on the department chair's role in two important ways. First, it focused specifically on perceptions faculty hold concerning both the chairs' role in faculty development and leadership practices. Second, it researched the topic in a segment of the higher education community not previously studied, namely library faculty.

Expanding this body of knowledge to include non-teaching university departments, such as those represented by university library faculty, broadened the knowledge base. In contrast to other university faculty, a majority of library faculty represent female, twelve month employed, faculty with a Master of Library Science as the terminal degree. While of interest to all university library faculty, the results can provide helpful insights to department chairs in university libraries regarding how their professional subordinates perceive the chair's activities. The results also documented which independent and mediating variables significantly influence library faculty perceptions of the chair's activities. This information will be useful to chairs in considering their own experiences and activities. The results will also assist university-wide faculty development offices in planning programs for all faculty, in various disciplines.

Organization of the Study

After the introductory Chapter I, the remainder of this dissertation is presented in four additional chapters.

A review of the literature relative to the major areas of concern in this study is contained in Chapter II. Those major areas include the role of the department chair, especially as related to faculty development and leadership practices, and academic library leadership and faculty development.

A discussion relevant to the research methods used in this study is set out in Chapter III. Included are the research design, population and sample, instrumentation, variables in the study, procedures for administration of the survey, and methods of data analysis.

The responses to the survey and the analysis of those results are presented in Chapter IV.

A summary of the study, discussion and conclusions drawn from the research efforts are given in Chapter V. Implications and recommendations for further research conclude the chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A review of the literature related to the topic of the department chair's leadership practices and role in faculty development, from a university library faculty perspective, had to begin with the background literature in the following relevant areas: 1) the role of the department chair, especially as related to faculty development and leadership; and 2) academic library leadership and faculty development.

There is a significant amount of literature on chairing academic departments and the role of the chair. The activities of chairs of teaching departments have been the primary focus of those publications. In much of that literature faculty development and/or leadership have been recognized as activities in which chairs are involved. The chairs' own perspectives of their role take the forefront in the literature. Faculty members, the chair's administrative supervisor (usually a dean), or a combination of two, or all three, of the groups have sometimes been the research population for perceptions of the role of the chair. Research specifically focused on the chair's role in faculty development and leadership has been targeted almost exclusively on the chair's perspective.

There is little literature addressing the role of department chairs in university libraries. Deans or directors have been the more common subjects. Research on university library department chair's leadership practices and role in faculty development from any viewpoint is limited.

Sources for this research included refereed journal articles, conference papers, documents, and monographs identified by utilizing the ERIC, SocioFile, and UnCover

databases, as well as monographs found through the OCLC FirstSearch WorldCat database. Dissertations, identified through Dissertations Abstracts International, on topics related to this research were also reviewed.

Role of the Department Chair

The department chair position has long been recognized as an important one in post-secondary institutions. Since the post GI bill years saw the swelling of enrollments on college and university campuses, research has been focused on department chairs, their role and functions. That research has shown the very nature of the position carries with it an expectation for at least some level of leadership. A role in faculty development has been a constant for chairs as well; however, the types of activities and depth the role involved has evolved.

The role of leader has often been highlighted in the literature regarding the department chair. However leadership is a somewhat vague and ambiguous term. The qualities of a leader are sometimes more easily recognized when seen in action, than actually defined with words. Some believe leadership is merely one of the chair's many roles. Others view the chair as functioning as a specific type of leader. Still others consider leadership the overarching, defining role the department chair should strive to fulfill.

Faculty development has been a concern of the academic community for decades. Times of retrenchment and increasing numbers of mid-career faculty have brought times of reflection and increased research on effective faculty development. In the early literature faculty development was viewed almost exclusively in terms of how it could improve teaching. Also, it was commonly considered the responsibility of each individual

faculty member. However, over the years, the emphases have expanded and shifted with the times and interests on campuses. Though the terms used for it vary slightly through the literature, faculty development appears as a recurring role in the research on the roles and responsibilities of the department chair. The department chair has been viewed as a mid-level administrator in a position to act as a leader, encouraging or assisting faculty members, in professional development and growth.

The Chair's Perceptions

During the decade of the 1950s research on the role of academic department chairs began to appear. With his survey of thirty-three private liberal arts college department chairs, Doyle's (1953) doctoral dissertation research was the first to focus on what he termed the chairs' status and function. A wealth of research has followed.

Recognizing the chairperson as a faculty leader Heimler (1967), himself a department chair, extended the definition of that leadership beyond policymaking, curriculum development and instructional improvement, to "stimulation of faculty research and scholarship." He noted a need for further research on the role of the chair and recommended research to answer several questions including, "How do college departmental chairmen perceive their role? How is their administrative role perceived by the departmental faculty and the administration? What conflicts, if any, exist among these perspectives?"

In the late 1960s the American Council on Education sponsored two institutes for department chairs, while Higher Education Executive Associates was begun with the purpose of presenting institutes for department chairs. Brann and Emmet (1972) edited a collection of papers from these institutes. Each paper considers a different view of the

chairship expressed in a position paper, opinion piece, or, in some cases, research based on the experiences and observations of the particular author. Aspects of the chair's role, from the new department chair to relationships with faculty, deans and students, from large public institutions to community colleges, are covered. The importance of chair leadership and the unique position of the chair to influence and encourage faculty development are highlighted. Several of the authors note the limited literature, and need for further research, on the position of chair.

Almost twelve hundred department chairs, at thirty-eight doctorate-granting state universities, were surveyed for McLaughlin et al.'s 1975 research. The three major roles identified were academic, administrative, and leadership. The chairs enjoyed the academic role the most, but were frustrated to have little time to commit to the teaching, research, advising and development it involved. The administrative role took the most time, was the least liked, and was perceived as necessary to keep things running smoothly and central administration happy. Leadership involved faculty and program development. Chairs saw this role as satisfying, as they encouraged professional development and the spirit of academic freedom. The majority of the chairs indicated a need for training in performing the nonacademic roles related to the position.

Now updated to its third edition, Tucker's (1992) classic work, addressed the varied responsibilities, roles, and "hats to be worn" by the department chair. The book resulted from research initially done on, and workshops presented for, chairs in the Florida university system in the late 1970s. Input from chairpersons who read the earlier editions, or were involved in department leadership workshops, contributed to the expansion of the later editions. Eight broad responsibilities, with a myriad of duties, and

twenty-eight roles, were listed early in the volume. Professional development was one of the eight broad responsibilities, while leader was identified as one of the twenty-eight roles. One chapter addressed "Leadership and Decision Making" and another addressed "Professional Growth and Faculty Development." Each chapter ended with questions to provoke thought and/or discussion of the options the chair may utilize in fulfilling his/her role, as well as a list of other resources that might be consulted.

Jennerich (1981) conducted a survey of chairs asking them to rank fourteen skills pulled from an extensive review of the literature. Ranking was according to importance for the performance of the chair's duties. The 218 responses came from 48 of the 50 states, all types of four-year institutions and all disciplines. The respondents represented varying years of experience, sizes of departments and preparation for the job. There was no significant difference between the national ranking and each of the variables, or between the variables. The six highest ranked competencies concerned personal/ interpersonal/managerial skills with the second rated competency, "Leadership Ability" being a combination of all three. Jennerich observed that although the person in the chair position was generally thought of as having been chosen by colleagues, his survey showed the reality was that most were appointed by higher-level administrators. He concluded chairs, and the competencies needed for their positions, were quite similar across higher education and that training for chairs should be implemented.

Case studies were the method used by Bennett (1983) as thought-provoking models of ways to deal with the various responsibilities and situations chairs may face. At least two faculty members responded to each case and many of the respondents were department chairs themselves. Bennett then added notes highlighting his perspective

gained from leading workshops and seminars for the American Council on Education's Departmental Leadership Institute. Through these selections important roles often addressed by chairs, including leadership, counseling, decision-making, and encouragement of faculty development, were outlined.

Thirty-eight chairs at a mid-east (U.S.) university system were interviewed regarding their "...background, goals, leadership experience and style, and sources of satisfaction and stress," by Miles (1983). When asked to describe their role as chair with a single term, one-third chose "administrator", with the rest being divided among fifteen different terms, including faculty developer and leader. Miles found over half the chairs had had no training for their role. That role involved delegating, motivating, organizing, and evaluating other people. A senior personnel associate at a university, Miles concluded academic institutions needed "to take a serious look at the development of their own human resources".

The Chair of the Department of English at San Jose State University, described his personal morale-lifting experience when a series of seminars resulted in enhancement of faculty development and a feeling of collegiality, all due to the university implementing required post-tenure reviews (Galm, 1985).

Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak (1986) sent a questionnaire to ninety chairs at six universities in Israel asking them to rate twenty-nine items both according to the extent to which they fulfilled each role and the extent to which they would like to fulfill each role. Five main factors were identified: curriculum and instruction; initiation; staff development; democratic leadership style; and departmental status. The results indicated the chairs would like to do a better job of fulfilling their roles, and the smaller the

department and the more senior the chair the greater their satisfaction.

A collection of essays, edited by Bennett and Figuli (1990), most of which first appeared in The Department Advisor, a quarterly newsletter begun in 1986, brought together information from recognized names in the field in one convenient place. Roles of department chairs were addressed, as well as dilemmas associated with the position. Both Wolverton (1990) and Warren (1990) point out the leadership role of department chairs in different contexts, but with similar emphases on traits consistent with transformational leadership. Goldenberg (1990), McKeachie (1990), and Boice (1990) expanded on the faculty development role of the chair, while Eble (1990) tied the two together recognizing the effective chair as a leader who knows the faculty in the department well and helps each one to reach their full development and institutional potential.

After three years as a department chair, Napier (1993) described her view of three roles the chair should play inside the department to aid faculty members. The buffer has an administrative and information function, as well as protecting faculty members from themselves. The facilitator helps with teaching and research, while the guide may gently steer, offer suggestions, counsel, or simply model behavior. In return, Napier noted faculty should be willing to consider requests the chair makes of them, make the effort to succeed, respect the chair's time for scholarly pursuits, and respect the support staff who help the chair and the faculty do their jobs.

A concise, yet comprehensive, easy-to-read summary of the literature and current thinking on department chairs was put together by Seagren et al. in 1993. In considering the roles of the chair, the responsibilities, leadership, power and politics, faculty

evaluation and development, institution types, and academic disciplines were all considered as factors in how chairs function. This information was used in recommending where the position of department chair should be headed in the future. Included was an extensive, useful list of references.

A special issue of the ADFL Bulletin specifically addressed the "often discussed ... need for a resource book or handbook for foreign language department chairs" (Bugliani, 1994, p. 3). All except three of the twenty articles were written from the chair's perspective by current or former chairs. As a result, the articles addressed varying views of the chair's role from various types of institutions, sizes of departments, departmental and college contexts, and personal styles of the writers. The model of the training of new chairs at Michigan State University was described to encourage such training at all institutions (Peters, 1994). An article was included specifically to outline the chair's role in faculty development (Jarvis, 1994), while other articles included faculty development as a part of the role of chairs (Riegel, 1994; Harper, 1994; Peters, 1994). A former chair himself, Jarvis (1994) shared his observations on the need for faculty development, activities to enhance it, and urged "make development your main job." Another contributor to the issue expounded on the chair's leadership mission to guide the foreign language department to its place in the institution and the discipline (Brod, 1994).

Almost three thousand community college chairs responded to the 1992 International Community College Chair Survey (Seagren et al, 1994). From the results fourteen roles were clustered into three categories: interpersonal role, administrator role, and leader role. Roles in the interpersonal cluster were ones important in the chair's

activities to relate with and promote development of faculty; i.e., information disseminator, facilitator, advocate, caretaker, and mentor. The five roles in the leader cluster helped the department to move into the future: motivator, delegator, entrepreneur, visionary, and planner. At the same time tasks were grouped and a category for "professional development and communication tasks" included five tasks rated important, or very important, by over ninety percent of the respondents. These roles and tasks related to interpersonal activities, leadership, and professional development were characteristic of information sharing and transformational leadership.

Gmelch and Miskin (1993, 1995) identified the most important tasks of department chairs as faculty developer, manager, leader, and scholar. This list was determined by surveying 800 department chairs from colleges and universities across the United States. The chairs viewed the faculty developer role as their most important responsibility. The leader role allowed them to help others professionally, influence the profession and the department, and have a challenging job. In the first half of their 1993 work Gmelch and Miskin addressed adjusting to becoming the leader of the department with responsibilities as manager and faculty developer. Each of the sections of their 1995 book addressed chair responsibilities related to one of the four tasks. Both resources contained exercises, action plans, examples and thought-provoking questions for those in a chair's position.

The Dean's Perceptions

A dean's perception of the role and powers of an ideal chair was put forth by Jeffrey (1985). An ideal chair was a good manager of the department's business, solving problems without having to forward them to the dean too often, providing "the greatest

amount of information in the briefest form" to support requests and recommendations, having a vision for the department consistent with the mission of the college, and providing intellectual leadership for the department. The excellent performance of these tasks meant the chair understands and possesses two significant traits Jeffrey identified as personal power and a high tolerance factor.

The deans of arts and science colleges at universities with over 10,000 students were asked to rate the importance of twenty-one chair leadership qualities in a nationwide survey reported by Moxley & Olson (1988, 1990). In addition, the deans listed the top five leadership qualities, named qualities not listed, indicated whether the chair primarily represents the faculty or the administration, and commented on the most important aspects of the chair's position. The top five duties included one related to budget management and two concerning communication. The remaining two were encouraging faculty development and applauding/rewarding faculty achievement. The top unlisted qualities were problem-solving, effective interpersonal skills, honesty, and a sense of humor. Most deans (55%) saw the chair primarily as representing the faculty, though 33% took the time to go outside the offered answers to indicate they believed the chair represented both the faculty and the administration.

Multiple Views

To ascertain three levels of expectations regarding department chairs Smith (1972) surveyed faculty, chairs, and upper level administration at twelve public two-year colleges. The 985 respondents rated 46 job activities on the level of use they would expect their chair to give the activity. The job activities were broken into six functional categories: production; maintenance; production supportive; institutional supportive;

adaptive; and managerial. The eight adaptive activities, those addressing goals, planning, and programs for the department, received high ratings from all three groups – none below 78 percent. Activities related to faculty development or leadership were spread across the categories with most under the maintenance or institutional supportive categories. Those received high percentage ratings from all three levels of respondents as well.

Faculty, chairs and deans at two land-grant universities completed the chair effectiveness questionnaire developed by Siever, et al (1972). Respondents were asked to rank thirty-six characteristics of an effective chair divided into three categories of twelve each in professional activities, administrative responsibilities and personal characteristics. There was high agreement among the 481 respondents regarding the chair characteristics of most and least importance. Several of the characteristics addressed the leadership activities or faculty development efforts in which a department chair might engage. "Achieves program goals", "develops good teaching", and "decisive thinking and action" were such characteristics and were the top ranked characteristic in each category respectively. The least agreement was on the personal characteristics of effective chairs. This was seen as indicative of the variation in perceptions of important leadership traits. For example besides "decisive thinking and action", "decision maker with faculty as advisors", and "delegates decision making" were also choices within the category. These were rated 1, 4, 5 at one institution and 1, 3, 6 at the other. It was noted that subgroups seemed to know what characteristics were important in their particular situation.

Kenny (1982) addressed the role of the chair from the three perspectives of the faculty, the administrator, and the chair. Her opinion and advice came from personal

experience in all three roles. Realistic and forthright in addressing what each level wants and expects from the department chair, Kenny also succeeded in communicating respect for all three views. She left the reader with a positive perspective on the future of academia and the importance of the role of the chair in that future.

More recently, Leaming (1998) brought insights from 20 years as a department chair at four different institutions, service as a dean and, of course, as a faculty member, into his book "of good ideas and information" (p. xiii) for chairs. It was divided into short, easily read or consulted sections on the array of roles and responsibilities of chairs. The fresh approach he used covers such traditional matters as the budget and curriculum, as well as more recently "hot" topics as the Americans with Disabilities Act and "Managing Generation X." Included in the roles addressed were the Chair's responsibility for providing leadership and strategies for faculty development.

The Faculty Perceptions

The preferred research method for determining faculty perceptions regarding the role of the department chair has been the use of questionnaires. Watson (1979,1986) and Gordon et al. (1991) asked for views on the overall role of the department chair. Others have focused their curiosity on more specific, yet broadly defined, responsibilities given names such as "academic leader" (Hirokawa et al., 1989) or "pursuit of excellence" (Moses, 1985).

Watson (1979) surveyed faculty at the University of Victoria in Canada in 1970 regarding five roles of the head or chair. Asked to rank the defined roles -- Intellectual Leader, Coordinator, Representative, Resource Mobilizer, and Personnel Administrator -- faculty chose Coordinator first, then Leader and Representative. The other two roles

ranked so low they were not considered further. In an analysis of responses by discipline Social Scientists most commonly chose Coordinator, while those in the Natural Sciences and Humanities chose Leadership as most important. Women were also found to be more likely to rank the chair's role as Leader as most important. A follow-up study, fourteen years later, with faculty in the same institution found the faculty's perceptions had changed (Watson, 1986). The Resource Mobilizer and Personnel Administrator roles still dropped out, however the Coordinator role was chosen as the most important role across the disciplines. Watson found it interesting that the Coordinator role dealt mostly with decisions affecting things, while the literature seemed to stress the need for chairs to function as department leaders.

Faculty's perceptions of the chair's leadership and the chair's performance were the research focus of Knight and Holen (1985). They gathered 5,830 faculty member's ratings of 458 department chairs in 65 institutions across five Carnegie classification types across the United States. Those chairs rated high on both "initiating structure" and "consideration" leader behaviors also received high performance ratings. The results were consistent across institution types. These results lent support to the position that effective leader behavior translates into effective chair behavior.

Only eight of sixty-four department chairs requested the evaluation Moses (1985) offered chairs as a means for faculty feedback at the University of Queensland in Australia. The questionnaire included thirty functions based on Tucker's 1981 work, and discussions with chairs. The faculty in those eight departments gave their perception of the importance of each of the functions. An administrative and a professional development function tied for greatest importance, and one from each of the same two

categories tied for second. The two professional development functions, "Encouraging good teaching in the department" and "Stimulating research and publications", prompted over one hundred research interviews across 43 departments to learn "What encouragement is given in your department to excellence in teaching?" with the same question regarding research. Both questions were followed up with "Is there anything (else) you'd like to see done?" Moses concluded chairs encourage excellence in both teaching and research. They do this administratively by organizing the work environment, and academically by acting as a leader and senior colleague with relevant experience and by fostering younger faculty talents.

Hirokawa et al. (1989) surveyed faculty members in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Iowa. The instrument asked the faculty to rate the importance of each of nineteen skills for effective department leadership and their perception of their chair's manifesting each skill in the past year. Faculty also rated their chair's overall leadership performance. The skills were loosely organized into four categories: resource management, climate management, image management, and faculty development. The faculty rated all nineteen items as important, generally agreed across all disciplines on their importance, and their ratings were good predictors of the chair's perceived effectiveness.

In a survey conducted by Gordon et al. (1991), the faculty in schools of education all across the U.S. ranked twelve categories of chair leadership activities based on their perception of the chair's current and ideal functioning. There were significant differences between seven of the twelve categories. The one hundred six responses showed faculty felt four categories needed less emphasis by the department chairs: implementer,

supervisor, evaluator, and recruiter. Three categories related to interacting with people were perceived as needing more emphasis: communicator, advisor/counselor, and motivator.

Faculty perceptions of the importance of the chair's role in faculty tenure acquisition were determined by a questionnaire used by Daly and Townsend (1992, 1994). Tenured and tenure-track faculty at doctorate-granting I universities were asked to indicate whether nineteen roles of the chair had assisted or would assist them in acquiring tenure. A majority of the respondents perceived thirteen roles as assisting in acquiring tenure. An interesting finding was that the tenured and tenure-track faculty chose the same five roles, but in different order. The results supported department chairs taking a leadership role in their faculty's development and progress toward tenure acquisition.

Chair's Role in Faculty Development and Leadership

A widely distributed early publication on faculty development, the position paper by the Group for Human Development in Higher Education (1974), recommended future directions for what was called faculty development, but focused almost exclusively on teaching. It considered the broad institution-wide implications of establishing a program to improve teaching and did not focus on individual positions, such as department chairs.

A clarification of the types of development was set forth by Gaff (1975) early in his work on what he called "faculty renewal." Faculty development focused on the individual faculty member, while the goal of instructional development was "improvement of learning for students." Organizational development focused on institutions, the units within them, and their functioning. Information was gathered from two hundred programs. Fifty-five directors were surveyed and nine were visited in

person. Findings showed all three approaches to development were included in comprehensive programs. However the terminology used varied and sometimes impeded clear communication even among professionals seeking to share experiences and expertise. While, in the end, development rests with the individual faculty member, the department chair was recognized as the front line leader responsible for providing support to enable that development. Also, to be able to better assist their faculty's development, chairs should develop themselves.

Though the publication had sections on instructional development, organizational development, and personal development, Bergquist & Phillips' (1975) *A Handbook for Faculty Development* clearly was written with the goal of assisting faculty to improve teaching and increase student learning. Each section and the chapters on sub-topics such as "team building" and "helping skills" all turned the focus back to the effects on classroom outcomes. Two years later, in their second volume, Bergquist & Phillips (1977) viewed faculty development in broader terms. While the different types of development all may contribute to better teaching and learning, the development of the faculty member on a more holistic level was the focus. Leadership, with the department chair as one who may act as an academic leader, was seen as a factor that could influence both organizational and personal development.

Since the mid-1980s the position that the department chair should and does play a role in faculty development has been more aggressively researched. In their report on the Bush Foundation Faculty Development Project, Eble & McKeachie (1985) noted the importance of administrative support of faculty development programs. The Bush Project started with the assumption faculty must feel development is their program. Evidence

showed administrative support was equally as important as faculty support and, in fact, balance between faculty and administrative support was the key to success. Eble & McKeachie addressed the administrative support needed in only general terms. They noted leadership provided in this respect came from varied sources, from deans to faculty members, encouraging further research.

Using a qualitative method, the grounded theory approach, Mitchell (1986, 1987) planned to focus specifically on factors related to department heads' leadership in faculty development. The terminology proved limiting and was broadened to learn the management strategies department heads used to enhance faculty productivity, performance, and work satisfaction, as well as department effectiveness, and to discover the factors they felt were essential for effective department leadership. Chairs of "outstanding" departments at three urban institutions were interviewed. Five factors contributing to effective department leadership were identified: leader values (or beliefs), development stage of the department, management strategies, shared values and goals across the faculty and administration, and control of resources.

The chairperson's role in "enhancing the growth and development of faculty" was the focus of Wilhite's (1987, 1990) case study research, also a qualitative method. Thirty department chairs, all male, in the Colleges of Agriculture of land grant institutions were interviewed. Deans and department chairs had designated the thirty chairs as excellent at assisting faculty professionally. Practices used to enhance faculty performance were identified as recruitment, communication, goals identification, support, evaluation, and recognition.

In their research of the literature on what was referred to as "faculty vitality",

Bland and Schmitz (1988, 1990a, 1990b) found one hundred fifty-two recommendations from over one hundred thirty-five authors. They narrowed and combined the recommendations down to twenty, and then categorized those into three areas of focus. Within the focus regarding the roles of the institution and the faculty, Bland and Schmitz pointed out the literature supported "mid-level administrators" taking on faculty vitality as a responsibility, and pursuing training to facilitate it. Their bibliographies (Bland & Schmitz, 1988, 1990b) listed resources that address the concern. A shortcoming was that any Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) documents, which are only available on microfiche, were not included due to concern that the quality of the materials varied widely. This left out even the applicable, quality resources indexed in that collection.

Creswell et al. (1990) utilized interviews to gather information on the strategies used by two hundred department chairs at seventy campuses across the nation to encourage faculty development and renewal. These "excellent" chairs were so designated by "senior academic administrators and faculty development specialists" as those "who excel in assisting faculty [to] grow and develop professionally." Strategies for self-assessment and development of the chairs themselves were presented first. Ways to apply these strategies in working with faculty to enhance their growth and development completed the work. The use of many quotes directly from the "excellent" chairs made this research quite readable and of practical use to new chairs, those considering a move to the position of chair, and chairs needing fresh ideas on leading faculty improvement.

In his book on new faculty professional development Boice (1992) recognized the crucial role of department chairs in the success of faculty. He addressed the work to a

broad audience, but chairs were listed as "first and foremost (p. xii)." Based on his personal research, review of the literature, and work with faculty over twenty-five years, Boice addressed "obstacles" new faculty face, ways to help them overcome those obstacles, and followed up with guidelines on building an institutional support system. Part of the institutional support system was chairs acting as advocates for faculty development activities and programs, and leading faculty by participating in self-evaluation and functioning as models and facilitators.

Using a gender specific approach, Jahanshahi (1992) researched the dominant leadership styles of over one hundred female academic department heads nationwide. The majority of these women (85%) indicated the high supportive, low directive leadership style as their dominant style. One factor found to significantly impact style effectiveness was faculty size. Noted in the recommendations for future research was the need for leadership research instruments more sensitive not only to gender, but also to needs of the academic environment.

Lucas (1994) took the four chair roles identified by Gmelch and Miskin (1993, 1995) and chose the leader and faculty developer roles "as key to effective departmental functioning," then identified nine major responsibilities related to those two roles. The chair was encouraged to rate each of the responsibilities on a leadership matrix according to: the importance of the responsibility to the department; satisfaction with the chair's skill level with that responsibility; and an intersection of the two ratings. The dean, and faculty members, could do this rating as well to give the chair input regarding areas for development. Chairs were encouraged to utilize transformational leadership in leading their departments as a means to "revitalize faculty and improve their professional

development." Lucas used the five headings presented by Kouzes and Posner (1987) to identify the behaviors of transformational leaders. The belief in people, vision, and encouraging basis of transformational leadership was carried through the rest of Lucas' book, as the remaining major responsibilities were each covered in turn. In addition, the relationship between the chair and the dean was not forgotten. Nor was the well-being of the chair forgotten, as plans for reducing stress and tips for attaining leadership effectiveness were covered.

For his dissertation research, Adibe (1997) developed his own leadership style questionnaire to learn faculty perceptions of leadership styles of academic department chairs for comparison to the chairs' perceptions of themselves. The four basic areas of leadership behaviors were governance, professional development, communication, and faculty affairs. Significant perceptional differences between chairs and faculty and based on demographic variables were found.

In the late 1990s chairs were functioning in a new geography where demographic changes had affected not only the students enrolled in higher education, but chairs themselves, the faculty they lead, and the institutions within which they worked. According to Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, and Tucker (1999), "The kind of leadership that chairs need to exert is that of building bridges, creating connections, and defusing tensions (p. 16)." Acting as a leader within the university, not just managing a department, now was the norm for department chairs. Beyond the overall leader function specific leadership skills recommended were as a "purposeful, facilitative leader." Such a leader was encouraged to facilitate the department acting as a collective group and functioning as a community of scholars, while rewarding outcomes at a department level.

This leadership was seen as part of the chairs responsibilities in handling the operations of the department. Encouraging professional development was a role chairs fill in advancing the department and its people. Helping faculty to develop professionally could promote the department's goals and foster collaboration among members of the department.

Each of these resources highlighted, either explicitly or implicitly, the leadership and/or faculty development role the chair fulfills. As the administrative middle manager the chair is naturally seen as in a leader position to influence subordinates. The chair is also situated strategically to assist faculty in their development, growth, and progress professionally.

Development of the Literature on Academic Library Department Chairs

The general literature on department chairs, university leadership or faculty development almost never gives any indication that library personnel were considered, or included, in research. Boice (1992) was a unique exception and also collaborated with librarians on research regarding library faculty and teaching faculty demands on scholarship (Boice, Scepanski, and Wilson, 1987). He noted faculty in other departments on campus may not even be aware if librarians have faculty status (Boice, 1992, p. 276).

The lack of inclusion of library faculty is likely related to their relatively recent acquisition of a recognized, professional status on campus. University teaching faculty members managed the first academic libraries. By 1900 academic librarianship was a recognized profession; however, ranks similar to those held by colleagues in teaching departments were reserved for only the highest administrative positions. Even that was not guaranteed and the title, rank and status of librarians in non-administrative positions

varied greatly (Massman, 1972). Over the decades of the twentieth century the library literature included much on the debate regarding what the correct status for librarians in the university setting should be (Downs, 1976). "Professional academic librarians" were welcomed into membership in the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1956. The University Libraries Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) established an Academic Status Committee in 1958. While the committee issued a statement that endorsed faculty status for academic librarians in 1959, it was not until 1971 that the ACRL membership officially approved Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians (McAnally, 1975). The Standards have been revised twice since (Krompart, 1994). The Standards address areas recognizable to any faculty member: professional responsibilities; governance (library, college, and university); compensation; tenure and promotion; sabbatical and other research leaves; research and development funds; and academic freedom (ACRL Committee on the Status of Academic Librarians, 2001).

Today, faculty status is still not a given for librarians in higher education. In fact, among the Carnegie research institutions just over half have faculty status for their librarians. The professional librarians at a large majority of the remaining institutions have what is termed academic status (Leysen & Black, 1998; Lowry, 1993). The ACRL approved Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Libraries in 1990. Included in the nine guidelines are recommendations for involvement in governance, research and professional activities, and protection of academic freedom (Kroll, 1994). Whether recognized with faculty or academic status, university librarians are expected to be involved in continuing professional development.

Beyond the historical record of ambivalence for the profession and its status on university campuses, other differences in the organizational setup of libraries may have delayed the focus of research from turning toward department chairs. Chief librarians at universities in the first half of the twentieth century tended to be quite autocratic, blocking the library from arranging itself along the lines of a more democratic organization similar to its teaching counterparts (McAnally, 1975). As a result, much of the research on leadership in academic libraries has been focused on the library deans or directors, not department chairs. At the same time the need for support personnel to perform a myriad of duties in academic libraries has meant that librarians in their very first professional position may be called upon to be a supervisor of support staff or student workers (Bailey, 1976). The result has been literature focused on supervision of personnel and often based on a business management background. Specific department chair concerns, especially as related to leading faculty, have been addressed only in a limited manner.[1] Even the literature regarding academic librarians at the department chair level varies on the title given their role. Examples are department chair, department head, division head, division chair, team leader, unit leader, or middle manager.

Mentioned in the literature and statistics gathering at least as early as the 1920s (Downs, 1976), the number of department chairs in university libraries proliferated with the rapid growth in institutions of higher education and their libraries in the post-World War II era. The increase in the number of librarians employed led to more focused

[1] An excellent example of this are the editions of *Practical Help for New Supervisors* prepared by the Supervisory Skills Committee, Personnel Administration Section, Library Administration and Management Association of the American Library Association (Giesecke 1992, 1997).

individual position responsibilities and organizations divided into units with middle level administrators to oversee those units. Beyond the traditional breakdown by public service or technical service area, common departments created included reference, archives, cataloging, acquisitions, and serials. Research on these library middle managers did not begin until the late 1960s (Bailey, 1987). Similar to the broader department chair literature, the main focus of the research and literature has been the chairs themselves or the views of higher administrators. The perceptions of faculty in university library departments regarding the department chair have not been well documented.

Academic Library Department Chair Leadership and Faculty Development

Utilization of published instruments to research library leadership or faculty development practices is limited. Such research specifically on department chairs in the academic library setting is an even smaller subset. Most publications regarding the subjects have been either based on data gathering that used a researcher-developed instrument, surveys of the existing literature, or were basically opinion pieces.

The predominance of library literature that focused on descriptions and applications with little actually of a research nature was noted by Plate (1970). He utilized a short questionnaire and interviews with seventy-seven librarians who supervised at least four fellow librarians at thirteen Association of Research Libraries (ARL) institutions in the northeastern United States. These middle managers felt the professional development of those they supervised was not their responsibility, but the responsibility of the individuals themselves.

Stone's (1969) research addressed the individual librarian's view of professional development. She surveyed "professional librarians" who had received the accredited

Master of Library Science degree in 1956 and 1961, of which, approximately one half were in academic libraries. While "the ultimate responsibility for continuing education was placed by the librarians on the individual (p.192)", the results urging administrator support for professional development included the observation " supervisors should be rewarded or promoted on the basis of how well they promote professional growth of those under them (p.175)." A developmental style of leadership along with personal improvement was recommended for library managers to stimulate professional growth.

Several studies regarding library leadership have used the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII (LBDQ-XII), developed at Ohio State University, or a modified version. It examined the style of leadership as perceived by the supervisor and subordinate groups. The supervisor completed the instrument regarding them self, while a selected number of subordinates completed it regarding the supervisor. Results of the LBDQ-XII rated two dimensions: "consideration" which focused on job relationships, and "initiation of structure" which concentrated on goal achievement. Research on libraries in institutions of higher education included Sparks (1976), Comes (1978/1979), and Olive (1991). Sparks utilized the instrument for a very limited study of one academic library supervisor and fifteen subordinates (eleven actual respondents). Comes' doctoral research included twenty-four medium size academic libraries (offered graduate programs, 15 to 50 professional librarians/ media specialists, and director had been in position over one year) at public universities accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. He targeted the director at each institution and eight subordinates who held supervisory responsibilities. Results showed the directors gave themselves significantly higher mean scores than did their subordinates. Though her

research was conducted on public libraries, Dragon (1976, 1979) noted shortcomings in the LBDQ-XII. Some reports of its validity and reliability were extremely low. She concluded it was being utilized due to being "better than the available alternatives" and "until something better comes along it is the best available" (1979, p. 59-60). Over ten years later the LBDQ-XII was again utilized to research both professional and non-professional academic library personnel. Olive (1991) surveyed public services and technical services department heads, and their subordinates, in private Liberal Arts I institution libraries. Significant differences were found in the perceptions of the "consideration" dimension when the department head was female and when the department head had been in the position six to ten years. Significant differences were found in the perceptions of the "initiation of structure" dimension in technical services departments, when the department head was between 21 to 35 years of age, and when there were only one or two professionals in the department.

Middle managers and administrators in libraries of five ARL member institutions were interviewed by Bailey (1978, 1981) regarding their perceptions of the job responsibilities of middle managers and the formal and informal training available for persons prior to and in those positions. Professional development support recommended was related to training for business management and public or personnel administration, as well as specific work experience.

Questionnaires and interviews were both used by Person (1980) who included middle managers in nine large academic libraries in the Great Lakes states in her research of managerial role concepts in academic and public libraries. Of particular interest were the results indicating the public library managers perceived themselves having higher

levels of involvement in internally oriented roles such as "leader" than did their academic library counterparts. The academic library managers gave higher ratings to their involvement in externally directed areas, such as "liaison," "spokesperson," and "negotiator".

Using Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness, Mitchell (1989) surveyed academic library department heads and their immediate supervisors in 137 academic libraries. The model evaluated the leader's motivation, whether task oriented or relationship oriented. He found that heads of both technical service areas and public service areas had good leader-member relations and strong position power. However, they differed in that technical service areas had high task structure, while public service areas had low task structure. Findings indicated task structure was the variable most related to effectiveness, but accounted for only 20 percent of managerial effectiveness variance and 13.4 percent of group effectiveness variance. The implication for leaders in libraries was attention to the type of tasks performed in a department when matching potential leaders and department head positions.

Bailey & Murphy (1989) researched the "management competencies" of middle managers in eleven large ARL libraries in the mid-west. They asked three managers with average performance records and three superior performers, at each institution, "to narrate three positive and three negative experiences in which they had utilized management principles." They then compared their findings to the academic portion of an earlier study. While the categories assigned differed between the two studies, they were similar and the results of both indicated an emphasis on staffing and personnel management, which included subcategories for motivation and staff development.

Library faculty perceptions of the role of the department chair in faculty development were researched at a single institution by Boden (1991, 1994). The desired role of the chair was the basis of the research. The categories determined from the project which utilized grounded theory research (Boden, 1994), were used as the basis for the development of a pilot survey conducted for the follow-up project (Boden, 1991). The six role categories were: advocate; communicator; counselor; leader; manager; and motivator. The leader role was seen as involving leading by example, being knowledgeable of the profession, the organization, the faculty themselves and their responsibilities and needs, and acting as an intermediary for faculty with the administration (Boden, 1994). Review of the items when grouped according to Creswell's (1991) category codes (see Appendix D) showed the library faculty saw the department chair's most important category of practices as "helping faculty in an administrative capacity". The roles of advocate and communicator were important, but the manager role to "Provide resources to support professional activities" was rated at the top (Boden, 1991).

Heads of cataloging and heads of reference departments in over one hundred ARL libraries were surveyed by Wittenbach, Bordeianu, and Wycisk (1992) regarding management education and training. Their results showed few institutions required management training when hiring department chairs, or ongoing training for the chairs.

An overview presented by Sullivan (1991, 1992) addressed the roles of department chairs in university libraries, changes taking place, and predictions of skills needed to be effective in the future. Her focus was general, while looking at the middle manager role of the library department head in the light of recognized management

models. The description of library middle manager functions and responsibilities would likely have been familiar to department chairs in any academic unit:

> "... were selected for their positions because of their functional expertise, not because of a proven ability to supervise or manage, ... reports to an assistant, associate, or deputy librarian [dean or director], ... is responsible for a major unit and function, but frequently does not have direct control over the resources necessary for managing the unit, ... seldom has full control over the expenditure of the budget for the department, the freedom to hire staff as needed, or the ability to reorganize the department." (1992, p.272)

Sullivan's information was broadly focused to cover library department chair's supervision of staff as well as faculty. The roles of team leader and supporter of continuing development of personnel were among those highlighted.

Fulton (1990) and Nofsinger & Bosch (1994) addressed the head of the library reference department specifically. Fulton used the analogy of the Greek tale of Mentor and Telemachus applied to the role of the department head in initiating beginning reference librarians into their new professional positions. Besides being highly specific to reference librarians at the beginning of their career, the information put forth is mostly on initial training and highlights communication skills. Nofsinger & Bosch discussed three roles of the head of reference: people manager, technology facilitator and leader. Within the role of leader, the head of reference was also credited with often acting as a role model for the professional development of colleagues.

Kazlauskas (1993) focused on the relationship between library faculty perceptions of their manager's leadership practices and job satisfaction, and between job satisfaction and demographic characteristics. She utilized the Leadership Practices Inventory: Other (LPIO) and the Survey of Organizational Climate (SOC) in her survey of academic librarians in the State University System of Florida. While five combinations, of the

thirty possible between the five subunits of the LPIO and the six subunits of the SOC, were statistically meaningful, strong relationships were not indicated. She concluded job satisfaction among this group was more related to autonomy than to leadership practices. Job satisfaction was significantly different based on gender, rank (Associate differing from others), and years of service (1 to 4 differing from 30 to 39).

Though not based on primary research, nor targeted specifically to academic libraries, Giesecke (2001) focused on the leadership role of department heads in libraries. She stressed the need for library department heads to transition from managers fulfilling historically based, structured roles to leaders actively, innovatively working to develop their personnel and organization. Identified roles of the department head were leader, facilitator, working leader, and catalyst. Within the leader role, acting as a mentor to enhance the professional development of others was identified as an essential responsibility requiring on-going commitment, but holding the potential for resulting in untold benefits. Written to be broadly applicable to all types of libraries, the author succeeded (without mentioning library faculty, tenure, promotion, or institutional hierarchies) in presenting strategies readily recognizable as practical for use by university library department chairs.

The literature traces the transition of leadership in academic libraries from the domain of the library dean or director alone to the responsibility of department and unit leaders as well. Faculty development is an integral responsibility of the leadership function of department chairs. Having just recently begun, further research on the leadership practices and faculty development activities of department chairs in academic libraries is needed.

Summary

Prior research on the topic of this study concentrated on teaching departments. There are a number of research works on the role of the department chair from all three levels of viewpoint: chairs themselves, administrators, and faculty. Literature on faculty development has been building over the last thirty years. It has addressed faculty development as a separate division within the university helping all faculty address concerns in the area, or incorporated it as an aspect of the functioning of departments, addressing ways each unit can enhance faculty development. Many works cover the chairperson's roles and responsibilities, but recurrent roles in much of the literature are the department chair's leadership role and role in enhancing faculty development. Documentation of several actions in support of these roles are evident in the general literature on the role of the department chair, as well as in research specifically on the chair's role in faculty development or leadership.

Limited research and literature exists specifically on library faculty perceptions of the department chair's role. Library directors and deans were the early focus of literature on library leadership. The library department chair was not a focus of research before the late 1960s. Much of what has been researched since that time has focused on the middle managers themselves, and possibly their supervisors or subordinates, and emphasized management types of issues regarding supervising and training personnel. In contrast to the teaching department literature, studies addressing the issue determined library middle managers and librarians placed responsibility for professional development and "continuing education" principally on the individual (Plate, 1970; Stone, 1969).

The present study of library faculty perceptions of the department chair's role in

faculty development and leadership practices is important. It expands the documentation of perceptions held by library faculty, regarding not only the faculty development role (Boden, 1991, 1994), but also the leadership practices, engaged in by library department chairs to multiple academic research institutions. It documents what institutional, chair, and faculty characteristics influence library faculty perceptions of their department chair. As evidenced by the earlier studies, research based on teaching departments, could not be relied upon to hold true for library faculty. The results will be important for education and training of academic librarians and their department chairs, and higher education faculty development personnel whose clientele include academic librarians.

CHAPTER III.

METHODS

Research Design

A cross-sectional mail survey was used to study the department chair and institutional correlates of library faculty perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development and leadership practices. Survey research was used because of its several advantages: economy of design, low cost for distribution and return, rapid turn-around time, and applicability to a particular type of research question (Babbie, 1990). The data gathered from the survey was used to describe the population being studied (Fowler, 1993). The survey also permitted "the simultaneous examination of two or more variables" (Babbie, 1990). Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained by the use of an identification number on the survey, which was used for mailing purposes only. This should have encouraged respondents' honesty in answering the "what is" questions regarding the department chairs' current level of use of methods to enhance faculty development as well as the leadership practices in which they engage. (Fink & Kosecoff, 1985).

Population and Sample

The population for this study was non-administrative library faculty at research universities in the United States. The total number of professional library faculty (FTE) at institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Research Universities I or Research Universities II was determined (N=9351) (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 1996; Kyrillidou, O'Connor, & Blixrud, 1998). Non-administrative excluded Deans or Directors; Assistant or Associate Deans or Directors; or Department or Division Heads or Chairs. According to the

Association of Research Libraries (ARL), the number of non-administrative faculty positions in their member university libraries in the United States was 5119 (Kyrillidou, Blixrud, & Rodriguez, 1998). This excluded medical and law librarians at ARL member universities.

The sampling frame for this particular research project was the non-administrative faculty members in the university libraries of the member institutions of the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium as of September 1, 1998, which were also Research Universities. Seventeen of the twenty institution libraries were also members of the ARL (Kyrillidou, O'Connor, & Blixrud, 1998). The sample surveyed numbered 361 of the approximately 1060 university library faculty (see Appendix A). This sample, from the broad population, was more manageable for the researcher, not only in number, but also in mailing cost. As recommended by Fowler (1993), this sample size should have allowed for the minimum number of actual respondents needed to meet the minimum sample sizes for the subgroups of the mediating variables, with a percent error confidence region of plus or minus five ($p < .05$). These institutions, located in the middle of the continental United States geographically, advertise their available faculty positions nationally and employ faculty from throughout the United States. These faculty members' views should be generally representative of the views of university library faculty at research universities throughout the nation.

Instrumentation

A single, multi-part instrument was utilized consisting of three parts: (1) a demographics section on the faculty member, their institution, and their department chair; (2) a researcher-developed survey of faculty perceptions of the department chairs' role in

faculty development; and (3) the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer (LPI-O) as developed by Kouzes and Posner, and used by permission (see Appendix B). The complete survey instrument, along with a copy of the cover letter, may be found in Appendix C.

Demographics Section

The first part of the instrument gathered data on the respondents, their institution, and their department chair. These data represent the mediating and independent variables in the research. As highlighted in the theoretical perspective in Chapter One, these may have influenced the faculty members' perceptions of the department chair's faculty development activities and leadership practices (the dependent variables). Respondent data gathered included gender, rank, tenure status, service area, professional experience, years at institution, educational level, age range, and library station. Institutional information gathered was institution type, number of library faculty, number of faculty in the department, and organization structure. Chair characteristics surveyed were type of chair appointment, promoted from within or outside the department or libraries, gender, years at chair, tenure status, educational level, rank, and location in relation to library faculty member.

Researcher-developed Survey

The second part of the survey instrument was researcher-designed and asked faculty to rate the chair's current level of use of faculty development activities. A Likert five point scale was used to rate each item on a list of twenty-seven faculty development activities. The faculty members were asked to rate these activities according to their perceived level of use by their department chair within their department.

Findings of qualitative studies (Boden, 1994; Creswell et al., 1990; Creswell and Brown, 1991; Miles, 1983; Mitchell, 1986) and quantitative studies (Boden, 1991; Gordon et al., 1991; Jennerich, 1981; Seagren et al., 1994) were used to formulate descriptions of the twenty-seven faculty development activities included in this portion of the survey. All except Boden (1991, 1994) and Gordon et al (1991) were studies of chairpersons' perceptions. Gordon et al (1991) was a study of teaching faculty. Boden's studies were of library faculty.

The researcher conducted a pilot test of the faculty development activities portion of the survey in fall 1991. The survey, along with a cover letter, was distributed to all not-yet-tenured faculty members in the University Libraries at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This audience was chosen due to their meeting the criteria set out in the research undertaken at that time, their easy accessibility to the researcher, and to determine the usefulness and clarity of the survey. The results of the pilot showed no problems with the survey, contributing to content validity. (Boden, 1991)

A second review of the faculty development activities (FDA) portion of the survey was undertaken while the researcher was enrolled in the Survey Methods course in the graduate program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in fall 1994. Several suggestions for adjustments in the wording of specific items on the survey were offered at that time. The survey statements were adjusted accordingly.

The twenty-seven faculty development items in this part of the instrument were coded according to the four categories identified by Creswell (1991) as "practices chairs engage in in assisting faculty in their growth and development" (see Appendix D). The categories were based on responses from interviews of academic department chairs for a

national study "sponsored by TIAA-CREF and supported financially by the Lilly Endowment, Inc" (Creswell, et al., 1990, p. 121). Senior academic administrators and faculty development specialists had identified the chairs as very supportive of the professional development of the faculty in their department. Use of these category codes will assist any future comparisons of these methods for enhancing faculty development activities of non-teaching faculty to broader methods for enhancing faculty growth and development of teaching faculty.

Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer

The third part of the survey instrument was the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer (LPI-O), formerly titled Leadership Practices Inventory - Other (Kouzes & Posner, 1994, p. 7). Kouzes and Posner, developed both this instrument and the Leadership Practices Inventory – Self, collectively called the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), to measure five leadership practices: (a) challenging the process, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way, and (e) encouraging the heart. The Self form measures individual's perceptions of themselves and was not applicable to this research. The Observer form asks individuals (in the case of this research, library faculty) expected to be familiar with the behavior of the person under consideration (in this research, the department chair) to complete the instrument's thirty items. Six items address each of the five practices (see Appendix E). Each item was to be rated on a ten point Likert-type scale ranging from "almost never" to "almost always". Faculty were asked to respond according to "how frequently this leader engages in the behavior.... typically" (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

The LPI-O has been administered to over thirty-seven thousand people and tests

of internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) range from .82 to .92 for the five leadership practices. Test-retest reliability is at levels greater than .90 correlation. Studies of the validity of the LPI have shown it has excellent face validity, predictive and concurrent validity. Further validation of the LPI has been demonstrated by its use by other researchers in over twenty investigations of various leadership issues. (Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Posner & Kouzes, 1992)

Subjecting responses to the LPI to prinicipal factoring with iteration and varimax rotation has extracted five factors with eigen-values greater than 1.0. Those factors accounted for 60.5 percent of the variance. The five factors were consistent with the five subscales identifying the five leadership practices listed above. The factor structure has been similar across subsamples and other research results. (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)

Reviewers (Leong, 1995; Lewis, 1995) have noted the sound research design of the LPI and its refinement through years of follow-up use and validity studies. Excellent face and psychometric validity, as well as strong structural and concurrent validity were noted. Further research using the instrument with diverse groups was advised to further test its differential validity. The current survey population was different from others previously researched with the possible exception of Kazlauskas (1993), who also used the LPI-O in survey research involving academic librarians.

Pilot

The complete survey instrument was pilot tested during the fall semester of 1998 with selected university library faculty and with selected members of the United States Agricultural Information Network (USAIN) who were also research university library faculty members. This group was utilized due to their accessibility to the researcher.

Twelve people were asked to complete the pilot survey. This pilot testing was important to establishing the face validity of the complete instrument. An estimate of the length of time required to complete the survey was determined for inclusion in the survey cover letter. Test respondents were also asked to analyze the instrument and their comments were incorporated into the final survey.

Variables in the Study

The major variables in this study were institutional characteristics, chair characteristics, faculty member characteristics, faculty members' perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development, and faculty members' perceptions of chair leadership practices. (See Table 1, p. 59)

Independent Variables. The major independent variables were institutional characteristics and chair characteristics. Institutional characteristics were institution type, number of library faculty, number of faculty in the department, and organization structure. Chair characteristics were type of appointment, promoted from within or outside the department or libraries, gender, years at chair, tenure status, education, rank, and location in relation to the library faculty member.

Mediating Variables. The mediating variables were faculty characteristics. They were gender, rank, tenure status, service area, years in the profession, years at the institution, education, age range, and library station.

Dependent variables. Faculty members' perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development, and faculty members' perceptions of chair leadership practices were the dependent variables in the study.

TABLE 3.1 Variables in the Study

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MEDIATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES
Institutional Characteristics	Faculty Characteristics	Faculty members' perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development,
Institution type	Gender	and
Number of library faculty	Rank	Faculty members' perceptions of chair leadership practices
Number of faculty in the department	Tenure status	
Organization structure	Service area	
Chair Characteristics	Years in the profession	
Type of appointment	Years at the institution	
Promoted from within or without	Education	
Gender	Age	
Years at chair	Library station	
Tenure status		
Education		
Rank		
Location in relation to faculty member		

Procedures for Administering the Survey

Approval for this project was obtained from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board (IRB); project number 98-10-066 EX was assigned. This research project met the IRB's criteria for an exempt research project and, as such, did not use the protocol of an informed consent form. Rather, by return of the survey, participants' consent to participate was implied. An identification number, for mailing purposes only, was included on a postcard to be returned separately when the survey was returned.

The Dean of Libraries at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln agreed to co-sign letters sent to the Dean, or Director, of Libraries at each of the institutions to be included in the survey. The first letter requested the Dean or Director support the research by providing a list of the non-administrative university library faculty at their institution. A follow-up letter, sent at the same time as the mailing of the survey instruments, again asked for a demonstration of support from the Dean or Director, by encouraging their faculty to complete and return the survey (see Appendix F).

To encourage a high response rate, a three-step procedure was used (Creswell, 1994, p. 122). The survey instrument, along with a cover letter and stamped return envelope, was mailed to ten of every thirteen library faculty members identified at universities that fit the stated criteria. Also included in the survey packet was a postcard to be returned separately, coded so that individuals who had responded could be identified. The researcher utilized bulk mail through the University of Nebraska Mail and Distribution services to reduce costs. Due to delays with bulk mail, the second mailing was a follow-up postcard, reminding non-respondents to complete and send in the survey.

The reminder postcard was sent via first class mail three and one-half weeks after the initial survey mailing. Two weeks later the third and final mailing, which consisted of the complete instrument with return postcard of a different color, was sent to those individuals who had not returned the survey. Due to the timing of that mailing, which occurred just at semester break for university campuses, the requested return date was extended. The entire process took about twelve weeks.

Data Analysis.

The data analysis and results are described in Chapter IV. Information on the number of returns and non-returns of the survey was reported. Because this research involved a survey utilizing a multi-wave mailing, a t-test for the equality of means was run to test for possible late respondent response bias (Dalecki, Ilvento & Moore, 1988). This was accomplished by keeping a log of respondents for the duration of the time period of receipt of accepted responses - a period that extended seventeen weeks.

Descriptive statistics for the institutional, department chair, and faculty member (respondent) characteristics were calculated and presented in tables. The mean of the responses to each of the statements in the faculty development and leadership practices portions of the survey were calculated to determine those activities and practices university library faculty perceive as most used by their department chair. Correlation matrix was applied to test the degree of intracorrelation among items that comprise each of the instrument portions of the survey to determine internal consistency. Reliability was estimated by Cronbach's alpha to determine if scores from the Faculty Development Activities and Leadership Practices Inventory –Observer instruments each met a reasonable level of consistency for the sample. A principal components factor analysis

with varimax rotation was performed on the faculty development activities items and on the Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer items to examine the correlations between the items on each instrument and determine if there were clusters.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if there were significant differences in the library faculty's perceptions of the department chair's activities to enhance faculty development and leadership practices according to the independent variables (institutional and department chair characteristics) or mediating variables (respondent characteristics). When variables of three or more categories produced significant F values in the ANOVA procedures a post hoc comparison using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) was conducted to identify significantly different pair-wise differences.

CHAPTER IV.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The purpose of this survey research was to test role theory by surveying university library faculty perceptions of the department chair's faculty development activities and leadership practices, and analyzing the relationship between the correlates and the faculty's perceptions.

This chapter contains the results of the analysis of the survey data. Description of survey responses is presented first, followed by the demographic data on the institutional, department chair, and respondent (library faculty) characteristics. Next the results of the survey ratings of the faculty development activities and the Leadership Practices Inventory-Other are described, along with the report of the exploratory factor analysis of each. Last, the analysis of the results relative to the three relationship research questions is presented.

Survey Responses

The survey instrument was mailed to 361 library faculty members/ librarians meeting the criteria of the sampling frame. Thirteen respondents withdrew from the research. A total of 228 useable responses were returned, for a return rate of 63.2%. This percentage should have excellent representativeness, especially in consideration of the homogeneous nature of the group surveyed (Leslie, 1972). Of the 228 returned and useable responses, the first mailing generated 131 responses (57.5%). The reminder postcard was sent to 217 individuals and produced 35 (15.4%) more responses. The final complete mailing was sent to 183 persons and resulted in the remaining 62 (27.2%) responses.

To test for possible late response bias, a t-test for the equality of means was run. The responses were divided into those received during late 1998 and those received in early 1999. Table 4.1 indicates there was no significant difference in the responses to the dependent variable instruments (faculty development activities (FDA) and Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI-O)).

TABLE 4.1 T-Test for Equality of Means Across Response Timeframe

	Timeframe	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Sig.(2-tailed)
Total LPI-O Score	1998	145	182.06	59.28	.433
	1999	51	174.39	61.78	
		n=196			
Total FDA Score	1998	143	86.67	20.65	.832
	1999	50	87.42	23.76	
		n=193			

Demographic Data

The total number of respondents (n) for all demographic data was 228.

Institutional Characteristics. The institutional characteristics were institution type, number of library faculty, number of faculty in the department, and organization structure. Of the 228 library faculty/librarians who provided useable responses 127 (55.7%) were employed at Carnegie Research University I institutions, 99 (43.4%) were at Carnegie Research University II institutions, and two could not be determined from their returns. Table 4.2 shows the number of library faculty/librarians at the respondents'

institutions and the number of faculty in the respondents' departments. The large majority of respondents were in academic libraries organized into departments (82.9%). Only five (2.2%) respondents indicated their libraries were organized into teams. Twenty-nine (12.7%) respondents indicated their libraries have some other organizational structure, while five did not respond.

TABLE 4.2 Number of Library Faculty at the Institution and in the Department (excluding the Department Chair)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Number of Library Faculty at Institution		
1 – 39	55	24.1%
40 – 49	69	30.2%
50 – 65	31	13.6%
66 – 85	24	10.5%
Over 85	35	15.4%
Missing (No response)	14	6.1%
Number of Library Faculty in Department		
1 – 5	93	40.8%
6 – 10	70	30.7%
11 – 15	20	8.8%
16 - 25	20	8.8%
Over 25	4	1.8%
Missing (No response)	21	9.2%

n=228

Department Chair Characteristics. The department chair characteristics were type of appointment, promoted from within or outside the department or libraries, gender, years as chair, tenure status, education, rank, and location in relation to the library faculty member. The characteristic, location in relation to the library faculty member, was so heavily represented by one subgroup, with 207 (90.8%) in the same building, further analysis of that characteristic was deemed unreliable. The department chairs were 64.5% female (147) and 34.2% male (78). A large percentage (85.9%) of the chairs were in permanent appointments, while 18 (7.9%) were in specific term appointments, and 14 (6.2%) were serving as interim chairs. Table 4.3 indicates over 65% of department chairs were named from within the libraries, or even more likely the same department of the libraries as, they serve.

TABLE 4.3 Origin of the Department Chair

Origin of Chair	Frequency	Percent
Within Department	106	46.5%
Within Libraries, not Dept	44	19.3%
Outside	71	31.1%
No response	7	3.1%

n=228

TABLE 4.4 Years as Department Chair

Years	Frequency	Percent
1 to 2	56	24.6%
3 to 5	56	24.6%
6 to 10	49	21.5%
11 to 15	24	10.5%
Over 15	34	14.9%
No response	9	3.9%

n=228

The results in Table 4.4 indicate almost half (49.2%) of the department chairs had been serving in that capacity for five years or less. Most department chairs (81.6%) are tenured or in a tenure track position, as shown in Table 4.5 below.

TABLE 4.5 Tenure Status of Department Chair

Status	Frequency	Percent
Tenured	143	62.7%
Tenure Track	43	18.9%
Term	17	7.5%
Other	21	9.2%
No response	4	1.8%

n=228

The department chairs usually have attained the rank of associate or full professor as shown in Table 4.6. Table 4.7 reveals approximately one half of the department chairs

hold only the recognized terminal degree for the library field, the Master of Library Science, while over one third hold an additional Master's degree.

TABLE 4.6 Rank of Department Chair

Rank	Frequency	Percent
Instructor	5	2.2%
Assistant Professor	35	15.4%
Associate Professor	108	47.4%
Professor	57	25%
No response	23	10.1%

n=228

TABLE 4.7 Chair's Education

Degree(s)	Frequency	Percent
MLS	115	50.4%
2nd Masters	78	34.2%
Doctorate	13	5.7%
Other	6	2.6%
Unknown	13	5.7%
No response	3	1.3%

n=228

Respondent Characteristics. Two thirds (152) of the 228 library faculty/ librarians who provided useable responses were female. The respondents were usually located in

the main library at their institution (82%), with 36 (15.8%) in branch libraries, three (1.3%) listing themselves as other and two not responding. The data collected regarding other demographic characteristics of the respondents are summarized in Tables 4.8 through 4.11. As might be expected, a higher percentage of respondents (54.4%), compared to the department chairs (50.4%), hold only the terminal degree. At the same time, however, a higher percentage of the faculty member respondents (7.5%) than department chairs (5.7%) hold doctoral degrees (Compare Tables 4.7 and 4.10). It is interesting to note, from Table 4.11, that a high percentage of respondents had many years in the library profession, as well as many years at the same institution, and over 42% were over fifty years of age.

TABLE 4.8 Service Area of Respondents

Service Area	Frequency	Percent
Public Services	130	57%
Technical Services	54	23.7%
Split (PS & TS)	25	11%
Other	19	8.3%

n=228

TABLE 4.9 Respondents' Rank and Tenure Status

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Rank		
Instructor	20	8.8%
Assistant Professor	93	40.4%
Associate Professor	74	32.5%
Professor	24	10.5%
No response	17	7.9%
Tenure Status		
Tenured	99	43.4%
Tenure Track	81	35.5%
Term	28	12.3%
Other	17	7.5%
No response	3	1.3%

n=228

TABLE 4.10 Respondents' Education

Degree(s)	Frequency	Percent
MLS	124	54.4%
2nd Masters	73	32%
Doctorate	17	7.5%
Other	14	6.1%

n=228

TABLE 4.11 Respondents' Years in the Profession, Years at Institution, and Age

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Years in Profession		
1 to 5	47	20.6%
6 to 10	43	18.9%
11 to 15	30	13.2%
16 to 20	36	15.8%
20 +	72	31.6%
Years at Institution		
1 to 3	61	26.8%
4 to 5	23	10.1%
6 to 10	43	18.9%
11 to 15	26	11.4%
16 +	75	32.9%
Age		
21 to 29	15	6.6%
30 to 39	46	20.2%
40 to 49	71	31.1%
50 to 59	66	28.9%
60 +	30	13.2%

n=228

Survey Ratings: Library Faculty Perceptions

The results of the library faculty responses to the faculty development activities (FDA) and Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI-O) portions of the survey instrument are presented here. The reliability of the two instruments was estimated with Cronbach's alpha. Both were found to have high reliability, with the FDA alpha value of .9581 and the LPI-O alpha value of .9794.

Respondents completing all twenty-seven items of the faculty development activities instrument numbered 193. The item means on the FDA ranged from 2.52 to 4.12 with standard deviations ranging from 1.01 to 1.28. The overall mean for the instrument was 3.2172. The top ranked item received a mean .43 above the mean for the next ranked item. The total difference between the means of the remaining twenty-six items was 1.17, with .15 being the widest difference between two adjacent items. Correlation matrix was applied to test the degree of intra-correlation among the items that comprise the FDA to determine internal consistency. All items were positively correlated, and only four correlations were below .2, showing good internal consistency. Yet the correlations were not extremely high, with only two correlations above .7.

Respondents completing all thirty items of the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer numbered 196. The item means on the LPI-O ranged from 4.61 to 7.83 with standard deviations ranging from 2.25 to 2.89. The overall mean for the instrument was 6.002. The mean of the top three ranked items and the three lowest ranked items were separated from the means of the middle range of items by more than one half a point (0.5). Results of the correlation matrix run on the LPI-O showed all items were positively

correlated, and only three correlations were below .3. While only two correlations were above .8, fifty-eight were between .7 and .8.

Pearson correlation was run on the mean scores of the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer and the faculty development activities instruments, and on the total scores of the two instruments. The scores of the two instruments were highly, positively correlated (.864) and significant at the .01 level.

Tables 4.12 and 4.13 present the overall mean scores for each item in each instrument in descending order, with the standard deviations. Means were rounded to two decimal places. Duplicate ranks indicate duplicate means.

TABLE 4.12 Rank order of Faculty Development Activities (FDA) by Overall Mean Score

Rank	Item as printed in survey	Item #	Mean	SD
1	Maintain an "open door policy" so faculty can speak with her/him at any time.	2.	4.12	1.02
2	Provide release time for other professional endeavors.	15.	3.69	1.10
3	Support in-house staff development activities (instruction, training, workshops, presentations, etc.)	27.	3.57	1.09
4	Encourage participation in professional peer groups at the local, state, regional, national level (committees, conferences, publishing, research, etc.)	7.	3.55	1.11
5	Provide resources to support professional activities of faculty (funding, travel, release time, staff support, etc.)	6.	3.48	1.16
6	Act as an intermediary for the faculty with the dean's office and higher administration.	5.	3.47	1.25
7	Be a good listener.	22.	3.39	1.23
8	Act as an advocate for resources with the dean's office and higher administration.	24.	3.36	1.23
9	Provide positive reinforcement for good performance and accomplishments.	8.	3.34	1.02

n=193

TABLE 4.12 Continued to next page

TABLE 4.12 (Continued) Rank order of Faculty Development Activities (FDA) by Overall Mean Score

Rank	Item as printed in survey	Item #	Mean	SD
10	Monitor faculty progress toward tenure and promotion.	3.	3.33	1.09
11	Share advice, wisdom, experience, and expertise.	13.	3.32	1.19
12	Show a personal, individual interest in faculty member's growth and development activities.	19.	3.32	1.18
13	Encourage faculty collaboration.	16.	3.29	1.19
13	Foster a professional atmosphere, open to ideas and innovation without fear of failure or punishment.	23.	3.29	1.28
15	Communicate the professional expectations of the organization (department, unit, institution).	14.	3.27	1.07
16	Lead by example --provide a role model.	10.	3.19	1.25
17	Delegate responsibility for projects to faculty to provide growth through progressively more responsible activities.	11.	3.18	1.10
18	Assist faculty in setting realistic, professional goals.	17.	3.16	1.11
19	Keep faculty informed of opportunities to participate in professional activities.	1.	3.12	1.14
20	Provide ongoing feedback to faculty regarding their professional performance.	4.	3.05	1.01
21	Publicize faculty accomplishments to administrators, fellow faculty, and peer groups.	9.	3.03	1.12
22	Refer faculty to workshops, centers, or training courses for improving, or providing support for, their capability for growth and development.	18.	2.97	1.16
23	Encourage faculty participation in campus-wide activities and committees.	21.	2.89	1.15
24	Help faculty to identify an area of expertise.	25.	2.75	1.16
25	Spend time with faculty informally in social settings.	26.	2.60	1.12
26	Assist faculty in getting involved in professional organizations and activities by name-dropping, nominating, recommending, etc.	12.	2.60	1.17
27	Provide regular meetings for groups of faculty to discuss ways to enhance faculty growth and development.	20.	2.52	1.23

n=193 Scale: 1 = Not used at all; 2 = Slightly Used; 3 = Moderately Used; 4 = Used Regularly; 5 = Used Constantly

TABLE 4.13 Rank order of Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer (LPI-O) items by Overall Mean Score

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI] - OBSERVER

Rank	Item as printed in survey	Item #	Mean	Std.Dev.
1	Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	23.	7.83	2.25
2	Treats others with dignity and respect.	13.	7.78	2.33
3	Follows through on the promises and commitments that he or she makes.	14.	7.39	2.26
4	Supports the decisions that people make on their own.	18.	6.87	2.36
5	Develops cooperative relationships among the people he or she works with.	3.	6.63	2.44
6	Praises people for a job well done.	5.	6.57	2.40
7	Sets a personal example of what he or she expects from others.	4.	6.47	2.66
8	Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	2.	6.30	2.36
9	Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	28.	6.29	2.53
10	Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	24.	6.24	2.59
11	Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her own skills and abilities.	1.	6.22	2.27
11	Makes progress toward goals one step at a time.	29.	6.22	2.40
13	Actively listens to diverse points of view.	8.	6.22	2.63
14	Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	30.	6.05	2.70
15	Is clear about his or her philosophy of leadership.	19.	5.92	2.89
16	Makes it a point to let people know about his or her confidence in their abilities.	10.	5.90	2.49

n=196

TABLE 4.13 Continued to next page

TABLE 4.13 (Continued) Rank order of Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer (LPI-O) items by Overall Mean Score

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI] - OBSERVER

Rank	Item as printed in survey	Item #	Mean	Std.Dev.
17	Spends time and energy on making certain that the people he or she works with adhere to the principles and standards that have been agreed on.	9.	5.83	2.34
18	Takes the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.	26.	5.82	2.44
19	Challenges people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.	6.	5.80	2.49
20	Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	27.	5.62	2.82
21	Is contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.	22.	5.59	2.72
22	Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	20.	5.56	2.61
23	Experiments and takes risks even when there is a chance of failure.	21.	5.51	2.49
24	Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects.	15.	5.40	2.54
25	Searches outside the formal boundaries of his or her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	11.	5.39	2.65
26	Asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.	16.	5.32	2.59
27	Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.	25.	5.30	2.64
28	Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.	7.	4.75	2.52
29	Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	17.	4.66	2.53
30	Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	12.	4.61	2.55

n=196

Scale: 1 = Almost Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Seldom; 4 = Once in a While;

5 = Occasionally; 6 = Sometimes; 7 = Fairly Often;

8 = Usually; 9 = Very Frequently; 10 = Almost Always

The five leadership practices identified by Kouzes & Posner (1987) and addressed by six statements regarding each in the Leadership Practices Inventory make comparison of total mean scores and standard deviations possible for the five practices. As shown in Table 4.14, the rank order of the practices in this research are not consistent with the results obtained by Kouzes and Posner (1995, p. 346).

TABLE 4.14 Total mean scores of the five leadership practices statements in the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer

	Present Research		Kouzes & Posner (1995)	
Leadership Practice	Mean	Std Dev	Mean*	Std Dev
Enabling others to act	41.61	12.24	23.72	4.56
Modeling the way	38.08	12.58	22.17	4.30
Encouraging the heart	34.78	13.78	21.89	5.41
Challenging the process	34.06	12.76	22.31	4.32
Inspiring a shared vision	31.53	13.44	20.46	5.05

* These results were based on the LPI-O that used a five-point Likert scale.

Factor Analysis

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy was run on each instrument to determine the suitability of the faculty development activities and the leadership practices correlation matrix for factor analysis. Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black (1995, p. 374) noted measure of sampling adequacy statistics in the 0.90s are

considered "marvelous". The better suited the matrix is for factor analysis, the larger the statistic will be.

The KMO statistic for the faculty development activities matrix was .937. A second test of the data's appropriateness for factor analysis, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, resulted in a value of 3466.158 ($p<.001$) which indicated the correlations were substantial enough to justify factor analysis.

The KMO statistic for the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer matrix was .967. Bartlett's Test yielded a value of 6199.967 ($p<.001$). Both assessments indicated the LPI-O correlation matrix was suited for factor analysis.

Factor analysis results from each instrument were reviewed and, based on guidelines set forth by Hair et al. (1995) regarding factor loadings considered significant for differing sample sizes (p.385), items with factor loadings of .45 or higher were loaded into a factor.

Faculty Development Activities: Factor Analysis

Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the faculty development activities items. Selection of factors based on consideration of the scree plot and eigenvalues greater than 1.0 resulted in four factors. The eigenvalues, percent of variance explained, and cumulative percent of variance for the four factors are presented in Table 4.15.

TABLE 4.15 Faculty Development Activities Factor Analysis Results

Factor	Eigenvalue	%of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance
1	13.136	48.653	48.653
2	1.541	5.706	54.359
3	1.178	4.361	58.720
4	1.083	4.013	62.733

Cronbach's alpha = .9581

The results of the forced four-factor rotation were arranged within the four categories identified by Creswell (1991). Examination of the results yielded no apparent relationship between the four factors and the four categories. Results of the factor analyses of the responses to the faculty development activities instrument are presented in Appendix G.

Review of the factor loadings resulting from the forced four-factor rotation indicated thirteen of the 27 items in the faculty development activities instrument loaded only on factor one. Seven items loaded uniquely to factor two. Factors three and four had only two and three items, respectively, load uniquely to those factors. Two items double loaded on factor one and factor two.

Kline (1994) noted, "Factors loading on only a few items (four or five) are almost certainly worthless," and "...are usually bloated specifics" (p.175). Hair et al. (1995) mentioned the advisability of trying different factor rotations, reviewing them and determining the number of factors to extract based on the best representation of the data. In consideration of the low number of items loading to, and the small portion of variance (less than 5% each) accounted for by, factors three and four, a forced two-factor rotation

was run. This resulted in ten items loading to factor one, eight items to factor two, seven items loading to both factors, and two items not loading to either factor. Review of the items loaded to the factors revealed no distinguishable explanation for the groupings.

Because these results pointed to a single general factor with no group factors, the varimax rotation was run again, this time forcing a single factor. This single factor accounted for 49% of the variance among the items. All items loaded significantly on the single factor. The significant loadings ranged from .515 to .822. These results supported a single total score to represent the dependent variable, library faculty members' perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development. The total score on the faculty development activities instrument could range from 27 to 135. The total score on the faculty development activities instrument was used in the analyses in this study.

Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer: Factor Analysis

Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer. Selection of factors based on consideration of the scree plot and eigenvalues greater than 1.0 resulted in three factors. The factor analysis results are presented in Table 4.16.

TABLE 4.16 Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer Factor Analysis Results

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance
1	18.892	62.975	62.975
2	1.866	6.219	69.193
3	1.065	3.550	72.743

Cronbach's alpha = .9794

The results of the factor analyses of the responses to the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer instrument are presented in Appendix H. Review of the factor loadings resulting from the forced three-factor rotation indicated 21 of the 30 items in the Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer loaded on – correlated with – the first factor. Fourteen of those loaded only on the first factor, while three items double loaded to factors one and two, and four items double loaded to factors one and three. Only two items loaded solely on the second factor, while a single item loaded uniquely on the third factor. Six items double loaded on factors two and three.

In consideration of Kouzes and Posner's published factor analysis results from research using the Leadership Practices Inventory a forced five-factor rotation was run. The five factors accounted for 77.9% of the variance among the items. Fourteen items loaded on the first factor, with half of those also loading on another factor (three on the second factor, three on the fourth factor, and one on the fifth factor). Six items loaded uniquely on the second factor. Factors three and five each had three items load uniquely on them. Only two items loaded uniquely on factor four, while two items loaded on both factors three and four. These results were not comparable to those obtained by the developers of the instrument, which extracted five factors with eigen-values greater than 1.0 and accounting for 60.5 percent of the variance (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). For each of the five leadership practices, all of the six items addressing the practice loaded most heavily to a unique one of the five factors (see Table 6 of Posner and Kouzes, 1988, Table 12 of Posner and Kouzes, 1992, and Table A.2. of Kouzes and Posner, 1995). The present research did not support the five leadership practices as factors.

The developers of the Leadership Practices Inventory saw the statements as descriptive of transformational leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 321). Fields and Herold (1997) suggested the LPI-O could be used to determine subordinate perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. A two-factor rotation was run to determine if such perceptions might be distinguishable from the responses of the respondents in this research. Twelve items loaded uniquely to the first factor. Only four items loaded uniquely to the second factor. The remaining fourteen items double loaded to both factors.

Review of the items loading on each factor in each of the rotations did not reveal an apparent rationale for their grouping, or definitive differences identifying them. Because the results of the factor analysis strongly indicated a single general factor with no group factors, the varimax rotation was rerun forcing only one factor. This single factor accounted for 63% of the variance among the items. All items loaded significantly on the single factor. The significant loadings ranged from .542 to .893. Given these results, responses on all items on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer were totaled for a single score for use in the analyses in this study. The total score on the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer could range from 30 to 300.

Analysis of Results Relative to Relationship Questions

The remainder of this chapter presents the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures, which addressed the research questions, related to relationships between the independent or mediating variables and the dependent variables. Levene's Test of equality of error variance was run on each group of independent and mediating

variables. This test determined if homogeneity of variance had been violated and, if violated, the test of between-subjects effects was reviewed more stringently ($p<.025$).

Relationship Question #1: What institutional characteristics significantly effect library faculty perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices?

One characteristic, organization structure, was deemed unreliable for further analysis due to low representation of the subgroup of respondents in non-departmentalized libraries who supplied complete useable responses to the dependent variables instruments (FDA and LPI-O). The responses to the questions regarding the number of library faculty/librarians at the respondent's institution and in the respondent's department were converted into two categories for each. The number of library faculty/ librarians in the institution was categorized by "less than 50", combining the "25 – 39" and "40 - 49" categories from the instrument, and "50 or more", combining the "50 – 65", "66 – 85", and "over 85" categories from the instrument. The category of "1 to 5" for department size was retained, while the remaining categories, "6 – 10", "11 – 15", "16 – 25", and "over 25", were combined into the category "6+".

Faculty Development Activities and Institutional Characteristics

For the dependent variable, total score on the Faculty Development Activities (FDA) instrument, Levene's Test of equality of error variance confirmed the homogeneity of variance across groups ($F=1.889$, $p=.074$). The tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant effects from institutional characteristics individually or by interaction. The R squared indicated the total institutional characteristics accounted for only 2% of the variance in the total faculty development activities score. The single

variable "number of library faculty" accounted for almost three fourths of that variance (1.4%). The results are presented in Table 4.17.

TABLE 4.17 Institutional Characteristics: Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Faculty Development Activities)

Institutional Characteristic	*df*	F-ratio	Sig.	Eta Squared
Type	1	.003	.960	.000
Total library faculty	1	2.372	.125	.014
Department size	1	.229	.633	.001
Type X Library faculty	1	.053	.819	.000
Type X Dept. size	1	.225	.636	.001
Lib fac X Dept size	1	.481	.489	.003
Type X Lib fac X Dept size	1	.204	.652	.001

None significant ($p<.05$)

Descriptive statistics regarding the results on the Faculty Development Activities instrument relative to the institutional characteristics are presented in Table 4.18. The results provide evidence of the insignificant difference between scores on the FDA when considered according to the characteristics of the respondents' institution. The widest margin between means for categories on any institutional characteristic, individually or by interaction, was less than 5.5. In fact, on the FDA, a twenty-seven-item instrument, a review of all means considered by institutional characteristics shows the maximum difference was less than 10 (9.8275).

TABLE 4.18 Mean Scores on the Faculty Development Activities Instrument by Institutional Characteristics

Institutional Characteristic			Mean	N(=174)	Std. Deviation
Type		Research 1	85.9886	88	21.6532
		Research 2	86.5698	86	21.6418
Total library faculty		Less than 50	84.1600	100	21.8954
		50 or more	89.1351	74	20.9705
Department size		1 to 5	85.1818	77	24.1654
		6+	87.1443	97	19.3837
Type X Library faculty	Res 1	< 50	83.8113	53	23.0218
		50+	89.2857	35	19.2500
	Res 2	< 50	84.5532	47	20.7928
		50+	89.0000	39	22.6542
Type X Dept. size	Res 1	Small	85.6842	38	24.4497
		Large	86.2200	50	19.5180
	Res 2	Small	84.6923	39	24.1946
		Large	88.1277	47	19.4015
Lib fac X Dept size	< 50	Small	81.9773	44	23.9432
		Large	85.8750	56	20.1973
	50+	Small	89.4545	33	24.1584
		Large	88.8780	41	18.3169
Type X Lib fac X Dept size					
Research 1	< 50	Small	81.5455	22	26.8784
		Large	85.4194	31	20.1623
	50+	Small	91.3750	16	20.0861
		Large	87.5263	19	18.8836
Research 2	< 50	Small	82.4091	22	21.2371
		Large	86.4400	25	20.6419
	50+	Small	87.6471	17	27.9619
		Large	90.0455	22	18.1750

Leadership Practices and Institutional Characteristics

For the dependent variable, total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI-O) score, Levene's Test showed the homogeneity of variance was violated (F=2.159, p=.040). As a result, the tests of between-subjects effects were reviewed more stringently (p<.025). Using the more stringent review, the tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant effects from institutional characteristics individually or by interaction. The R squared indicated the total institutional characteristics accounted for only 4.1% of the variance in the total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer score. The single variable "number of library faculty" accounted for over half of the variance (2.4%). These results are presented in Table 4.19, while Table 4.20 presents descriptive statistics.

TABLE 4.19 Institutional Characteristics: Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer)

Institutional Characteristic	*df*	F-ratio	Sig.	Eta Squared
Type	1	.083	.774	.001
Total library faculty	1	4.039	.046	.024
Department size	1	.704	.403	.004
Type X Library faculty	1	.074	.786	.000
Type X Dept. size	1	.339	.561	.002
Lib fac X Dept size	1	.023	.879	.000
Type X Lib fac X Dept size	1	1.654	.200	.010

None significant (p<.025)

TABLE 4.20 Mean Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer by Institutional Characteristics

Institutional Characteristic			Mean	N(=173)	Std. Deviation
Type		Research 1	176.6629	89	59.0406
		Research 2	179.8095	84	63.1352
Total library faculty		Less than 50	170.4804	102	62.9546
		50 or more	189.2676	71	56.4363
Department size		1 to 5	173.5443	79	66.2582
		6+	182.0957	94	56.0770
Type X Library faculty	Res 1	< 50	171.0000	55	61.6405
		50+	185.8235	34	54.2041
	Res 2	< 50	169.8723	47	65.1225
		50+	192.4324	37	58.9781
Type X Dept. size	Res 1	Small	174.0000	39	65.2033
		Large	178.7400	50	54.3424
	Res 2	Small	173.1000	40	68.0986
		Large	185.9091	44	58.3784
Lib fac X Dept size	< 50	Small	165.0652	46	68.2588
		Large	174.9286	56	58.4913
	50+	Small	185.3636	33	62.4619
		Large	192.6579	38	51.2457
Type X Lib fac X Dept size					
Research 1	< 50	Small	161.6522	23	71.8228
		Large	177.7188	32	53.3505
	50+	Small	191.7500	16	51.3297
		Large	180.5556	18	57.5860
Research 2	< 50	Small	168.4783	23	65.9351
		Large	171.2083	24	65.7240
	50+	Small	179.3529	17	72.4827
		Large	203.5500	20	43.3972

The descriptive statistics in Table 4.20, regarding the results from the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer instrument relative to institutional characteristics, indicate the widest margin between means for categories, individually or by interaction, was less than 25. The independent variables included in the institutional characteristics were not significant factors in this sample of library faculty's perceptions of their department chair's leadership practices.

Relationship Question #2: What chair demographic characteristics significantly effect library faculty perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices?

Several of the chair characteristics were recoded. The chair's type of appointment was placed into two categories for this analysis: permanently appointed as chair and specific term or interim. The responses regarding the chair's "number of years as chair" were grouped by one to five years and six years or more. Tenured and not tenured (including tenure track, specific term and other) were the assigned chair tenure categories. The chair's level of education was grouped as those with the Master of Library Science (or equivalent) and those with other graduate degree(s) in addition to the MLS. The academic rank of the chair was changed to group together Instructors and Assistant Professors, and Associate and Full Professors.

Faculty Development Activities and Chair Characteristics

For the dependent variable, total score on the faculty development activities, Levene's Test of equality of error variance showed the homogeneity of variance was violated ($F=1.495$, $p=.038$). However more stringent review was unnecessary since the tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant effects from any chair

characteristics even at the less stringent level ($p<.05$). The R squared indicated the total chair characteristics accounted for only 4.7% of the variance in the total faculty development activities score (see Table 4.21). Over half of that variance was accounted for by "promotion location" (2.5%).

TABLE 4.21 Chair Characteristics: Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effect (Faculty Development Activities)

Chair Characteristic	*df*	F-ratio	Sig.	Eta Squared
Appointment	1	.006	.937	.000
Promotion location	2	1.950	.146	.025
Gender	1	1.895	.171	.012
Years as Chair	1	.630	.429	.004
Tenure status	1	.019	.892	.000
Education	1	.018	.894	.000
Academic Rank	1	.055	.815	.000

None significant ($p<.05$)

Descriptive statistics regarding the results on the Faculty Development Activities instrument relative to the chair characteristics are presented in Table 4.22. The results indicate the widest margin between means for categories on any chair characteristic, individually or by interaction, was 8.785 between chairs promoted from within the department and chairs promoted from within the libraries. None of the independent variables included in chair characteristics were significant factors for this sample of

library faculty's perceptions of their chair's activities to enhance faculty development.

TABLE 4.22 Mean Scores on the Faculty Development Activities Instrument by Chair Characteristics

Chair Characteristic		Mean	N(=161)	Std. Deviation
Appointment	Other	87.1429	21	23.1220
	Permanent	86.9214	140	22.0500
Promotion location	Department	89.8235	85	18.6708
	Libraries	81.0385	26	29.0565
	Outside	85.1400	50	23.0846
Gender	Female	89.0962	104	20.3816
	Male	83.0351	57	24.6895
Years as Chair	1 to 5	88.9630	81	21.4811
	6+	84.9125	80	22.6979
Tenure status	Non-tenured	87.3617	47	23.4228
	Tenured	86.7807	114	21.6626
Education	MLS	87.1310	84	22.1494
	MLS+	86.7532	77	22.2280
Academic Rank	Instr./Assist.	87.1481	27	20.5963
	Assoc./Full	86.9104	134	22.4856

Leadership Practices and Chair Characteristics

For the dependent variable, total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer score,

Levene's Test confirmed the homogeneity of variance across groups (F=1.320, p=.116). The R squared indicated the total chair characteristics accounted for approximately 7.3% of the variance in the total Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer score. The tests of between-subjects effects showed the only significant chair characteristic to be the chair's location prior to promotion to chair (see Table 4.23). That characteristic alone accounted for 5.1% of the variance. Post hoc analysis with the Tukey-HSD procedure indicated the only significant difference on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer for the three locations (department, libraries, or outside) was between within the department and within the libraries.

TABLE 4.23 Chair Characteristics: Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer)

Chair Characteristic	*df*	F-ratio	Sig.	Eta Squared
Appointment	1	.298	.586	.002
Promotion location*	2	3.913	.022	.051
Gender	1	.752	.387	.005
Years as Chair	1	.758	.358	.005
Tenure status	1	.001	.976	.000
Education	1	.941	.334	.006
Academic Rank	1	.001	.970	.000

* Indicates a significant characteristic ($p<.05$) for the LPI-O.

TABLE 4.24 Mean Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer by Chair Characteristics

Chair Characteristic		Mean	N(=154)	Std. Deviation
Appointment	Other	175.2632	19	70.5942
	Permanent	182.7259	135	59.5474
Promotion location*	Department	193.2785	79	51.0891
	Libraries	156.6154	26	76.5188
	Outside	176.6735	49	62.5211
Gender	Female	186.3689	103	57.9146
	Male	172.5882	51	65.9067
Years as Chair	1 to 5	185.3421	76	61.5902
	6+	178.3590	78	60.2378
Tenure status	Non-tenured	180.7174	46	66.7099
	Tenured	182.2685	108	58.4411
Education	MLS	186.7654	81	57.8043
	MLS+	176.3014	73	63.9302
Academic Rank	Instr./Assist.	179.6667	27	66.0606
	Assoc./Full	182.2598	127	59.9051

* Indicates a significant characteristic ($p<.05$) for the LPI-O.

The descriptive statistics regarding the results on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer relative to the chair characteristics are presented in Table 4.24. Review of the mean scores on the significant characteristic, chair's location prior to

promotion, indicates a wide margin (36.6631) between the total mean score given by respondents whose chair was promoted from within the department and those whose chair was promoted from within the libraries. The mean score on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer for chairs promoted from within the department was higher than for those chairs promoted from within the libraries. The mean score for chairs promoted from outside, was near the midpoint between the two other scores, supporting the results indicating this score was not significantly different from either of the other two.

Relationship Question #3: What library faculty demographic characteristics significantly effect their perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices?

One characteristic, library station, was deemed unreliable for further analysis due to low representation of the subgroup of respondents stationed outside the main library who supplied complete useable responses to the dependent variables instruments (FDA and LPI-O). Several of the library faculty characteristics were recoded for analysis. The academic ranks for library faculty were grouped by Instructors or Assistant Professors and Associate or Full Professors. Tenured, tenure track, and specific term or other, were the three assigned library faculty tenure categories. Three areas of service of the library faculty were public services, technical services, and split or other. The library faculty's years in the library profession were grouped by one to five years, six to fifteen years, and sixteen or more years. Four groups for the characteristic "years at present institution" were identified: one to three years, four to ten years, eleven to fifteen years, and sixteen or more years. For the education characteristic, library faculty were grouped by those with the Master of Library Science (or equivalent) and those with another graduate

degree(s) in addition to the MLS. The two age categories for under age 40 were combined into one sub-group, while the other three age categories were retained.

Faculty Development Activities and Respondent Characteristics

For the dependent variable, total score on the faculty development activities, Levene's Test of equality of error variance showed the homogeneity of variance was violated (F=2.314, p=.001). However, again the more stringent review was unnecessary since the tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant effects from any library faculty characteristics, even at the less stringent level (p<.05). The R squared indicated the total library faculty characteristics accounted for 10% of the variance in the total faculty development activities score (see Table 4.25). Almost half (4.2%) of the variance was accounted for by the faculty characteristic "years at present institution".

TABLE 4.25 Faculty Characteristics: Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Faculty Development Activities)

Characteristic	*df*	F-ratio	Sig.	Eta Squared
Gender	1	.040	.841	.000
Academic Rank	1	.519	.472	.003
Tenure Status	2	.955	.387	.012
Service Area	2	.249	.780	.003
Years Professional	2	1.915	.151	.024
Years Institution	3	2.313	.078	.042
Education	1	2.079	.151	.013
Age	3	.774	.510	.014

None significant (p<.05)

TABLE 4.26 Mean Scores on the Faculty Development Activities Instrument by Faculty Characteristics

Faculty Characteristic		Mean	N(=175)	Std. Deviation
Gender	Female	86.7719	114	22.3179
	Male	87.5082	61	21.4372
Academic Rank	Instr./Assist.	85.0306	98	20.7967
	Assoc./Full	89.5714	77	23.2370
Tenure Status	Nontenured	90:0000	24	22.4073
	Tenure-Track	82.8000	70	21.7739
	Tenured	89.8025	81	21.6595
Service Area	Public	86.8235	102	21.0339
	Technical	88.5581	43	17.2258
	Split/Other	85.5333	30	30.2629
Years Professional	1 to 5	87.2326	43	21.4385
	6 to 15	86.8033	61	21.0751
	16+	87.0986	71	23.2749
Years Institution	1 to 3	80.8200	50	20.9525
	4 to 10	91.4182	55	21.3218
	11 to 15	87.7895	19	16.6085
	16+	88.0980	51	24.4117
Education	MLS	88.7576	99	20.3641
	MLS+	84.7763	76	23.8208
Age	Under 40	86.1132	53	21.0482
	40 to 49	84.1273	55	23.5357
	50 to 59	90.2653	49	21.5578
	60+	89.7778	18	20.9553

The descriptive statistics regarding the results on the Faculty Development

Activities relative to the faculty characteristics are presented in Table 4.26. The results show the widest margin between means for categories on any faculty characteristic, individually or by interaction (10.5982), was between those respondents with 1 to 3 years and those with 4 to 10 years at the present institution. This also represents the widest range across all the means by faculty characteristics. None of the mediating variables included in the faculty characteristics were found to be statistically significant factors in library faculty's perceptions of their chair's activities to enhance faculty development.

Leadership Practices and Respondent Characteristics

For the dependent variable, total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer score, Levene's Test confirmed the homogeneity of variance across groups ($F=.859$, $p=.743$). The R squared indicated the total library faculty characteristics accounted for approximately 15.9% of the variance in the total Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer score. The tests of between-subjects effects showed the only significant library faculty characteristics to be the faculty member's "years at present institution" and education (see Table 4.27). The characteristic, "years at present institution", accounted for the most variance in the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer score by any single characteristic (5.6%). Education of the respondents accounted for 3.5% of the variance in the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer score. Post hoc analysis of number of years at the institution using the Tukey-HSD procedure indicated the only significant differences on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer between the four categories was between those new to the institution (1 to 3 years) and those who had been at the institution four to ten years, and between the newcomers and those with many years at the institution (16 or more years).

TABLE 4.27 Faculty Characteristics: Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer)

Faculty Characteristic	*df*	F-ratio	Sig.	Eta Squared
Gender	1	.079	.780	.001
Academic Rank	1	.512	.475	.003
Tenure status	2	1.830	.164	.023
Service Area	2	.387	.680	.005
Years Professional	2	2.142	.121	.027
Years Institution*	3	3.003	.032	.056
Education*	1	5.563	.020	.035
Age	3	.629	.598	.012

* Indicates a significant characteristic ($p<.05$) for the LPI-O.

Descriptive statistics regarding the results on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer relative to the faculty characteristics are presented in Table 4.28. These results indicate, for the significant characteristic "years at present institution", the library faculty new to the institution rated their department chair lower on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer than the faculty with 4 to 10 years or 16 or more years at the institution. Review of the other significant characteristic, education, reveals faculty with a graduate degree(s) in addition to the MLS rated their department chair lower on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer than faculty with the MLS alone.

TABLE 4.28 Mean Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer by Faculty Characteristics

Faculty Characteristic		Mean	N(=170)	Std. Deviation
Gender	Female	178.7522	114	63.2768
	Male	181.7143	56	57.6329
Academic Rank	Instr./Assist.	171.3196	97	59.0894
	Assoc./Full	191.0694	72	62.8153
Tenure Status	Nontenured	188.3750	24	63.4911
	Tenure-Track	161.8571	70	58.6835
	Tenured	193.6533	75	59.5511
Service Area	Public	179.6500	100	61.0367
	Technical	185.3095	42	49.3482
	Split/Other	171.3704	27	78.3469
Years Professional	1 to 5	171.4048	42	62.2399
	6 to 15	180.0000	54	60.5057
	16+	184.3288	73	61.7052
Years Institution*	1 to 3	154.6327	49	57.0167
	4 to 10	192.6531	49	57.3493
	11 to 15	179.8500	20	55.3860
	16+	191.3922	51	65.3110
Education*	MLS	187.0300	100	58.6927
	MLS+	169.1594	69	63.8679
Age	Under 40	168.0192	52	61.1865
	40 to 49	179.7292	48	62.0562
	50 to 59	185.0000	51	58.5037
	60+	198.6667	18	65.7052

* Indicates a significant characteristic ($p<.05$) for the LPI-O.

Summary

Information on the survey response and descriptive statistics regarding the demographic data gathered from the survey results began this chapter. The reliability and internal consistency of the two instruments included within the survey were outlined. The respondents' overall rankings of the activities to enhance faculty development and the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer behaviors engaged in by the chair were presented in table form.

A principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the items on the Faculty Development Activities and the items on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer to determine the associations among items on each instrument. Factor loadings were reviewed after forced factor rotations were run based on eigenvalues and scree plots. Second forced factor rotations were run based on review of the resulting data from the Faculty Development Activities instrument, and published factor analysis results from previous research that utilized the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer. The forced factor rotations pointed to a single general factor for each of the two instruments. Thus a single score for each of the dependent variables was used in the analyses in this study.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significant relationships between the independent and/or mediating variables and the scores on the two dependent variable instruments. None of the independent or mediating variables were found to have a significant relationship with the score on the Faculty Development Activities instrument. Significant relationships were found between the score on the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer and the chair's location prior to promotion to chair, the

respondent's number of years at the institution, and the respondent's educational level.

Conclusions and implications regarding these findings will be discussed further in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V.

SUMMARY

Chairs of academic departments have been recognized as holding potentially influential positions in the success of their faculty members. Chairs may fulfill many roles including ones in leadership and faculty development. While research on perceptions of the chair's roles has focused not only on those of the chairs themselves, but also on the perceptions of the administrators to which they report and/or the faculty members they supervise, it has also focused almost exclusively on chairs of teaching departments. Faculty members in academic libraries are expected to meet tenure and promotion criteria, much like their teaching department colleagues. Several characteristics identify this group of faculty as different from the majority of teaching department faculty, including a high percentage of females, and full-time, twelve-month employment. Research regarding library faculty perceptions of the role of the department chair in faculty development and leadership practices was needed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this survey study was to test role theory by analyzing the relationship between the correlates (department chair, institutional and faculty characteristics) and library faculty perceptions of the chair's leadership practices and role in faculty development. A review of the literature found very limited research on perceptions of the roles of department chairs in academic libraries from any viewpoint. Those that had addressed library faculty perceptions presented research done approximately thirty years ago (Stone, 1969), focused on one institution (Boden 1991, 1994), or a state university system (Kazlauskas, 1993). This project was designed to

research perceptions of library faculty at institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as Research Universities I or Research Universities II.

Research Design

This study utilized a cross-sectional mail survey to study the department chair and institutional correlates of library faculty perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development and leadership practices. The population for this study was non-administrative library faculty at research universities in the United States. The sampling frame for this particular research project was the non-administrative faculty in the university libraries of the member institutions of the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium as of September 1, 1998, which were also Research Universities. Of the approximately 1060 faculty in the libraries at those institutions, 361 were randomly selected to receive the survey.

A single, multi-part instrument was used consisting of three parts: (1) a demographics section on the faculty member, their institution, and their department chair; (2) a researcher-developed survey of faculty perceptions of the department chairs' role in faculty development; and (3) the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer (LPI-O) as developed by Kouzes and Posner, and used by permission.

The dependent variables in the study were faculty members' perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development, and faculty members' perceptions of chair leadership practices. The independent variables were institutional characteristics (institution type, number of library faculty, number of faculty in the department, and organization structure) and chair characteristics (type of appointment, promoted from within or outside the department or libraries, gender, years at chair, tenure status, education, rank, and

location in relation to the library faculty member). Faculty characteristics (gender, rank, tenure status, service area, years in the profession, years at the institution, education, age range, and library station) were the mediating variables.

Descriptive statistics for the institutional, department chair, and faculty member (respondent) characteristics were calculated and presented in tables. The mean of the responses to each of the statements in the faculty development and leadership practices portions of the survey were calculated to determine those activities and practices university library faculty perceive as most used by their department chair. A principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the faculty development activities items and on the Leadership Practices Inventory -Observer items. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if there were significant differences in the library faculty's perceptions of the department chair's activities to enhance faculty development and leadership practices according to the independent variables (institutional and department chair characteristics) or mediating variables (respondent characteristics). When variables with three or more categories produced significant F values post hoc comparison using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) identified significant pair-wise differences.

Findings

Thirteen of the 361 recipients of the survey withdrew from the research. Returned, useable responses numbered 228 for a 63.2% return rate.

Demographic Results.

Institutional Characteristics. Review of the prevalent responses to the survey questions regarding the institutional characteristics showed the most common respondent

was at a Carnegie Research University I with a total library faculty of 40 to 49 members organized into departments of five or less faculty.

Chair Characteristics. Review of the prevalent responses to the survey questions regarding the chair characteristics indicated the chair was most commonly located in the same building as the respondent and was female with a permanent appointment as chair. The larger percentage of chairs were appointed from within the department they serve, had five or less years of experience as chair, and were tenured, associate professors holding the Master of Library Science degree.

Respondent Characteristics. The highest percentage responses to the survey questions regarding the respondents themselves indicated they were tenured, female, assistant professors, working in public services in the main library at their institution. They hold the Master of Library Science degree as their terminal degree, are in their forties, and have over twenty years of experience in the profession, with over sixteen years at their present institution.

Results of the demographic portion of the survey supported reports in the earlier literature regarding the gender of academic library faculty compared to all faculty at doctoral granting institutions. Precisely two thirds of the respondents were female, while only 28.3% of all faculty at doctoral granting institutions are female (Benjamin, 1998, http://www.aaup.org/Wsaltab2.htm).

Assistant professors accounted for the highest percentage (40.4%) response category regarding the rank of the respondents, however the combined percentage of associate and full professors (43%) corresponded closely to the percentage of tenured library faculty (43.4%). The survey questions regarding rank received no response from a

rather high percentage of participants both regarding themselves (7.9%) and their department chair (10.2%). This was likely due to some academic librarians holding academic, rather than faculty, status and having alternate titles, so that they were unsure of their rank when comparing with those listed as choices on the survey.

While the highest percentage age response category was "40 to 49" (31.1%), the "50 to 59" and "60+" categories combined showed slightly over 42% of the respondents were age 50 or older. This supported other research findings and reports. Kazlauskas (1993) found 56.8% of the State University System of Florida librarians were age 45 or older. According to Wilder (1996, http://www.arl.org/newsltr/185/agedemo.html), a U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics report revealed 58% of librarians were age 45 and over in 1994. This is not surprising considering that librarians often begin their studies, and so begin their careers, at an older age. Statistics on the age, level of student, and enrollment by major field of study in postsecondary education showed only 5.8% of library science students are under age 25. This percentage was over thirty percent lower than any other major field. 36.6% of the library science students were age 35 or older (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997, http://nces.ed.gov/ pubs/digest97/dt213.html). Library science is usually a graduate major only, with the earlier degree(s) in other field(s). A number of librarians are employed in other fields before deciding to pursue the Master of Library Science and a career in librarianship.

Survey Ratings.

The results of the respondents' ratings of the faculty development activities and leadership practices of their department chairs showed high reliability and good intracorrelation among the items in each of the two instruments. The correlation between

the total scores on the two instruments was also high.

Faculty Development Activities. Review of the library faculty ratings of the faculty development activities, utilizing the preliminary categorization using Creswell's category codes (see Appendix D), showed no category rising definitely to the top of the ratings, nor falling to the bottom of the ratings. In fact, one activity from each of the categories was in the top four in the ratings.

Comparison of these results to the rating results obtained by Boden (1991) with a smaller sample of not-yet-tenured library faculty at a single institution found little similarity. That research project focused on library faculty's perceptions of the methods department chairs should use in enhancing faculty professional activities. The survey asked respondents to rate each of the twenty-seven activities' level of importance to enhancing the professional activities of faculty.

The mean of the top rated activity, at 4.12, was almost one half a point (.43) above the mean of the second rated activity. A review of the other five activities from the same category, "relating to faculty personally", found two more activities in the top third, but only one activity in the middle, and two activities in the lower, third of the ratings. Faculty in Boden's (1991) previous research placed that top chair activity, "Maintain an 'open door policy' so faculty can speak with her/him at any time" right in the middle of the ratings, at 14th, on importance in enhancing faculty professional activities.

The category "helping faculty develop and refine skills", with five activities, had the third rated activity, then was split with two activities each in the middle and lower third of the ratings. The earlier group placed all except one of the five activities in the lower third of the ratings on importance. Only "Lead by example – provide a role model"

was rated higher, at tenth (Boden, 1991).

Results for the seven-activity category, "helping faculty in an administrative capacity", had two activities in the top third, four in the middle, and only one activity in the top of the bottom third (20th overall) of the ratings. The category with the largest number of activities (nine) was "helping faculty relate to the organizational environment". Three of the activities were rated in the top third, two in the middle, and the remaining four (including the two lowest rated activities) were in the bottom third of the ratings. These two categories are closest to consistency with the earlier results. Those library faculty rated the importance of all seven "administrative" activities in the top seventeen, with four in the top eight. The activities related to the "organizational environment" were divided similarly across the ratings, three in the top, two in the middle, and four in the lower third, however the actual activities in each portion, and their actual ratings, differed (Boden, 1991).

The present results show of the twenty-seven activities listed, three have means .4 or more below the midpoint on the five-point likert scale used. Those are activities the library faculty/ respondents perceive as below even "moderately used" by their department chair. Research has found an activity chairs may use to promote faculty development is providing regular meetings for faculty and opportunities for face-to-face discussions of ways to enhance faculty growth and development (Seagren et al., 1986). This group of library faculty rated such activity to be the least used of the twenty-seven activities listed in the faculty development activities instrument with a mean of 2.52.

Smith (1972) recognized, as have many researchers since, that a common activity of chairs is "encourages faculty to participate in conventions, conferences, professional

associations, etc.". Advocating for faculty by contacting appropriate individuals, committees, agencies, etc. on their behalf is a tactic chairs use to aid the advancement of faculty (Creswell et al., 1990). While library faculty rated their department chairs activity "Encourage participation in professional peer groups at the local, state, regional, national level" fourth of the twenty-seven activities, they did not perceive their chairs as acting as advocates for them. The activity "Assist faculty in getting involved in professional organizations and activities by name-dropping, nominating, recommending, etc." was rated twenty-sixth with a mean of 2.6 and standard deviation of 1.17.

Some research on chairs' perceptions of their role have noted chairs perceive part of their role as handling social events for the department (Mitchell, 1986, p. 138), or informally spending time with faculty as part of an encouraging role (Creswell & Brown, 1991). The library faculty's perception of their chair's level of use of the activity "Spend time with faculty informally in social settings" placed it twenty-fifth among the twenty-seven activities with a mean of 2.6 and standard deviation of 1.12.

Leadership Practices. A review of the ratings of the thirty statements in the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer concerning their department chair's typical behavior indicated library faculty perceived a higher level of use of some of the leadership practices as grouped by Kouzes & Posner (see Appendix E). Five of the six statements comprising the practice "enabling others to act" were in the top nine in the ratings. The remaining statement was in the top half of the ratings at thirteenth. Five of the six statements comprising the practice "modeling the way" were in the top half (15) of the ratings. The remaining statement was seventeenth. Statements regarding the leadership practice "encouraging the heart" were widely rated, from sixth to twenty-

seventh. Respondents rated five of the six statements concerning the two remaining leadership practices lower. The "challenging the process" statements were rated eighteenth to twenty-sixth, with the outlying statement rated eleventh. The "inspiring a shared vision" statements' ratings ranged from twentieth to thirtieth, with the outlying statement rated eighth.

A review of the total mean scores for the five practices reflected the ratings noted. Tests of within-subjects effects, using Greenhouse-Geisser as the correction for violation of sphericity assumed, showed significant differences between the scores for the five practices. The scale accounted for 33% of the difference. The paired samples test results indicated only the scores on the practices "encouraging the heart" and "challenging the process" were not significantly different from each other.

When the order of the leadership practices mean scores from this research was compared to other results, similarities and differences were found. Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer reported by Kouzes and Posner (1995) and by Kazlauskas (1993) matched the results of the present research in that the practice "enabling others to act" received the highest mean score and the practice "inspiring a shared vision" received the lowest mean score. Some attention has been given to the possibility gender may impact leadership practices. Respondents in the Kouzes and Posner research were over 75% male. Kazlauskas' respondents were almost 71% female. Both Kouzes and Posner, and Kazlauskas reported the practice "challenging the process" with the second highest mean score. Their results were at variance with each other on the third and fourth rated practices. The present research and Kazlauskas' research, both with high percentages of female respondents, had the practice "encouraging the heart" rated in

the middle at third. The present research however, found the practice "modeling the way" second and "challenging the process" fourth, rated by total mean score.

Factor Analysis.

Both the faculty development activities instrument and the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer results were found to be suited for factor analysis. The statements from the instruments had previously been assigned to categories – four categories for the faculty development activities instrument and five categories for the Leadership Practices Inventory. Based on the scree plot and eigenvalues greater than 1.0, selection of factors for the faculty development activities instrument resulted in four factors. However, review of the factor loadings was not definitive and did not match the categories. The Leadership Practices Inventory had a wealth of factor analysis data that supported the five categories as factors. The results of factor analysis with varimax rotation for Bauer's (1993/1994) research on college presidents' leadership practices had shown limited support for three factors for the LPI-O. While the number of factors indicated in that research, by the scree plot and eigenvalues greater than 1.0, was the same as the initial results for the present research, the factor groupings differed. Also, the present results had many items load on two factors. Previous research using the Leadership Practices Inventory and involving academic librarians gave no indication of the use of factor analysis (Kazlauskas,1993).

As advised by Hair et al. (1995), different factor rotations were tried for each instrument. Review of the results of the factor analyses of the responses to the instruments resulted in support of a single general factor for each instrument. The single factor accounted for 49% of the variance among the items of the faculty development

activities instrument. The single factor accounted for 63% of the variance among the items of the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer. A single score for each of the instruments was used in the analyses in this study.

Results Analysis by Relationship Questions.

This research addressed three stated relationship questions. All three questions addressed library faculty perceptions of the chair (dependent variable) as effected by the independent and mediating variables. Stated together, the relationship research questions asked what (1) institutional characteristics, (2) chair characteristics, and (3) library faculty demographic characteristics significantly effect library faculty perceptions of the chair's a) activities to enhance faculty development, and b) leadership practices?

The faculty development activities instrument demonstrated high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha value of .9581, and internal consistency with positive correlations between all except four items at .2 or above. The Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer demonstrated high reliability with a Chronbach's alpha value of .9794, and internal consistency with positive correlations between all except three items at .3 or above.

Institutional Characteristics. Previous research supported the prediction that institutional characteristics can be significant organizational factors in the expanded model of the role episode. Institutional type or size was "inferred" as a factor in department chairs' perceptions of their role by Lee (1985), but was proven not significant in faculty's perceptions of the leadership and effectiveness of academic chairs by Knight & Holen (1985). Ostrander (1992) found institutional type a significant factor in faculty tenure attitudes, while Oppegard (1997) found institutional size a significant factor in

perceived department chair stress related to demands of the human resource function. Katz and Kahn (1966) supported the premise that the organization can be considered as a whole, or some part of it. The present research considered three levels of the organization: the institution as a whole, the total number of library faculty, and department size. Biddle (1979) considered organizational size a significant factor in the role episode. Department size as a significant factor in the role episode was supported by Pfeffer & Salancik (1975), and later observed as significant in the length of chair tenure (Pfeffer & Moore, 1980), chair leadership style effectiveness (Jahanshahi, 1992), and library department head leadership style (Olive, 1992). It was not significant to perceived chair stress (Oppegard, 1997). Both institutional and department size were significant factors in chairs' perceptions of influence from outside interest groups (Whitson & Hubert, 1982).

In the present research, institutional type was limited to Carnegie Research Universities I or II institutions. Organizational size (number of library faculty) and department size were expected to be significant factors in library faculty's perceptions of the department chair's role in faculty development activities and leadership practices. Due to low representation of organization structures other than departments, that characteristic was not analyzed further.

None of the three institutional characteristics deemed reliable for further analysis were found to have a significant relationship with the respondents' rating of either instrument. The R squared showed only 2% of the variance in the total faculty development activities instrument score was accounted for by the institutional characteristics. For the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer score, Levene's Test

of equality of error variance showed the homogeneity of variance was violated in the case of institutional characteristics. Due to the violation the tests of between subjects effects were reviewed more stringently ($p<.025$), which resulted in even the characteristic "total library faculty" being found not significant (.046). Only 4% of the variance in the total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer score was accounted for by institutional characteristics.

The two institution types considered in this study were Carnegie Research Universities I and Carnegie Research Universities II. These two types are defined by the same parameters, except for their level of federal support dollars. Individual library faculty, whose perceptions were the subject of this research, are not usually directly or personally impacted to a great extent by whether the institution they serve receives above or below $40 million in federal support. The similarity between the two types related to this characteristic, but for that one area, may explain the lack of significant difference between the mean scores of the instruments based on this characteristic. The mean scores given to the faculty development activities instrument by these two groups were separated by only .58, while the mean scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer were only 3.15 apart.

Neither total number of library faculty (organizational size) nor department size, as a significant factor in library faculty's perceptions of the role of the chair in faculty development or leadership practices, were confirmed. While some previous research revealed these institutional characteristics as significant factors in chair perceptions, they were not for the faculty respondents in the present research. University faculty often function independently and express their perceptions in the same manner. These research

results indicate the number of library faculty in the institution, and the number in the department, are not significant factors in library faculty members' personally held perceptions of their department chair's role in faculty development or leadership practices.

Chair Characteristics. Several chair characteristics have been significant factors in previous research results. Due to the level of experience chairs usually have before taking on the role, the tenure status and/or rank of the department chair have not always been asked about in previous research. Oppegard (1997) however, in her research on chair stress, found tenure status a significant factor in relationships with external constituents, and rank a significant factor regarding general job demands. The variance in the status of librarians at Carnegie research institutions made tenure status and rank of the chair important to include in the present survey research. Gender of the department head was a significant factor in Olive's (1992) research regarding library subordinates' perceptions of the department head's leadership behavior and Oppegard's (1997) research involving chair stress factors. The number of years the chair has served in that capacity has in some cases been a significant factor in research results (Bao, 1991; Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak, 1986; Olive, 1992; Oppegard, 1997), but in other cases was not significant (Jennerich, 1981; Rasch, Hutchison & Tollefson, 1986). Jennerich (1981) found the chairs' preparation for the position had no significant relationship with the ranking of the importance of fourteen chair skills. Chair characteristics in the present research related to preparation for the position were education and promoted from within or outside the department or libraries.

In the present research, only one of the seven chair characteristics deemed reliable for analysis was found to have a significant relationship with the respondents' rating of either instrument. For the faculty development activities instrument, Levene's Test of equality of error variance showed the homogeneity of variance was violated in the case of the chair characteristics. Due to the violation the tests of between subjects effects should have been reviewed more stringently ($p<.025$), but that was unnecessary since no significant effects were found even at the .05 level. The R squared showed only 4.7% of the variance in the total faculty development activities instrument score was accounted for by the chair characteristics.

The homogeneity of variance across groups was confirmed in the case of the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer instrument. One characteristic, chair's location prior to promotion to chair, was found to have a significant effect on faculty perceptions of the chair's leadership practices. Approximately 5.1% of the variance in the total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI-O) score was accounted for by that one characteristic. Post hoc analysis found the only significant difference was between two of the three categories describing the characteristic, chair promoted from within the department and chair promoted from within the libraries. A total of 7.3% of the variance in the total LPI-O score was accounted for by the chair characteristics.

Library faculty rated the leadership practices of their department chair significantly higher when the department chair had been promoted from within the department than when promoted from within the libraries. The significance of this characteristic may be attributable to its' interpersonal nature. Faculty rating the chair leadership practices may have held a somewhat favorably biased perception of the chair

that was "one of their own". Also, chairs promoted from within the department have familiarity with prior department activities and may be able to maintain the status quo, contributing to higher faculty perceptions of the leadership practices used. Circumstances may mean a chair brought in from another department is resented, or makes changes, which cause subordinates to have lower perceptions of their leadership. Chairs hired from outside were rated between the two other categories and not significantly different from either. While not having the advantage of familiarity and established interpersonal factors of the highly rated chair promoted from within the department, the search and hiring process may help the new chair be rated, by faculty more accepting of new leadership practices, higher than an outsider promoted from the inside.

Library Faculty Demographic Characteristics. While there is less research regarding faculty perceptions of the department chair, and even fewer that address faculty demographic characteristics as factors in those perceptions, some faculty demographic characteristics have been determined to be significant factors in their perceptions of the department chair. Adibe's (1997) study of faculty's perceptions of chair leadership styles found gender, rank, tenure status, education and age were all significant demographic characteristics. Tenure status was a significant factor in faculty perceptions of the chair's role in tenure acquisition (Daly & Townsend, 1992, 1994).

In the present research, Levene's Test of equality of error variance showed that for the faculty development activities instrument the homogeneity of variance was violated in the case of the faculty characteristics. Due to the violations the tests of between subjects effects should have been reviewed more stringently ($p<.025$), but that was unnecessary since no significant effects were found even at the .05 level. The R

squared showed only 10% of the variance in the total faculty development activities instrument score was accounted for by faculty characteristics.

For the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer instrument the homogeneity of variance across groups was confirmed. Two characteristics, years at present institution and education, were found to have a significant effect on faculty perceptions of the chair's leadership practices. Education accounted for approximately 3.5% of the variance in the total Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI-O) score. Years at present institution accounted for 5.6%. Post hoc analysis of the characteristic, years at present institution, found the only significant differences were between the lowest range of years and two other categories describing the characteristic. A total of 15.9% of the variance in the total LPI-O score was accounted for by the faculty's characteristics.

Library faculty who had been at their present institution three years or less rated their department chair's leadership practices significantly lower than those with four to ten years, or sixteen or more years at the institution. New faculty members, in the process of learning a new job, often desire support and leadership, which influences their perception of the chair's leadership practices. Their short time with the organization means they may not yet share, or understand, the organizational goals and objectives. They do not have the perspective of interaction with the chair over time that longer-term faculty hold. Faculty closer to the time of the tenure decision and soon after, as in the case of the four to ten year faculty, may feel they are receiving, or have recently received, more leadership from the department chair in assisting them toward that goal. Having been at the institution for a period of time, they also are likely to feel comfortable in the organizational culture. In the case of library faculty with sixteen or more years at the

institution, comfortable in their career and familiar with how the institution, the libraries, and the department function, the chair's leadership practices likely serve them well resulting in their perceiving those practices higher than new faculty. Faculty with eleven to fifteen years at the institution rated the department chair' leadership practices in the middle between the low rating and the two high ratings, but not significantly different from either. Faculty at that mid-point are often considering going up for promotion to full professor (or an equivalent rank), or actively preparing for it, and may have leadership needs of their own. While with their years of interaction and familiarity with the organizational culture, they perceive their chair's leadership practices higher than their new colleagues; they did not rate their chair as high as the other groups.

Library faculty with an advanced degree(s), in addition to the accredited Master of Library Science, rated their department chair's leadership practices significantly lower than those with the MLS as the single graduate degree. The traditional program of study for the accredited library degree has stressed management and supervision of staff. Leadership, when emphasized, has been considered a tool for use in working with staff supervised, or the domain of the director or dean (Evans, Ward & Rugaas, 2000). As a result, those having the MLS alone may hold low expectations for leadership from their department chair, and rate the chair's existing leadership practices highly. The additional advanced degree(s) held by library faculty are often in another discipline, which may have involved leadership training or education, or was undertaken due to leadership aspirations. If the degree is a doctorate in library science, it was likely acquired due to the recipient having goals of moving into library administration (Harvey & Lambert, 1971).

As a result, this group has higher expectations for leadership, considers their chair's actions more stringently, and rates the chair's leadership practices lower.

Conclusions

Library faculty members at research universities perceive their department chair's activities to enhance faculty development and the chair's leadership practices each as one function the chair performs. None of the independent or mediating variables was a significant factor in library faculty members' rating of the chair's activities to enhance faculty development. Three variables proved to be significant factors in the rating of the chair's leadership practices. Within the context of the extended role episode, none of the organizational factors were significant. One of the attributes of the person was a significant factor. Two of the interpersonal factors were significant.

Faculty Development Activities.

Initial consideration of the principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation, resulting in four factors for the faculty development activities instrument, seemed supportive of the four categories from Creswell's (1991) research. Boden's (1994) early qualitative research, on a similar population, had identified six categories related to chair faculty development activities. Yet a single factor, with all items loading significantly, was supported by the present results. This is similar to the variance regarding perceptions of the chair's role found across the research literature. The titles, categories and sub-categories of roles differ with each study and research population. Support is found for faculty development as one function of the department chair, and for faculty development as a role with several responsibilities. The results of the present

study indicate these library faculty view the faculty development activities of their department chair as methods used within a single role.

Consideration of the characteristics predicted in Chapter One to be significant factors in library faculty perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development found none significant. No characteristic, included in the scope of this research, was found to be a significant factor in library faculty perceptions of the chair's role in faculty development. In fact, with twenty-seven statements rated on a five-point scale, the widest range of total mean scores across all categories of the variables considered was only 10.5982 (80.82 to 91.4182).

Earlier research revealed teaching department chairs and faculty (Gaff, 1975), as well as library department chairs (Plate, 1970) and faculty members (Stone, 1969; Boden, 1994) have at times supported the view that development was the individual faculty member's responsibility. The activity receiving the highest mean score (4.12), "Maintain an 'open door policy' so faculty can speak with her/him at any time," requires almost no action on the chair's part and places responsibility for initiating the activity on the faculty member. Library faculty's ratings of the remaining faculty development activities utilized by their department chair, with such middle of the ratings scores (means of 2.52 to 3.69), may indicate library faculty are uncertain regarding their department chair's role in this area. The "3" rating was defined with the term "moderately used" on the five point scale used on the instrument. Perhaps the interviewee in Boden's (1994) qualitative research, that initially indicated "... it is not a requirement that they [department heads] keep track of each faculty member, because I think it's each individual faculty member's responsibility," is representative. She did not perceive the chair having a high level of

involvement in faculty development, but simply referred to "what was nice for the department head to do." Faculty members who do not identify the department chair as having responsibility for their development are unlikely to perceive that chair regularly ("4" rating), or constantly ("5" rating), engaging in activities to enhance faculty development.

Leadership Practices.

The results of the factor analysis of the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer scores deviated from the results found by Kouzes and Posner and the overwhelming majority of the published research based on their instrument. Yet considered with the results obtained by Bauer (1993/1994), a variance in the perception of leadership practices in an academic setting may be indicated. Even within the academic setting, Daly and Townsend (1992, 1994) highlighted the need for acknowledgement that differences in practices (and so the perceptions of them) may exist across disciplines. Sheldon (1991) noted the lack of study of leadership in libraries "in any concerted way" and the lack of even the recognition of a need for leadership concepts to be included in the academic curriculum leading to the MLS. The inclusion of the library department chair in the leadership arena has been limited and recent. As with the faculty development role, library faculty indicated, when considering this new image of the department chair as a leader, the leadership practices were perceived as a single group.

Review of the rating of the leadership practices items suggests that, as with faculty development, library faculty felt primarily responsible for their own growth in this area. They gave only three items mean scores above seven, identifying practices their chair uses "fairly often." The mean scores for those three items were separated from the

remaining items by over .5. Two of the three were "enabling others to act" practices, of which all six were rated in the top thirteen. The other one of the three was a "modeling the way" practice, of which all six were rated in the top seventeen. The three lowest rated items, with mean scores below 5.0, were separated from the other items by over .5, as well. All three of those were "inspiring a shared vision" practices, and addressed the future in conceptual terms. Library faculty perceived their chair's use of them as less than "occasional."

These results support the published literature in academic librarianship. The faculty indicate they are primarily responsible for themselves. The leadership that is provided by department chairs in academic libraries at Research Universities I and II institutions, is perceived as empowering the faculty to function on their own (enabling others to act) and setting an example for the faculty (modeling the way), but committing little to the unforeseeable and theoretical future (inspiring a shared vision). It is evident the one inspiring a shared vision practice, "Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done," which was rated in the top third, at eighth, is there due to its' practical nature (getting the work done) and applicability in today's technologically changing library environment.

Of the characteristics predicted in Chapter One to be significant factors in library faculty perceptions of the chair's leadership practices, three significant variables were found.

1. The only significant independent variable, and chair characteristic, was the chair's location prior to promotion to chair. Within the context of the extended role episode, this variable is an interpersonal factor. The leadership practices of chairs

promoted from within the department were rated significantly higher than those promoted from within the libraries.

2. One significant mediating variable and faculty characteristic was the number of years the faculty member has been at the institution. Within the context of the extended role episode, this variable is an interpersonal factor. Faculty with three years or less at the institution rated the leadership practices of the chair significantly lower than those with four to ten, or sixteen or more, years at the institution.

3. The other significant mediating variable and faculty characteristic, the faculty member's education completed, was an attribute of the person within the context of the extended role episode. Faculty with an additional graduate degree(s) to the MLS rated the chair's leadership practices significantly lower than those with only the MLS.

These results support role theory, considered within the context of organizations, as set out in the model of the role episode by Katz & Kahn (1966). Referring to the extended model of the role episode presented in Chapter One (See Figure 2, p. 12): two interpersonal factors (chair's location prior to promotion to chair and faculty member's years at the institution) and one personal attribute of the role sender (faculty member's education completed) were found to be significant factors in the role sender's (faculty member's) perceptions of the focal person's (chair's) behavior (leadership practices). None of the organizational factors, which were the institutional characteristics in this research, were found to be significant.

Implications and Recommendations

Implications of the results of this study, considered with the limitations of the research, suggest areas recommended for further research. Adjustments in policies and

practices related to academic libraries department chair appointments and interactions with their faculty are offered for consideration. An area to be further addressed in the education of professional academic librarians is also suggested.

Further Research

Future research should include review of the instruments used in the present research to enhance the construct validity of the measures. Items for consideration might include whether: the statements in the two instruments adequately measure separate and different concepts of leadership and faculty development; the Leadership Practices Inventory is an appropriate instrument for measuring leadership in academic libraries; and, the statements in the faculty development instrument are valid indicators of the chair's activities to enhance faculty development. Testing across multiple groups should be undertaken to determine if consistent findings support the construct validity of the methods listed as adequate measures of library faculty perceptions of the chairs' leadership practices and activities to enhance faculty development.

Further research regarding library faculty/ academic librarians' perceptions of the department chair's role in professional development and leadership practices is needed. The sample in this study was limited to respondents in the libraries of Carnegie Research institutions in the Big Twelve Plus Libraries Consortium. Institutional variables were found not significant in the present research. Perceptions held by academic librarians across other levels of post-secondary institutions, across different types and sizes of institutions and libraries, should be researched as well. Librarians in the Carnegie Research institutions do not always hold faculty status, but rather may have academic status. The same is true for their colleagues in other levels of post-secondary institutions.

Research regarding possible effects of differences in the professional librarian's status on the perceptions of the professional development role and leadership practices of the department chair should be undertaken.

Research regarding academic library department chairs' perceptions of their role in faculty development and leadership practices is needed. The present research found a significant factor in the library faculty's perceptions of the chair's leadership practices was the chair's location prior to promotion. Research to determine significant factors in the chairs' perceptions of their role and practices is warranted.

Research regarding top academic library administrators' (deans or directors) perceptions of the department chairs' role in faculty development and leadership practices is needed. For academic library department chairs to function well as leaders, and support their faculty's development activities, they must have the support of the library administration. Determination of academic library administrators' views regarding appropriate activities of middle level managers' in support of their faculty will advance understanding between the groups.

In consideration of the difference between the factor analysis results from the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer instrument for this research and the wealth of previous results reported by Kouzes and Posner, further research utilizing the instrument with library personnel and employing factor analysis is recommended. Such research will help confirm or contradict the indication academic librarians consider leadership practices as a single factor. Research utilizing not only the LPI-O with the academic librarians, but also the Leadership Practices Inventory–Self instrument with their

department chairs, is recommended to identify differences between the chair's and the librarians' perceptions of the chair's leadership practices.

Department Chair Appointments and Interactions

Library faculty rated the leadership practices of department chairs promoted from within the libraries, but outside the department, significantly lower than chairs promoted from within the department. New chairs, wherever they were hired or appointed from, are beginning a leadership position in a pre-existing organizational culture within the department. Structured training for new department chairs should include more than the policies and procedures involved in their new middle management position. Library department chairs should be encouraged to address the unique concerns of the faculty they supervise, their leadership and faculty development. Instituting an acclimation process for new chairs, to become familiar with the faculty they now lead and to cooperatively determine/define the departmental climate, should be considered across university libraries.

New library faculty, within the first three years at the institution, rated their department chair's leadership practices significantly lower than did faculty with four to ten, or sixteen or more, years at the institution. Boice (1992) found that new library faculty knew little of what was expected of them for tenure and promotion, and even less of how to accomplish it. As the research in teaching departments across campuses has shown, department chairs are in a natural position to work with the new faculty in their department to assist them in adjusting to the rigors of a faculty position. Academic library department chairs should help their faculty to identify goals and activities that will aid

faculty progress toward the goals of promotion and tenure. The chair's efforts can mean the difference between success and failure.

Library faculty's extremely moderate ratings of their department chair's activities to enhance faculty development are somewhat troubling. The pervading attitude in Cubberley's (1996) guide, intended to help fellow academic librarians through the tenure and promotion process, agreed with the findings of Boice (1992) and reinforced the position implied by the results obtained from the present research. That view places responsibility for development heavily on the individual faculty member. The one exception was the higher rating given to the activity that required the most action on the faculty member's, rather than the chair's, part to instigate. In a similar manner the library faculty rated their department chair's leadership highest in the categories "enabling others to act" and "modeling the way". Just as one of Boden"s (1994) interviewees, in the course of considering her chair's role in faculty growth and development, changed her mind, perhaps the majority of academic librarians have yet to recognize "... that is a part of their [the department head's] job."

The shear number of library faculty, especially in the institutions included in this research project, mean the dean or director cannot fulfill the leadership role and be the champion of faculty development for all library faculty. The academic library department chairs must act as more than managers and supervisors of personnel. They must step up and not leave their faculty to fend for themselves in these important matters. Rather, they should communicate expectations, actively mentor, and take a leadership role to support not only new faculty, but all faculty in their department, and provide the best opportunity for their institutional success and continued professional growth throughout their careers.

Library Faculty Education

Library faculty's education, as a significant factor in the rating of their department chair's leadership practices, suggests adjustment in the curriculum of schools of library and information science may be in order. Those with a graduate degree in addition to the MLS rated their chair's leadership significantly lower than those with only the MLS. Library degree programs should be reviewed concerning the inclusion of segments addressing what is expected of academic librarians to acquire tenure and promotion, and participate collegially. Graduate school programs preparing future librarians to supervise and manage staff lead those librarians to feel they should be self-sufficient and not need to look to anyone, not even their department chair, for leadership. Library faculty with additional graduate degree(s) seem to have acquired expectations for helpful leadership somewhere along the way – leadership they do not perceive their department chair providing. The education and training of academic librarians should include preparation to recognize and take on leadership roles and continue professional development throughout their career life.

Closing Thoughts

Chairs of teaching departments have been accepted as in a position to assist their faculty's development and provide leadership. Perceptions of the chair's role from the faculty's, the chair's and higher administrators' viewpoints, and across a variety of institutional settings, have been the subject of research for decades. This research expanded the small amount of similar research that has begun regarding department chairs in academic libraries. Library faculty, like their teaching department counterparts, should be able to view their chair as interested in the development of their faculty and

willing to engage in meaningful leadership practices. Professionals striving to meet the ever-changing information needs of their colleagues across the academic community deserve nothing less.

REFERENCES

Adibe, D. M. (1997). Faculty perceptions of the leadership styles of academic department chairpersons in selected Texas urban universities. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 3371A.

American library directory 1998-99: Volume 1. Libraries in the United States. (1998). (51st ed.). New Providence, NJ: R. R. Bowker.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (1996). ACRL university library statistics 1994-95: A compilation of statistics from one hundred sixteen university libraries. Chicago: American Library Association.

Association of College and Research Libraries Committee on the Status of Academic Librarians. (2001). Faculty status and collective bargaining statements: Final versions. College and Research Libraries News, 62(3), 304-306.

Babbie, E. R. (1990). Survey research methods (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bailey, M. J. (1976). Some effects of faculty status on supervision in academic libraries. College and Research Libraries, 37(1), 48-52.

Bailey, M. J. (1978, September). Requirements for middle managerial positions. Special Libraries, 69, 323-331.

Bailey, M. J. (1981). Supervisory and middle managers in libraries. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Bailey, M. J. (1987, September). Middle managers in libraries/information services. Library Administration and Management, 1, 139-142.

Bailey, M. J. & Murphy, M. (1989). Management competencies of middle managers in large academic research libraries. Paper presented at the 5th National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 061)

Bao, J. Q. (1991). The roles of department chairs in higher learning institutions in the People's Republic of China. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 3483A.

Bauer, M. (1994). Are the leadership practices of college presidents in the northeast distinct from those of leaders of business and industry? (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Haven, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 2313A.

Benjamin, E. (1998). Disparities in the salaries and appointments of academic women and men: An update of a 1988 report of Committee W on the status of women in the academic profession. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved February 24, 2000 from the World Wide Web: http://www.aaup.org/Wrepup.htm

Bennett, J. B. (1983). Managing the academic department: Cases and notes. New York: American Council on Education.

Bennett, J. B. & Figuli, D. J. (Eds.). (1990). Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. New York: American Council on Education.

Bergquist, W. H. & Phillips, S. R. (1975-1977). A handbook for faculty development (Vols. 1-2). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Biddle, B. J. (1979). Role theory: Expectations, identities and behaviors. New York: Academic Press.

Biddle, B. J. & Thomas, E. J. (Eds.). (1966). Role theory: Concepts and research. New York: Wiley.

Bland, C. & Schmitz, C. C. (1988). Faculty vitality on review: Retrospect and prospect. Journal of Higher Education, 59(2), 190-224.

Bland, C. J., & Schmitz, C. C. (1990a). An overview of research on faculty and institutional vitality. In J. H. Schuster, D. W. Wheeler , & Associates, Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal (pp. 41-61). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bland, C. J., & Schmitz, C. C. (1990b). A guide to the literature on faculty development. In J. H. Schuster, D. W. Wheeler , & Associates, Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal (pp. 298-328). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bloss, A. & Lanier, D. (1997). The library department head in the context of matrix management and reengineering. College and Research Libraries, 58(6), 499-508.

Boden, D. W. R. (1991). Library faculty perceptions of the role of the department chair in enhancing the professional activities of faculty. Unpublished manuscript, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Boden, D. W. R. (1994). A university libraries faculty perspective on the role of the department head in faculty performance: A grounded theory approach. Revised. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 758)

Boice, R. (1990). Chairs as facilitators of scholarly writing. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.). (1990). Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. (pp. 125-131). New York: American Council on Education.

Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boice, R., Scepanski, J. M., Wilson, W. (1987). Librarians and faculty members: Coping with pressures to publish. College and Research Libraries, 48(6), 494-503.

Brann, J. & Emmet, T. A. (Eds.). (1972). The academic department or division chairman: A complex role. Detroit: Balamp Publishing.

Brod, R. (1994). The mission of leadership. In A. Bugliani (Ed.), Chairing the Foreign Language and Literature Department (Special issue). ADFL Bulletin, 25(3), 104-106.

Bugliani, A. (Ed.). (1994). Chairing the Foreign Language and Literature Department (Special issue). ADFL Bulletin, 25(3).

Coats, L. T., Lovell, N. B., & Franks, M. E. (1996). FIRO B: Analyzing community college department chairs' effectiveness. Paper presented at the Southeastern Association for Community College Research Conference, Panama City, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 999)

Cohen, W. D., Bleha, B., & Olswang, S. G. (1981). Administrative roles and perceptions of governance in the community college. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 5, 303-321.

Comes, J. F. (1978/1979). Relationships between leadership behavior and goal attainment in selected academic libraries (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5782A.

Creswell, J. W. (1991). [Codes, categories, and illustrations: Practices chairs engage in in assisting faculty in their growth and development]. Unpublished raw data.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. & Brown, M. L. (1991). How chairpersons enhance faculty research: A grounded theory study. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Creswell, J. W. & Brown, M. L. (1992). How chairpersons enhance faculty research: A grounded theory study. The Review of Higher Education, 16(1), 41-62.

Creswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). The academic chairperson's handbook. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Cubberley, C. W. (1996). Tenure and promotion for academic librarians: A guidebook with advice and vignettes. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

Dalecki, M. G., Ilvento, T. W., & Moore, D. E. (1988). The effects of multi-wave mailings on the external validity of mail surveys. Journal of the Community Development Society, 19(1), 51-70.

Daly, F. & Townsend, B. K. (1992). Faculty perceptions of the department chair's role in facilitating tenure acquisition. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 912)

Daly, F. & Townsend, B. K. (1994). The chair's role in tenure acquisition. The NEA Higher Education Journal: Thought and Action, 9(2), 125-145.

DeVries, D. L. (1972). The relationship of role expectations to faculty behavior. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 061 912)

Downs, R. B. (1976). The role of the academic librarian, 1876-1976. College and Research Libraries, 37(6), 491-502.

Doyle, E. A. (1953). The status and functions of the departmental chairman in colleges of liberal arts. (Doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America). Dissertation Abstracts, 0186. (University Microfilms No. 01-89-851)

Dragon, A. C. (1976). Self-descriptions and subordinate descriptions of the leader behavior of library administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 7380A.

Dragon, A. C. (1979). Leader behavior in changing libraries. Library Research, 1, 53-66.

Eble, K. E. (1990). Chairpersons and faculty development. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.). (1990). Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. (pp. 99-106). New York: American Council on Education.

Eble, K. E. & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, G. E., Ward, P. L., & Rugaas, B. (2000). Management basics for information professionals. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Falk, G. (1979). The academic department chairmanship and role conflict. Improving College and University Teaching, 27(2), 79-86.

Fields, D. L. & Herold, D. M. (1997). Using the Leadership Practices Inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57(4), 569-579.

Fink, A. & Kosecoff, J. (1985). How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Fowler, F. J., Jr. (1993). Applied social research methods series: Volume 1. Survey research methods. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Fulton, T. L. (1990). Mentor meets Telemachus: The role of the department head in orienting and inducting the beginning reference librarian. In B. Katz (Ed.), Continuing education of reference librarians. The reference librarian, no. 30, (pp. 257-273). New York: The Haworth Press.

Gaff, J. G. (1975). Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Galm, J. A. (1985). Welcome to post-tenure review: Finding true collegiality. College Teaching, 33(2), 65-67.

Giesecke, J. (Ed.). (1992). Practical help for new supervisors [2nd ed.]. Chicago: American Library Association.

Giesecke, J. (Ed.). (1997). Practical help for new supervisors (3rd ed.). Chicago: American Library Association.

Giesecke, J. (2001). Practical strategies for library managers. Chicago: American Library Association.

Gmelch, W. H. & Burns, J. S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairpersons. Journal of Educational Administration, 32(1), 79-94.

Gmelch, W. H. & Miskin, V. D. (1993). Leadership skills for department chairs. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Gmelch, W. H. & Miskin, V. D. (1995). Survival skills for scholars: Vol. 15. Chairing an academic department. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goldenberg, M. (1990). Common and uncommon concerns: The complex role of the community college department chair. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.). (1990). Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. (pp. 16-22). New York: American Council on Education.

Gordon, B. G., Stockard, J. W., Jr., & Williford, H. N. (1991). The perceived and expected roles and responsibilities of departmental chairpersons in schools of education as determined by teaching faculty. Education, 112(2), 176-182.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. (1974). Faculty development in a time of retrenchment. New Rochelle, NY: Change.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black W. C. (1995). Multivariate data analysis with readings (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Harnish, D. & Wild, L. A. (1994). Mentoring strategies for faculty development. Studies in Higher Education, 19(2), 191-201.

Harper, J. (1994). Survival tips for new department chairs. In A. Bugliani (Ed.), Chairing the Foreign Language and Literature Department (Special issue). ADFL Bulletin, 25(3), 94-98.

Harvey, J. F. & Lambert, B. (1971). The educational third dimension: II. Programs for continuing library education. In E. W. Stone (Ed.), Personnel Development and Continuing Education in Libraries, Library Trends, 20(1), 144-168.

Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). The department chair as academic leader (Oryx Press series on higher education). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education.

Heimler, C. H. (1967). The college departmental chairman. Educational Record, 48, 158-163.

Hersberger, R. M. (1989). The challenges of leading and managing faculty status librarians. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 14(6), 361-365.

Hirokawa, R. Y., Barge, J. K., Becker, S. L., & Sutherland, J. L. (1989). The department chair as responsible academic leader: A competency-based perspective. ACA Bulletin, 67, 8-19.

Jahanshahi, F. (1992). Female academic department head: A national study of self-perceived leadership styles in doctoral granting institutions. (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 3419A.

Jarvis, D. K. (1994). Who needs development? In A. Bugliani (Ed.), Chairing the Foreign Language and Literature Department (Special issue). ADFL Bulletin, 25(3), 23-25.

Jeffrey, R. C. (1985, April). A dean interprets the roles and powers of an ideal chair. Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 52, 15-16.

Jennerich, E. J. (1981). Competencies for department chairpersons: Myths and realities. Liberal Education, 67(1), 46-70.

Jones, D. R. & Holdaway, E. A. (1995). Expectations held for department heads in postsecondary institutions. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 41(2), 188-212.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.

Kazlauskas, D. W. (1993). Leadership practices and employee job satisfaction in the academic libraries of the state university system of Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 3053A. (University Microfilms No. 95-05, 669)

Kenny, S. S. (1982). Three views of the chair: Perspectives of the department members, the dean, and the chairperson. ADE Bulletin, 73(Winter), 33-37.

Kline, P. (1994). An easy guide to factor analysis. London: Routledge.

Knight, W. H. & Holen, M. C. (1985). Leadership and the perceived effectiveness of department chairpersons. Journal of Higher Education, 56(6), 677-690.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1994). Leadership practices inventory: Trainer's manual. San Diego: Pfeiffer.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1995). The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1997). Leadership practices inventory [LPI] Observer. Monte Sereno, CA: Kouzes Posner International.

Kremer-Hayon, L. & Avi-Itzhak, T. E. (1986). Roles of academic department chairpersons at the university level: Perceptions and satisfaction. Higher Education, 15, 105-112.

Kroll, S. (1994). Academic status: Statements and resources (2nd ed.). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association.

Krompart, J. (1994). A bibliographic essay on faculty status for academic librarians. In S. Kroll (Ed.), Academic status: Statements and resources (pp.29-38) (2nd ed.). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association.

Kyrillidou, M., Blixrud, J. C. & Green, J. (1999). ARL Annual Salary Survey, 1998-99. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Kyrillidou, M., Blixrud, J. C., & Rodriguez, K. (1998). ARL Annual Salary Survey, 1997-98. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Kyrillidou, M., O'Connor, M. & Blixrud, J. C. (1998). ARL Statistics, 1996-97: A Compilation of Statistics from the One Hundred and Twenty Members of the Association of Research Libraries. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Leaming, D. R. (1998). Academic leadership: A practical guide to chairing the department. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Lee, D. E. (1985). Department chairpersons' perceptions of the role in three institutions. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 61, 23-49.

Leong, F. T. L. (1995). Review of the Leadership Practices Inventory (Test No. 213). In J. C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), Mental Measurements Yearbook (12th ed.). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Leslie, L. L. (1972). Are high response rates essential to valid surveys? Social Science Research, 1, 323-334.

Lewis, M. A. (1995). Review of the Leadership Practices Inventory (Test No. 213). In J. C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), Mental Measurements Yearbook (12th ed.). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Leysen, J. M. & Black, W. K. (1998). Peer review in Carnegie Research libraries. College & Research Libraries, 59(6), 512-522.

Lowry, C. B. (1993). Research notes: The status of faculty status for academic librarians: A twenty-year perspective. College & Research Libraries, 54(2), 163-172.

Lucas, A. F. (1994). Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Massman, V. F. (1972). Faculty Status for Librarians. Metuchen, NJ:Scarecrow Press.

McAnally, A. M. (1975). Status of the university librarian in the academic community. In Association of College and Research Libraries Committee on the Status of Academic Librarians, Faculty status for academic librarians: A history and policy statements (pp. 1-30). Chicago: American Library Association.

McKeachie, W. J. (1990). Tactics and strategies for faculty development. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. (pp. 107-114). New York: American Council on Education.

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, J. R., & Malpass, L. F. (1975). Selected characteristics, roles, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen in state and land-grant institutions. Research in Higher Education, 3, 243-259.

Miles, B. W. (1983). Trials and tribulations of the academic chair. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 34(4), 11-15.

Mitchell, E. S. (1989). The library leadership project: A test of leadership effectiveness in academic libraries. In G. B. McCabe & B. Kreissman (Eds.), Advances in library administration and organization (Vol. 8, pp. 25-38). Greenwich, Ct: JAI Press.

Mitchell, M. B. (1986). Department chairperson management strategies: Enhancing faculty performance and work satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 3995A.

Mitchell, M. B. (1987). The process of department leadership. The Review of Higher Education, 11(2), 161-176.

Moses, I. (1985). The role of head of department in the pursuit of excellence. Higher Education, 14, 337-354.

Moxley, J. M. & Olson, G. A. (1988). The role of the modern English department chair. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 346)

Moxley, J. M. & Olson, G. A. (1990). The English chair: Scholar or bureaucrat? The NEA Higher Education Journal: Thought and Action, 6(1), 51-58.

Napier, N. K. (1993). Alice in academia: The department chairman role from both sides of the mirror. Journal of Management Inquiry, 2(3), 299-305.

National Center for Education Statistics (1997). Enrollment in postsecondary education, by major field of study, age, and level of student: 1995-96. In Digest of education statistics 1997 (Chapter 3: Postsecondary Education). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/digest97/dt213.html

Neumann, L. & Neumann, Y. (1983). Faculty perceptions of deans' and department chairpersons' management functions. Higher Education, 12, 205-214.

Nofsinger, M. M. & Bosch, A. W. (1994). Roles of the head of reference: From the 1990s to the 21st century. Reference Librarian, 43, 87-99.

Olive, J. F., III (1991). Leadership styles of selected academic library department heads as perceived by self and subordinates. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 2430A.

Oppegard, A. M. (1997). Factors of stress among department chairpersons at private baccalaureate institutions: A national study. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 2010A.

Ostrander, R. J. (1992). Individual and organizational correlates and faculty attitudes toward tenure: A secondary analysis (tenure attitudes). (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 0107A.

Person, R. J. (1980). Middle managers in academic and public libraries: Managerial role concepts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1820A.

Peters, G. F. (1994). Institutional responsibility and chair training: The Michigan State model. In A. Bugliani (Ed.), Chairing the Foreign Language and Literature Department (Special issue). ADFL Bulletin, 25(3), 99-103.

Pfeffer, J. & Moore, W. L. (1980). Average tenure of department heads: The effects of paradigm, size, and departmental demography. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25(3), 387-406.

Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. R. (1975). Determinants of supervisory behavior: A role set analysis. Human Relations, 28(2), 139-154.

Plate, K. H. (1970). Management personnel in libraries: A theoretical model for analysis. Rockaway, NJ: American Faculty Press.

Posner, B. Z. & Kouzes, J. M. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48(2), 483-496.

Posner, B. Z. & Kouzes, J. M. (1992). Psychometric properties of the leadership practices inventory. San Diego: Pfeiffer.

Rasch, C., Hutchison, J., & Tollefson, N. (1986). Sources of stress among administrators at research universities. The Review of Higher Education, 9(4), 419-434.

Riegel, J. K. (1994). A checklist for self-study for departments of foreign languages and literatures. In A. Bugliani (Ed.), Chairing the Foreign Language and Literature Department (Special issue). ADFL Bulletin, 25(3), 57-64.

Roach, J. H. L. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities. Educational Record, 57(1), 13-23.

Rommetveit, R. (1954). Social norms and roles. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Samuels, K. T., Jr. (1983). Management role of community college division chairpersons in Florida's system of public higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 3613A. (University Microfilms No. 84-07, 009)

Sarbin, T. R. (1954). Role theory. In Lindzey, G. (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology: Vol. 1. Theory and method. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, pp. 223-258.

Sarbin, T. R. & Allen, V. L. (1968). Role theory. In Lindzey, G. & Aronson, E. (Eds.). The handbook of social psychology: Vol. 1 (pp.488-567) (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Scott, J. H. (1990). Role of community college department chairs in faculty development. Community College Review, 18(3), 12-16.

Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report: No. 1. The department chair: New roles, responsibilities and challenges. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Seagren, A. T., Wheeler, D. W., Creswell, J. W., Miller, M. T., & VanHorn-Grassmeyer, K. (1994). Academic leadership in community colleges. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Seagren, A. T., Wheeler, D. W., Mitchell, M. B., & Creswell, J. W. (1986). Perception of chairpersons and faculty concerning roles descriptors and activities important for faculty development and departmental vitality. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 387)

Sheldon, B. E. (1991). Leaders in libraries: Styles and strategies for success. Chicago: American Library Association.

Siever, R. G., Loomis, R. J., & Neidt, C. O. (1972). Role perceptions of department chairmen in two land grant universities. The Journal of Educational Research, 65(9), 405-410.

Smart, J. C. (1976). Duties performed by department chairmen in Holland's model environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68(2), 194-204.

Smith, A. B. (1972). Department chairmen: Neither fish nor fowl. Junior College Journal, 42(6), 40-43.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1990). Development of new faculty. The Department Chair, 1(2), 9.

Sparks, R. (1976). Library management: Consideration and structure. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2(2), 66-71.

Stone, E. W. (1969). Factors related to the professional development of librarians. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Stryker, S. & Statham, A. (1985). Symbolic interaction and role theory. In Lindzey, G. & Aronson, E. (Eds.). Handbook of social psychology: Vol. 1 (pp. 311-378) (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Sullivan, M. (1991). A new leadership paradigm: Empowering library staff and improving performance. In K. Hendrickson (Ed.), Creative planning for library administration: Leadership for the future (pp.73-85). Binghamton, NY: Haworth.

Sullivan, M. (1992). The changing role of the middle manager in research libraries. Library Trends, 41(2), 269-281.

Thompson, H. L. (1990). The department chairperson: An academic leader. The Department Chair, 1(2), 16-17, 19.

Tucker, A. (1981). Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Tucker, A. (1992). Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers (3rd ed.). New York: American Council on Education.

Warren, C. O. (1990). Chairperson and dean: The essential partnership. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.). (1990). Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. (pp. 30-35). New York: American Council on Education.

Watson, R. E. L. (1979). The role of the department head or chairman: Discipline, sex and nationality as factors influencing faculty opinion. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 9(3), 19-28.

Watson, R. E. L. (1986). The role of the department chair: A replication and extension. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 16(1), 13-23.

Weinberg, S. S. (1984). The perceived responsibilities of the departmental chairperson: A note of a preliminary study. Higher Education, 13, 301-303.

Wheeler, D. W. (1992). The role of the chairperson in support of junior faculty. In Sorcinelli, M. D. & Austin, A. E. (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 50 (pp. 87-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whitson, L. J. & Hubert, F. W. R. (1982). Interest groups and the department chairperson: The exertion of influence in the large public university. Journal of Higher Education, 53(2), 163-176.

Whitt, E. J. (1991). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. The Review of Higher Education, 14(2), 177-197.

Wilder, S. (1996). The age demographics of academic librarians. ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Libraries and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC, 185 (April 1996). Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. Retrieved July 23, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://www.arl.org/newsltr/185/agedemo.html

Wilhite, M. S. (1987). Department chairperson behaviors: Enhancing the growth and development of faculty (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1620A.

Wilhite, M. S. (1990). Practices used by effective department chairs to enhance growth and development of faculty. NACTA Journal, 34(2), 17-20.

Wittenbach, S. A., Bordeianu, S. M. & Wycisk, K. (1992). Management preparation and training of department heads in ARL libraries. College & Research Libraries, 53(4): 319-30.

Wolverton, R. E. (1990). Chairing the small department. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.). (1990). Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. (pp. 8-15). New York: American Council on Education.

Zurcher, L. A. (1983). Social roles: Conformity, conflict, and creativity. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A

Big Twelve Plus Library Consortium

Research Universities I or II

Big Twelve Plus Library Consortium

member institutions, as of September 1, 1998, classified by the

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

as Research Universities I or II

Institution	Classification[a]	ARL Member[b]	Faculty[c]
Brigham Young University	II	Yes	101
Colorado State University	I	Yes	34
Iowa State University	I	Yes	48
Kansas State University	II	No	38
New Mexico State University	I	No	32
Oklahoma State University	II	Yes	48
Rice University	II	Yes	45
Southern Illinois University	II	Yes	41
Texas A & M University	I	Yes	68
Texas Tech University	II	Yes	48
University of Arkansas	II	No	38
University of Colorado at Boulder	I	Yes	55
University of Houston	II	Yes	46
University of Kansas	I	Yes	66
University of Missouri Columbia	I	Yes	47
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	I	Yes	45
University of New Mexico	I	Yes	46
University of Oklahoma	II	Yes	32

[a] "Carnegie Foundation's Classification," 1994.

[b] Kyrillidou, O'Connor, & Blixrud, 1998.

[c] American Library Directory 1998-99 (1998); Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 1996; Kyrillidou, O'Connor, & Blixrud, 1998.

Institution	Classification	ARL Member		Faculty
University of Texas at Austin	I	Yes		134
University of Utah	I	Yes		48
			TOTAL	1060

Participating

Big Twelve Plus Library Consortium

Member Institutions

Faculty and Percentage of Faculty Surveyed

Institution	Faculty[a]	# of Faculty[b]	Sample	% of Faculty[c]
Brigham Young University	101	63	51	81
Colorado State University	34	21	19	90
Iowa State University	48	24	22	91.7
Kansas State University	38	18	11	61
New Mexico State University	32	16	10	62.5
Oklahoma State University	48	23	16	69.6
Texas A & M University	68	47	32	68
Texas Tech University	48	22	15	68
University of Arkansas	38	15	12	80
University of Colorado at Boulder	55	22	15	68
University of Houston	46	19	15	79
University of Missouri Columbia	47	22	16	72.7
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	45	33	21	63.6
University of New Mexico	46	16	13	81
University of Oklahoma	32	13	13	100
University of Texas at Austin	134	64	54	84.4
University of Utah	48	30	26	86.7
TOTALS	908	468	361	

[a] American Library Directory 1998-99 (1998): Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 1996; Kyrillidou, O'Connor, & Blixrud, 1998.

[b] Number of non-administrative library faculty as provided by the Dean or Director.

[c] Varies by institution due to combining of lists provided by Deans and Directors into one master mailing list for random selection.

APPENDIX B

Permissions and Communication

Regarding Use of Copyrighted Items

PERMISSIONS DEPARTMENT
605 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10158-0012
TEL 212.850.6011
FAX 212.850.6008

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Publishers Since 1807

February 21, 2001

Dana W.R. Boden
C.Y. Thompson
Library
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0717
Fax: 402 472 4412

Dear Dana Boden:

RE: Your 02/19/2001 request for permission to reuse 5 Figures and/or 300 words from Katz/SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF ORGANIZATIONS/ISBN 0471460400. This material will appear in your forthcoming dissertation, to be published by University of Nebraska in ~~2001~~ 2002 JHC

1. Permission is granted for this use, except that if the material appears in our work with credit to another source, you must also obtain permission from the original source cited in our work.

2. Permitted use is limited to your edition described above, and does not include the right to grant others permission to photocopy or otherwise reproduce this material except for versions made by non-profit organizations for use by visually or physically handicapped persons, and up to five copies of the published thesis may be photocopied by a microfilm company.

3. Appropriate credit to our publication must appear on every copy of your work, either on the first page of the quoted text, in a separate acknowledgment page, or figure legend. The following components must be included: Title, author(s) and /or editor(s), journal title (if applicable), Copyright © (year and owner). Reprinted by permission of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

4. This permission is for non-exclusive print rights and microfilm storage rights by University of Nebraska, for the English language only, throughout the world. For translation rights, please contact our Subsidiary Rights Department.

Sincerely,

Jonathan H Campbell
Permissions Assistant
John Wiley & Sons
212 850 6012
Fax: 850 6008

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
15419 Banyan Lane
Monte Sereno, California 95030 USA
Phone/FAX: (408) 354-9170

November 11, 1997

Dana W. R. Boden
C.Y. Thompson Library
East Campus
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0717

Dear Dana:

Thank you for your facsimile (dated November 3, 1997) requesting permission to use the Leadership Practices Inventory - Other (LPI-O) in your doctoral study. We are willing to allow you to reproduce the instrument as outlined in your letter, at no charge, with the following understandings:

(1) That the LPI-O is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;

(2) That copyright of the LPI-O is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement be included on each page of the instrument: "Copyright © 1997 Kouzes Posner International, Inc. All rights reserved.";

(3) That a *bound* copy of your dissertation, and one copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI-O data be sent promptly to our attention.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you please so indicate by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed, return envelope. Best wishes for every success with your research project. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Cordially,

Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
Managing Partner

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) DWRB Date: Other copy returned 18 Nov. '97

"Dana W. R. Boden" <danab@unllib.unl.edu>

09/16/98 03:36 PM
Please respond to "Dana W. R. Boden"

To: Barry Posner <BPosner@mailer.scu.edu>
cc: Dana Boden <danab@unllib.unl.edu>
Subject: LPI Request 9/16/98

Barry,

Last April you supplied me with a clean copy of the LPI-0 to be used for my dissertation research project. I had planned to photocopy it. As I prepare for the mailing of the survey, I realize keying in the instrument will allow me more flexibility to reduce the cost of photocopying and mailing. I will stay within the guidelines for use by: 1) not using the LPI-0 for financial gain, but only academic research purposes; 2) displaying the copyright statement with the instrument; and 3) forwarding a copy of the dissertation to you when this is all done.

Is it acceptable to you that I key in the LPI-0?

Looking forward to your response.

Dana

Dana W. R. Boden, Ph.D. Candidate
Associate Professor
C. Y. Thompson Library
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0717

Phone: (402) 472-4412
Fax: (402) 472-7005
Internet: danab@unllib.unl.edu

"Barry Posner" <BPosner@scu.edu>

09/16/98 07:03 PM

To: danab@unllib.unl.edu
cc:
Subject: Re: LPI Request 9/16/98

Dana:

This is absolutely fine. You do not need to reproduce our copy but are free to make a new original and format it so that it fits within your larger survey.

Best wishes.

Barry

APPENDIX C

Cover Letter and Survey Instrument

University of Nebraska Lincoln
Teachers College

Educational Psychology
116 Bancroft Hall
P.O. Box 880345
Lincoln, NE 68588-0345

November 12, 1998

IRB# 98-10-066 EX

Dear Library Faculty Member/Librarian:

I am conducting a research project to study university library faculty perceptions of department chair leadership practices and role in professional development as part of my dissertation work. The population for this study is non-administrative library faculty at research universities in the United States. The sample for this study will be non-administrative library faculty of the member institutions of the Big Twelve Plus Library Consortium.

This will be a cross-institutional study and data will not be reported for individual institutions. **Complete anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents will be protected and is assured.** An identification number, for mailing purposes only, is included on a postcard to be sent back separately when the survey is returned.

You are invited to participate in this important survey. The survey consists of three parts: demographic information; faculty development activities of the department chair; and leadership practices. The survey should require only approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. A summary of the findings of the study will be available from the researcher upon completion.

Please take a few minutes to complete the survey, fold it, and place it in the stamped, pre-addressed envelope enclosed. **Please return your completed survey, as well as the postcard, by November 25, 1998.**

If you have any questions, please contact the researcher at the following:

U. S. Mail: Dana W. R. Boden
C. Y. Thompson Library
East Campus
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0717

Phone: (402) 472-4412
Fax: (402) 472-7005
E-mail: danab@unllib.unl.edu

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject that have not been answered by the investigator, you may call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without any adverse effects.

Remember, your input on this project is essential to the success of this study. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John Creswell

Dana W. R. Boden,
Ph.D. Candidate

John W. Creswell,
Professor

Survey of
Department Chair Role in Faculty Development

****

Pursuant to federal guidelines, the following material is provided for the informed consent and protection of human subjects: Subjects participating in this research may exercise their option to voluntarily withdraw from participation at any time. Participation, or non-participation, will not in any way be held against you. The results of this research will be kept confidential. The code number on the postcard is only to identify who has returned the survey, for possible followup mailing purposes.

****

Please mark the most appropriate answer with an "X".

I. Demographic Information:

1. Faculty member characteristics:

a. Your gender: (1) Female _____ (2) Male _____

b. Your rank: (1) Instructor, or comparable title _____

(2) Assistant Professor, or comparable title _____

(3) Associate Professor, or comparable title _____

(4) Professor, or comparable title _____

c. Are you: (1) Tenured _____ (2) Tenure track, but not-yet-tenured _____

(3) Specific term appointment _____ (4) Other _____

d. Identify the area within library services in which you are employed:

(1) Public Services _____ (2) Technical Services _____

(3) Split between Public & Technical Services _____ (4) Other _____

e. Years in the library profession: (1) 1 - 5 years _____ (2) 6 - 10 years _____

(3) 11 - 15 years _____ (4) 16 - 20 years _____ (5) 20 + years _____

f. Years at present institution: (1) 1 - 3 years _____ (2) 4 - 5 years _____

(3) 6 - 10 years _____ (4) 11 - 15 years _____ (5) 16 + years _____

g. Education completed: (1) MLS (or equivalent) _____ (2) MLS and second Masters degree _____

(3) MLS and Doctorate _____ (4) Other _____

h. Please identify your age range: (1) 21-29 years _____ (2) 30 - 39 years _____

(3) 40 - 49 years _____ (4) 50 - 59 years _____ (5) 60 or over _____

i. Are you stationed in: (1) The main library _____ (2) A branch library _____

2. Institutional characteristics:

a. The institution you are employed at is a: (1) Carnegie Research Universities I _____

(2) Carnegie Research Universities II _____

b. Number of library faculty at your institution: (1) 25 - 39 _____ (2) 40 - 49 _____

(3) 50 - 65 _____ (4) 66 - 85 _____ (5) Over 85 _____

c. Number of faculty are in your department (excluding the Department Chair): (1) 1 - 5 _____

(2) 6 - 10 _____ (3) 11 - 15 _____ (4) 16 - 25 _____ (5) Over 25 _____

d. The library is organized into (1) Departments _____ (2) Teams _____

(3) Other (please explain) _____

3. Department Chair/Head/Team Leader characteristics:

a. What best describes the chair of your department?

(1) Permanently appointed as chair _____

(2) Specific term appointment _____

a) Length of term? _____

b) Renewable appointment? Yes _____ No _____

(3) Interim chair, until position is advertised and filled _____

b. Your department chair was:

(1) Promoted from within the department _____

(2) Promoted from within the libraries, but not this department _____

(3) Hired from outside _____

c. Gender of chair: (1) Female _____ (2) Male _____

d. Number of years as chair: (1) 1 - 2 years _____ (2) 3 - 5 years _____

(3) 6 - 10 years _____ (4) 11 - 15 years _____ (5) Over 15 years _____

e. Is your chair: (1) Tenured _____ (2) Tenure track, but not-yet-tenured _____

(3) Specific term appointment _____ (4) Other _____

f. Chair's education completed: (1) MLS (or equivalent) _____

(2) MLS and second Masters degree _____ (3) MLS and Doctorate _____

(4) Other _____ (5) Unknown _____

g. Chair's rank: (1) Instructor, or comparable title _____

(2) Assistant Professor, or comparable title _____

(3) Associate Professor, or comparable title _____

(4) Professor, or comparable title _____

h. Chair's location: (1) Stationed in the same, or adjoining, building as I _____

(2) Stationed in a different building than I _____

(3) Stationed on a different campus than I _____

II. Faculty Development Activities.

For the purpose of this study, "faculty development" refers to activities, programs, and procedures which assist faculty in gaining knowledge, training, skills, attitudes, and insights that improve their ability to be more effective in all functions of their professional lives.

Listed below are methods which may be used to **enhance faculty development**. Please read each method. In the blank on the right write a number from 1 to 5 reflecting the **current level of use of this method by the chair of your department**. Use the following five point scale:

1 -Not at all used 2 - Slightly Used 3 -Moderately Used
4 -Used Regularly 5 -Used Constantly

1. Keep faculty informed of opportunities to participate in professional activities. 1._____
2. Maintain an "open door policy" so faculty can speak with her/him at any time. 2._____
3. Monitor faculty progress toward tenure and promotion. 3._____
4. Provide ongoing feedback to faculty regarding regarding their professional performance. 4._____
5. Act as an intermediary for the faculty with the dean's office and higher administration. 5._____
6. Provide resources to support professional activities of faculty (funding, travel, release time, staff support, etc.) 6._____
7. Encourage participation in professional peer groups at the local, state, regional, national level (committees, conferences, publishing, research, etc.) 7._____

1 -Not at all used 2 - Slightly Used 3 -Moderately Used
4 -Used Regularly 5 -Used Constantly

8. Provide positive reinforcement for good performance and accomplishments. 8._____

9. Publicize faculty accomplishments to administrators, fellow faculty, and peer groups. 9._____

10. Lead by example --provide a role model. 10._____

11. Delegate responsibility for projects to faculty to provide growth through progressively more responsible activities. 11._____

12. Assist faculty in getting involved in professional organizations and activities by name dropping, nominating, recommending, etc. 12._____

13. Share advice, wisdom, experience, and expertise. 13._____

14. Communicate the professional expectations of the organization (department, unit, institution). 14._____

15. Provide release time for other professional endeavors. 15._____

16. Encourage faculty collaboration. 16._____

17. Assist faculty in setting realistic, professional goals. 17._____

18. Refer faculty to workshops, centers, or training courses for improving, or providing support for, their capability for growth and development. 18._____

19. Show a personal, individual interest in faculty member's growth and development activities. 19._____

20. Provide regular meetings for groups of faculty to discuss ways to enhance faculty growth and development. 20._____

21. Encourage faculty participation in campus-wide activities and committees. 21._____

22. Be a good listener. 22._____

23. Foster a professional atmosphere, open to ideas and innovation without fear of failure or punishment. 23._____

24. Act as an advocate for resources with the dean's office and higher administration. 24._____

25. Help faculty to identify an area of expertise. 25._____

26. Spend time with faculty informally in social settings. 26._____

27. Support in-house staff development activities (instruction, training, workshops, presentations, etc.) 27._____

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]
OBSERVER

Name of Leader: *Your Department Chair/Head/Team Leader* .

INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked by the leader whose name appears above to assess his or her leadership behaviors. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently this leader engages in the behavior* described.

Here's the rating scale that you'll be using:

1 = Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response, please be realistic about the extent to which the leader *actually* engages in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see this person behave or in terms of how you think he or she should behave. Answer in terms of how the leader *typically* behaves—on most days, on most projects, and with most people.

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement.

To what extent does this person typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the number that best applies to each statement and record it in the blank to the left of the statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

He or She:

_____ 1. Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her own skills and abilities.

_____ 2. Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.

_____ 3. Develops cooperative relationships among the people he or she works with.

_____ 4. Sets a personal example of what he or she expects from others.

_____ 5. Praises people for a job well done.

_____ 6. Challenges people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.

_____ 7. Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.

_____ 8. Actively listens to diverse points of view.

_____ 9. Spends time and energy on making certain that the people he or she works with adhere to the principles and standards that have been agreed on.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

He or She:

_____ 10. Makes it a point to let people know about his or her confidence in their abilities.

_____ 11. Searches outside the formal boundaries of his or her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.

_____ 12. Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.

_____ 13. Treats others with dignity and respect.

_____ 14. Follows through on the promises and commitments that he or she makes.

_____ 15.Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects.

_____ 16. Asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.

_____ 17. Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.

_____ 18. Supports the decisions that people make on their own.

_____ 19. Is clear about his or her philosophy of leadership.

_____ 20. Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.

_____ 21. Experiments and takes risks even when there is a chance of failure.

_____ 22. Is contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.

_____ 23. Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

_____ 24. Makes certain that we set achieveable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.

_____ 25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.

_____ 26. Takes the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.

_____ 27. Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.

_____ 28. Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

_____ 29. Makes progress toward goals one step at a time.

_____ 30. Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Thank You for completing this survey. Please fold it, put it in the stamped, pre-addressed envelope provided, and place it in the mail.

Remember to return the completed survey by **November 25, 1998.**

THANK YOU!

_____ Please check here if you would like to receive a copy of the summary of the findings of this study upon its completion.

APPENDIX D

Creswell's Category Codes and

Preliminary Categorization of Faculty Development Activities (FDA)

Using Those Codes

Codes, Categories, and Illustrations - Practices Chairs Engage in in Assisting Faculty in Their Growth and Development

001 Helping faculty develop and refine skills
- in teaching (modeling, mentoring, critiquing teaching)
- in research (modeling, help choose areas, create teams, specialities)
- through staff development activities (in-house training, speakers, meetings, attend workshops)

002 Helping faculty relate to the organizational environment

- Advocate and promote the needs of faculty: externally, enhance faculty leadership (national visibility, professional associations, off campus networks) and internally, with individuals on campus, mediate for faculty with deans
- the interpersonal environment (faculty to faculty, faculty to staff)
- the departmental environment (atmosphere, openness, friendliness)

003 Helping faculty in an administrative capacity

0031 - Evaluating faculty performance (related to the department and institution - set goals, prioritize goals; related to the individual - goal planning, student evaluations, annual appraisals, feedback; related to faculty careers - promotion and tenure)
0032 - Planning the long-range needs of the department: departmental/institutional planning - goal setting, evaluation, prioritization; individual planning (goal setting, evaluation)
0033 - Schedule adjustments in assignments (released time workloads and assignments)
0034 - Providing material and financial resources (funds - travel, secretarial assistance, in-house, outside); equipment (laboratory, computers, materials) information (grants opportunity flyers, journals)

004 Relating to faculty personally

- listening to faculty using good interpersonal skills (letting them ventilate)
- keeping faculty informed
- social interaction
- giving faculty positive reinforcement, praise and acknowledgement
- using humor

Preliminary categorization of Faculty Development Activities (FDA) using Creswell's Category Codes

001 Helping faculty develop and refine skills

10. Lead by example --provide a role model.
13. Share advice, wisdom, experience, and expertise.
18. Refer faculty to workshops, centers, or training courses for improving, or providing support for, their capability for growth and development.
25. Help faculty to identify an area of expertise.
27. Support in-house staff development activities (instruction, training, workshops, presentations, etc.)

002 Helping faculty relate to the organizational environment

5. Act as an intermediary for the faculty with the dean's office and higher administration.
7. Encourage participation in professional peer groups at the local, state, regional, national level (committees, conferences, publishing, research, etc.)
9. Publicize faculty accomplishments to administrators, fellow faculty, and peer groups.
12. Assist faculty in getting involved in professional organizations and activities by name-dropping, nominating, recommending, etc.
16. Encourage faculty collaboration.
20. Provide regular meetings for groups of faculty to discuss ways to enhance faculty growth and development.
21. Encourage faculty participation in campus-wide activities and committees.
23. Foster a professional atmosphere, open to ideas and innovation without fear of failure or punishment.
24. Act as an advocate for resources with the dean's office and higher administration.

003 Helping faculty in an administrative capacity

3. Monitor faculty progress toward tenure and promotion.
4. Provide ongoing feedback to faculty regarding their professional performance.
6. Provide resources to support professional activities of faculty (funding, travel, release time, staff support, etc.)
11. Delegate responsibility for projects to faculty to provide growth through progressively more responsible activities.
14. Communicate the professional expectations of the organization (department, unit, institution).
15. Provide release time for other professional endeavors.
17. Assist faculty in setting realistic, professional goals.

004 Relating to faculty personally

1. Keep faculty informed of opportunities to participate in professional activities.
2. Maintain an "open door policy" so faculty can speak with her/him at any time.
8. Provide positive reinforcement for good performance and accomplishments.
19. Show a personal, individual interest in faculty member's growth and development activities.
22. Be a good listener.
26. Spend time with faculty informally in social settings.

APPENDIX E

Statements from the

Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI-O)

Grouped by the Five Leadership Practices

Challenging the Process

1. Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her own skills and abilities.
6. Challenges people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.
11. Searches outside the formal boundaries of his or her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
16. Asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.
21. Experiments and takes risks even when there is a chance of failure.
26. Takes the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.

Inspiring a Shared Vision

2. Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
7. Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.
12. Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.
17. Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.
22. Is contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.
27. Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.

Enabling Others to Act

3. Develops cooperative relationships among the people he or she works with.
8. Actively listens to diverse points of view.
13. Treats others with dignity and respect.
18. Supports the decisions that people make on their own.
23. Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
28. Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

Modeling the Way

4. Sets a personal example of what he or she expects from others.
9. Spends time and energy on making certain that the people he or she works with adhere to the principles and standards that have been agreed on.
14. Follows through on the promises and commitments that he or she makes.
19. Is clear about his or her philosophy of leadership.
24. Makes certain that we set achieveable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.
29. Makes progress toward goals one step at a time.

Encouraging the Heart

5. Praises people for a job well done.
10. Makes it a point to let people know about his or her confidence in their abilities.
15. Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects.
20. Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.
25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.
30. Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

APPENDIX F

Request to Dean or Director for List of Non-administrative Library Faculty and Show of Support for Research Survey

University of Nebraska Lincoln

Office of the Dean of Libraries
The University Libraries
P.O. Box 880410
Lincoln, NE 68588-0410
(402) 472-2526
FAX (402) 472-5181

September 25, 1998

<Name>
<Title>
<Institution>
<Campus address>
<City>, <State> <Zip code>

Dear <Title> <Surname>:

A research project is being undertaken to study university library faculty perceptions of department chair leadership practices and role in professional development . The population for this study is non-administrative library faculty at research universities in the United States. The sample frame for this study will be the qualifying non-administrative library faculty of the member institutions of the Big Twelve Plus Library Consortium.

Your assistance is needed to identify those faculty at your institution that meet the criteria for the sample frame. Non-administative faculty excludes Deans or Directors; Assistant or Associate Deans or Directors; or Department or Division Heads or Chairs. **Please forward a list of the names of non-administrative library faculty at your institution meeting these criteria, along with their campus mailing address by October 9, 1998.** The information can be transmitted to me by whichever method is most convenient for you and your staff:

First class mail
Dana W. R. Boden
C. Y. Thompson Library
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0717

Fax: (402) 472-7005

E-mail: danab@unllib.unl.edu

Upon completion, a summary of the findings of the study will be available, upon request, from the researcher.

The information you provide is essential to the success of this study and is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please contact the researcher by e-mail or by telephone at (402) 472-4412.

Sincerely,

Dana W. R. Boden,
Ph.D. Candidate

Joan R. Giesecke,
Dean of Libraries

University of Nebraska Lincoln

Office of the Dean of Libraries
The University Libraries
P.O. Box 880410
Lincoln, NE 68588-0410
(402) 472-2526
FAX (402) 472-5181

November 13, 1998

<Name>
<Title>
<Institution>
<Campus address>
<City>, <State> <Zip code>

Dear <Title> <Surname>:

Thank you for your recent assistance in identifying those faculty at your institution that meet the criteria for the sample frame for a research project to study university library faculty perceptions of the department chair's leadership practices and role in professional development. As you know the sample frame for this study is the non-administrative library faculty of the member institutions of the Big Twelve Plus Library Consortium.

The survey is now being distributed to a sample of those faculty. Library faculty at your institution are included. Again, a show of your support for this research is requested. Please encourage your faculty that may be included in the survey to take a few minutes to complete and return the survey by November 25, 1998.

If you have any questions, please contact the researcher at the following:

Dana W. R. Boden
C. Y. Thompson Library
East Campus
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0717
Phone: (402) 472-4412 Fax: (402) 472-7005
E-mail: danab@unllib.unl.edu

Upon completion, a summary of the findings of the study will be available, upon request, from the researcher.

The information your faculty will provide is essential to the success of this study. Your demonstration of support is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dana W. R. Boden,
Ph.D. Candidate

Joan R. Giesecke,
Dean of Libraries

APPENDIX G

Factor Loadings for the

Faculty Development Activities Instrument

Factor Loadings for the Faculty Development Activities Instrument Using a Forced Four-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Creswell's Categories[b]	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Helping faculty develop and refine skills				
18	.31011	**.66002**	.29347	.19714
13	**.64622**	.28390	.33774	.23727
10	**.61242**	.38234	32752	.21385
25	**.53138**	**.54925**	.24307	.14298
27	.44665	**.50672**	.22440	.30391
Helping faculty relate to the organizational environment				
23	**.82285**	.19813	.19510	.17171
20	.22886	**.74395**	.04484	.00933
21	.35534	**.64551**	.15892	.21991
12	.29256	**.64266**	.26475	.21256
24	**.62711**	.30463	.25534	.35872
7	.08120	**.60600**	.33326	.42850
5	.36178	.21875	.32220	**.53921**
9	**.48888**	.44978	.26024	.31927
16	**.48033**	.39396	.00506	.40596
Helping faculty in an administrative capacity				
15	.28123	.12045	.02577	**.73950**
3	.14908	.10644	**.73275**	.26386
4	.41919	.19729	**.62317**	.01215
6	.12181	.33323	.33978	**.62194**
11	**.60544**	**.45206**	.21013	.03324
17	**.55935**	.38771	.39178	.13938
14	**.47988**	.40150	.37876	.24101
Relating to faculty personally				
22	**.81293**	.18087	.16277	.12507
8	**.67150**	.21529	.23649	.23981
2	**.64904**	.01208	.06191	.38721
19	**.60746**	.41942	.43722	.08732
1	.07090	**.60515**	.35554	.32272
26	**.52291**	.23503	.01804	.12732

[a] Boldface indicates factor loadings of .45 or higher.
[b] See Appendix D.

Factor Loadings for the Faculty Development Activities Instrument Using a Forced Two-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Creswell's Categories[b]	Factor 1	Factor 2
Helping faculty develop and refine skills		
13	**.709**	.398
18	.367	**.703**
10	**.672**	**.466**
25	**.572**	**.549**
27	.435	.419
Helping faculty relate to the organizational environment		
23	**.855**	.228
7	.170	**.795**
24	**.689**	.437
12	.347	**.687**
21	.394	**.647**
20	.217	**.566**
9	**.550**	**.554**
16	**.511**	.448
5	**.456**	**.494**
Helping faculty in an administrative capacity		
6	.230	**.653**
11	**.624**	.374
17	**.622**	.468
14	**.552**	**.525**
4	**.504**	.346
3	.281	**.457**
15	.352	.398
Relating to faculty personally		
22	**.836**	.183
1	.153	**.758**
8	**.719**	.301
2	**.685**	.136
19	**.671**	**.483**
26	**.524**	.189

[a] Boldface indicates factor loadings of .45 or higher.
[b] See Appendix D.

Factor Loadings for the Faculty Development Activities Instrument Using a Forced Single-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Creswell's Categories[b]	Factor 1
Helping faculty develop and refine skills	
10	.811
25	.793
13	.792
18	.743
27	.603
Helping faculty relate to the organizational environment	
24	.805
23	.789
9	.779
21	.725
12	.717
16	.679
5	.669
7	.658
20	.540
Helping faculty in an administrative capacity	
17	.775
14	.761
11	.714
6	.608
4	.606
15	.528
3	.515
Relating to faculty personally	
19	.822
22	.744
8	.736
1	.621
2	.601
26	.516

Cronbach's alpha = .9581

[a] All factor loadings were .5 or higher.
[b] See Appendix D.

APPENDIX H

Factor Loadings for the

Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer

Factor Loadings for the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer Using a Forced Three-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Practice[b]			
Challenging the Process	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
11	**.7816**	.2113	.2953
6	**.7211**	.3625	.3142
1	**.5051**	.0054	**.6730**
21	**.6639**	.3043	.3773
26	**.6053**	.3149	**.5800**
16	**.5973**	.4456	.3393
Inspiring a Shared Vision			
12	**.8727**	.1893	.1313
7	**.8605**	.1355	.2452
17	**.7526**	.3130	.2596
2	**.7330**	.1267	.3797
22	**.7256**	.2979	.3115
27	**.6258**	.2796	.4019
Enabling Others to Act			
23	.1650	**.8542**	.0082
18	.2988	**.7706**	.2568
13	.1630	**.6920**	**.4927**
8	.3890	**.6219**	**.4588**
28	**.6116**	.4288	.4207
3	.3937	**.5717**	**.4888**
Modeling the Way			
14	.1719	**.4961**	**.7226**
4	.3389	.3584	**.7216**
9	**.4665**	.1979	**.5999**
19	**.5664**	.1759	**.5360**
24	.3964	**.4773**	**.5586**
29	.4012	**.4854**	**.5557**
Encouraging the Heart			
20	**.6727**	.3988	.3066
15	**.6713**	.3836	.3811
10	**.6503**	**.4588**	.2956
25	**.6470**	.4088	.2908
30	**.6168**	**.5638**	.3529
5	**.5866**	**.5563**	.2696

[a] Boldface indicates factor loadings of .45 or higher.
[b] See Appendix E.

Factor Loadings for the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer Using a Forced Five-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Practice[b]					
Challenging the Process	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
11	**.721**	.333	.197	.203	.218
6	**.674**	.308	.361	.212	.239
21	**.625**	.329	.306	.383	.083
1	**.530**	.153	.024	**.663**	.186
26	**.495**	.390	.251	**.450**	.373
16	.414	**.521**	.333	.233	.279
Inspiring a Shared Vision					
7	**.838**	.269	.154	.141	.213
12	**.798**	.361	.170	.029	.186
2	**.782**	.131	.194	.300	.205
22	**.607**	**.464**	.239	.284	.128
17	**.572**	**.509**	.205	.096	.342
27	**.507**	.356	.211	.202	.437
Enabling Others to Act					
23	.131	.188	**.862**	.040	.087
18	.267	.222	**.778**	.184	.192
13	.129	.219	**.685**	**.458**	.202
8	.336	.262	**.607**	.339	.325
3	.360	.265	**.571**	**.450**	.198
28	**.497**	.352	.367	.198	**.482**
Modeling the Way					
9	.333	.275	.101	.261	**.726**
4	.309	.230	.346	**.666**	.291
24	.289	.266	.410	.273	**.629**
14	.022	.388	.385	**.622**	.390
29	.255	.347	.387	.290	**.602**
19	**.516**	.278	.155	**.456**	.272
Encouraging the Heart					
25	.354	**.743**	.211	.231	.203
20	.408	**.670**	.223	.185	.304
30	.363	**.665**	.399	.241	.302
15	.424	**.641**	.220	.255	.330
5	.371	**.623**	.423	.242	.137
10	**.459**	**.529**	.342	.149	.332

[a] Boldface indicates factor loadings of .45 or higher.
[b] See Appendix E.

Factor Loadings for the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer Using a Forced Two-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Practice[b]		
Challenging the Process	Factor 1 (Transformational)	Factor 2 (Transactional)
11	**.813**	.278
6	**.748**	.424
21	**.715**	.405
26	**.713**	**.513**
1	**.668**	.280
16	**.630**	**.516**
Inspiring a Shared Vision		
7	**.881**	.183
12	**.858**	.176
2	**.796**	.246
17	**.768**	.353
22	**.757**	.365
27	**.687**	.397
Enabling Others to Act		
13	.235	**.831**
18	.295	**.782**
23	.093	**.748**
8	**.449**	**.740**
3	**.465**	**.709**
28	**.667**	**.538**
Modeling the Way		
14	.322	**.765**
19	**.675**	.372
29	**.497**	**.664**
24	**.494**	**.658**
4	**.493**	**.633**
9	**.595**	.427
Encouraging the Heart		
15	**.717**	**.477**
20	**.697**	**.455**
10	**.668**	**.504**
25	**.667**	**.458**
30	**.643**	**.626**
5	**.592**	**.582**

[a] Boldface indicates factor loadings of .449 or higher
[b] See Appendix E.

Factor Loadings for the Leadership Practices Inventory - Observer Using a Forced Single-Factor Rotation[a]

Item #s grouped by Practice[b]	
Challenging the Process	Factor 1
26	.877
6	.848
16	.814
21	.811
11	.807
1	.695
Inspiring a Shared Vision	
17	.819
22	.818
7	.801
27	.784
12	.778
2	.774
Enabling Others to Act	
28	.857
8	.814
3	.807
18	.721
13	.705
23	.542
Modeling the Way	
29	.804
24	.798
4	.781
19	.759
14	.731
9	.731
Encouraging the Heart	
30	.893
15	.857
10	.836
20	.828
5	.826
25	.807

Cronbach's alpha = .9794

[a] All factor loadings were .54 or higher.
[b] See Appendix E.