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The major purpose of this study was to identify behaviors used by academic department chairpersons to assist faculty professionally and to describe conditions which affect those behaviors. Descriptive research design was employed in this study with major emphasis on the interview method of data collection and subsequent descriptive analysis. The survey population was 30 academic department chairpersons representing ten of the twelve North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture.

Six case studies were presented to demonstrate how chairpersons assist "troubled" faculty. Chairs were convinced that many potential problems could be averted by frequent interaction and continual monitoring of faculty performance. Department heads identified numerous behaviors to support the "movers", reduce the number and magnitude of faculty problems, and foster early detection of those that did occur. Most administrative behaviors were learned "on the job" and from other department heads. The behaviors were most influenced by
two conditions: (1) the declining resource base, (2) support from higher administration.

The implications of the study relate primarily to training and support of academic department chairpersons with emphasis on institutional policy and practice. The development of pre-service and in-service training directed toward faculty development and other issues confronting academic department chairs is warranted. The impact of chairpersons' effectiveness as faculty developers could be enhanced by more direct institutional support. In this regard, deans and other administrators in Colleges of Agriculture can assist chairpersons in their efforts to enhance faculty growth and development by: (1) selecting academic department heads based as much on management qualifications as the person's reputation as a scholar; (2) providing pre-service and in-service training in human resource management; (3) evaluating chairpersons in part on the basis of successful faculty development efforts; and, (4) recognizing and rewarding efforts to enhance the growth and development of faculty.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A college or university is only as good as its faculty. As Dressel (1981) writes, "The major work of the university is done by the faculty...and coordinated by administrative sources" (p. 27). Indeed, the faculty together with academic department heads in particular, are key to the successful operation of the university. Given the importance of faculty within the institution, their development and continued productivity becomes critical to the vitality of the university. While much has been accomplished in meeting the evolving development needs of faculty, attention to the state of the professoriate is especially critical today as environmental conditions in higher education continue to deteriorate (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Kanter, 1979; Schuster & Bowen, 1985). The reality of declining enrollments and diminishing resources has caused faculty to see themselves as "stuck" in the career structure of the organization (Kanter, 1979). These and additional factors including the phenomenon of the aging professoriate, the drop in real pay, and the growing employment of part-time faculty may cause a substantial number of the best people to leave higher education (Schuster &
Bowen, 1985). Those who remain may need help to remain vital, productive members of the institution. These factors contribute to a need for renewed interest in faculty development.

A variety of approaches to faculty development exist in institutions of higher education. Faculty development efforts have focused on the personal and professional needs of faculty in the organization and more recently on all aspects of the faculty member's life. The first programs in the contemporary faculty development movement emphasized instructional improvement as research efforts of a number of scholars focused on college teaching (Centra, 1976; Hildebrand, Wilson & Dienst, 1971; McKeachie, 1969). Later the institution's responsibility to the personal and professional growth and development of faculty was acknowledged spawning the organizational development movement (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Lawrie, 1979; Schmuck, 1972; Toombs, 1983, 1985). Recent faculty development efforts address the needs of faculty as they pass through various stages of chronological maturation (Baldwin, 1984). Sometimes referred to as the developmental approach, faculty development in this arena falls within the context of adult and career development (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Freedman, 1979; Hodgkinson, 1974; Levinson, 1978; Schein, 1978; Weathersby & Tarule, 1980).
One promising and economical approach to faculty development builds on the current institutional structure by working through "first-line" administration in higher education, the academic department chairperson. If, as Dressel (1981) suggests, most faculty find that their immediate concerns and involvement in the institution are through their departments, then department heads are in a particularly pivotal position to encourage, support, and recognize growth and development activities of their faculty.

While department heads acknowledge their responsibility for the enhancement of faculty growth and development (Boice, 1985), they are poorly prepared to assume this role. Most department chairs are promoted to these positions through the academic ranks with little or no leadership training and without a clear understanding of the skills of managing and facilitating the growth of faculty and staff. Knight and Holen (1985) contend that this inexperience "...intensifies the need for information concerning the behavior characteristics of department chairpersons who are perceived to be effective" (p. 685).

Most investigators, while acknowledging the development of faculty as a legitimate function of the department head (Bragg, 1980; McLaughlin, Montgomery & Malpass, 1975; Smart & Elton, 1976) and even a preferred
role (McLaughlin, et al., 1975), have limited their discussions to the identification of roles rather than an examination of specific behaviors. Tucker (1984) and Bennett (1983), for example, described the roles, functions and responsibilities of department chairpersons based on data collected from over 1,000 administrators since 1980. Other investigators have studied the complexity of the role (Bragg, 1980; McLaughlin, et al., 1981; Smart & Elton, 1976) with emphasis on the technical functions (e.g., budgeting, scheduling) rather than the human resource functions (e.g., leadership, personnel and program planning, problem-solving). Wheeler, et al., (1986) described the roles and activities used by outstanding department heads to assist faculty growth and development. The researchers concluded that the chairpersons have little or no training for the roles identified.

These studies suggest that while numerous roles and functions of the academic department chairperson have been identified, there is more written about the "technical functions" than the "human resource functions". In addition, studies identifying specific behaviors used by department heads are limited. What is needed is more research on the "practical dimensions" of the position (Tucker, 1984) with major emphasis on the identification of "behavior characteristics" of effective department
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine behaviors of academic department chairpersons from the North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture who have significantly enhanced the professional growth of faculty in their departments. Specifically, the objectives of this study were to (1) identify excellent department chair behaviors that assist faculty professionally, and (2) describe conditions which affect these behaviors (e.g., factors that influence behaviors, sources of information that helped chairpersons arrive at these behaviors, satisfactions and dissatisfactions, and advice to new chairs). Excellent chairs were selected from a list generated by each College of Agriculture dean and College of Agriculture chairpersons on the campus where the chairs work.

Major Research Questions

The study addressed the following questions:

1. What are the behaviors excellent chairpersons employ to assist faculty professionally?
2. Are there specific conditions that influence these behaviors (e.g., factors that influence behaviors, sources of information that help chairpersons arrive at these behaviors, satisfactions and dissatisfactions, and advice to new chairs)?

Definition of Terms

**Academic Department:** The basic administrative unit of the college housing a community of scholars that is relatively autonomous and responsible for instruction and research within a specialized field of knowledge (McHenry, p. 2, 1977).

**Academic Department Chairperson:** The designated individual charged with the management of a department and responsible to the dean of a college or comparable administrator. For the purpose of this study, no distinction is made among the titles department chairperson, department chair, and department head.

**Excellent Chairperson:** Academic department chairs who significantly enhance the professional growth and development of faculty in their units as identified by deans and department chairs.

**Faculty Development:** Programs and activities which help faculty to be more effective in their professional roles. It includes a concern for improving the conditions of student learning, awareness of changes in the
role of the professor, and involvement in the overall effectiveness of the institution (Freedman, 1973).

**North Central Region:** A designated region of the Agriculture Division of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). The region includes twelve states: Nebraska, Illinois, Kansas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Michigan.

### Assumptions

This study was conducted within the framework of the following assumptions:

1. The chairpersons see the development of faculty as part of their role and responsibility.
2. The selection of excellent chairs in Colleges of Agriculture will provide a fair and representative sample of the larger population.
3. The use of survey research was adequate for collecting data on behaviors utilized by department chairpersons to enhance faculty growth and development.
4. The answers given by excellent chairpersons to the survey questions were objective and to the best of their personal opinions and beliefs.
5. The study relied on the population judgement of the deans and chairpersons in the identification of excellent chairs.
Delimitations

The study was conducted under the following delimitations:

1. This study was primarily concerned with the behaviors utilized by excellent department chairpersons to assist faculty professionally.
2. The design for the study was descriptive.
3. The population involved in the study was confined to chairpersons in Colleges of Agriculture identified as "excellent" by deans and chairpersons.

Significance of the Study

In general, chairs remain largely unstudied (Miles, 1983; Weinberg, 1984). Past studies have limited their discussions to the identification of roles and functions and responsibilities of department chairs (Bennett, 1983; Tucker, 1984). No substantial examination has been made of the behaviors chairs use to assist faculty professionally. There is, then, an important need to conduct research on behaviors of chairs that further faculty growth and vitality in a department. In addition to expanding the research base on academic department heads and exploring the behaviors of chairs as faculty developers, information gathered in this investigation could provide chairpersons, both new and expe-
rienced, with proven methods for assisting faculty professionally.

Since most successful administrative development programs use experienced chairs to educate new chairs (Booth, 1982; Bragg, 1981), further significance of this study is seen in its potential for providing information which could be used by administrative development practitioners. Finally, faculty could benefit from the study as chairs begin to initiate effective development behaviors within their units.

**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 with the major emphasis directed toward the role of the department head and current trends in faculty development is contained in Chapter II.

A discussion relevant to the research methods used in this study is provided in Chapter III.

The results of the data and a discussion of those results are presented in Chapter IV.

A summary of the study and conclusions drawn from the research efforts are given in Chapter V. Implications and recommendations conclude the chapter.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The academic department has traditionally maintained a central position in the organizational structure of colleges and universities. Heimler (1967) suggests that eighty percent of the academic decisions made in the university are made at the department level.

Numerous authors label the academic department vital to the functioning of the university (Corson, 1975; Dressel, et al., 1970; Euwema, 1953; Heimler, 1967; McHenry, 1977; Waltzer, 1975) and key to the successful achievement of the university's mission of teaching, research, and public service (Anderson, 1968; Dilley, 1972; Ikenberry & Friedman, 1972; Roach, 1976). As Bennett (1983) asserts, "It is at the department level that the real institutional business gets conducted" (p. 1). Given the importance of the academic department within the institution, the department head becomes a critical link, fostering the professional and intellectual development of his or her faculty while providing leadership to accomplish the university's mission. Clearly, the department head working closely with faculty enhances the effective operation of the university. Murray (1964) concurs, indicating "...the relative success of the governance within an academic
institution is measured not so much by the success or skill with which it is governed at the top but by the success and skill with which its basic academic units govern themselves" (p. 236).

The level and quality of interaction between the department head and faculty is determined in part by the manner in which the department is governed. If the department head functions in such a way as to stimulate creativity and cooperation among faculty, the productivity and reputation of the academic institution will be enhanced.

This literature review first examines research on the governance of academic departments and the roles, functions and responsibilities of department heads. A discussion of the trends of the faculty development movement follows. A review of the appropriate ownership of faculty development efforts concludes the chapter.

The Academic Department Head

Governance

Bennett (1983) suggests that each department head should be clear about the character of his or her authority, "...each chair must recognize the difference between power over others that comes from the position itself and power with others that comes from one's own personal resources" (p. 13). Researchers who have inves-
tigated the scope of the chairman's authority or modes of decision making in academic departments have found a wide variation. For example, Caplow and McGee (1965) identified seven types of department chairmen in their study of five public and four private institutions. The authors offer a feudal analogy to the authority of the department chair's position identifying, for example, "... the 'robber baron' who functions as an absolute autocrat, 'the Lord of the Mountain Fief' who is apt to be a benevolent despot; the 'yeoman farmer' who toils in his fields with his men and is distinguishable from them only occasionally, and the 'boy ruler' who does the work of the chairmanship for his elders, while taking orders from them" (p. 168).

Dressel, Johnson and Marcus (1970) also classify department heads according to the level of participation by department members in the decision-making process. Six categories were identified including autocratic, paternalistic, oligarchic, bureaucratic, democratic, or laissez-faire. Dressel et al. (1970) have also classified the department head decision making process as a continuum along which the performance of certain administrative tasks are measured. In their study of department heads at fifteen major universities, the authors suggested that the administrative styles of department
chairmen could be labeled as "doers", "delegators", and "dalliers" according to the activities they performed.

Murray (1964) examined departmental development at 22 universities and concluded that while departments "...possessed no common departmental organizational structure...collectively they displayed a discernible pattern of department development which was intimately connected with university size, general campus administrative complexity and institutional prestige" (p. 228). He identified five stages of departmental development which range from autocratic headship in the small, less prestigious department to progressively larger prestigious departments in which the head has less formal power.

Other environmental factors are linked to variations in departmental decision making organization. Researchers find this decision making organization varies by discipline, the differing intellectual paradigms of departments (Demerath, Stephens, & Taylor, 1967), and by issue (Hobbes & Anderson, 1971). In the view of these researchers, expectations about the developmental role of the department head are likely to vary from department to department and from issue to issue and may be contingent, to some degree, on the field of the department and as Murray (1964) suggests, on its size, prestige, and stage of development.
A study by Hill and French (1967) presents data which apparently contradicts the conclusion of Murray. Their study in five state supported four-year colleges in two western states examined the power of department chairs as perceived by faculty. However, since their criterion measure was faculty perceptions rather than observations as recorded in the Murray and Caplow and McGee studies, their conclusions must in part be qualified (perceived power versus systematic observation). The Hill and French sample was consistent with those institutions in Murray's Stage 1 and Stage 2, dictatorial department chairmen. However, in the Hill and French study, "...faculty felt the department chair had less influence than any other group in the university, even less than faculty" (p. 558). The validity of both studies can be questioned--Murray's on the basis that observations were too casual; Hill and French's on the basis of a sample limited to a homogeneous group of institutions and the criterion measure of the faculty perception of power rather than actual power.

Gross and Grambsch (1968) in their survey of faculty and administrators at 68 universities, identified perceptions of the department chair's power which are similar to the perceptions recorded by Hill and French. Chairs were perceived to possess less total power than any other internal constituency except students. They
stated that "...the faculty is usually rated as having more power than do departmental chairmen as a group" (p. 99). At the same time, the authors suggest that a range of perceived power of chairs exists across institutions and that, at least in some institutions, "...chairmen as a group are perceived as having considerable say in decision making" (p. 93). Hill and French (1967) contend that the greater the power of the academic department head, the greater the level of faculty satisfaction and the greater the likelihood of improved faculty productivity. Gross and Grambsch concur "...where chairmen are powerful (relative to their counterparts at other universities), the well-being of the faculty receives heavy stress...and the professional development of the faculty are matters of concern" (p.93).

Although these studies suggest that each institutional and departmental case with respect to the chair's authority must be weighed separately, in general the effective department chair exercises influence rather than formal control. The successful chairperson, according to Peterson (1970), "...adopts an administrative style which is personally supportive, fosters communication, involves as many as possible in decision making and relies on expertise, as opposed to one who uses bureaucratic techniques" (p. 5).
Katz and Kahn (1966) contend that administrators in institutions of higher education possess much less power than authority figures in other types of organizations. This phenomena of limited power is particularly distressing to the academic department head as he confronts seemingly limitless roles. To be sure, an astonishing variety of tasks and duties face the department head. The roles, functions, and responsibilities of department heads were described by Tucker (1984) based on data collected from over 1,000 administrators since 1980. In a project funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Tucker designed and tested a model for planned change in higher education that would enhance the planning, management, and leadership competencies of department chairs within the nine institutions of the state university system of Florida. Subsequently, information was gathered from department chairs in colleges and universities outside of Florida. Based on this work, Tucker identified several categories of responsibilities, including department governance, instruction, faculty and student affairs, external communication, budget and resources, office management, and professional development. In the case of professional development, Tucker identified specific ways in which the department head can assist faculty growth and development including:

**Role Description**

Katz and Kahn (1966) contend that administrators in institutions of higher education possess much less power than authority figures in other types of organizations. This phenomena of limited power is particularly distressing to the academic department head as he confronts seemingly limitless roles. To be sure, an astonishing variety of tasks and duties face the department head. The roles, functions, and responsibilities of department heads were described by Tucker (1984) based on data collected from over 1,000 administrators since 1980. In a project funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Tucker designed and tested a model for planned change in higher education that would enhance the planning, management, and leadership competencies of department chairs within the nine institutions of the state university system of Florida. Subsequently, information was gathered from department chairs in colleges and universities outside of Florida. Based on this work, Tucker identified several categories of responsibilities, including department governance, instruction, faculty and student affairs, external communication, budget and resources, office management, and professional development. In the case of professional development, Tucker identified specific ways in which the department head can assist faculty growth and development including:
Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests
Foster good teaching in the department
Stimulate faculty research and publications
Encourage faculty members to participate in regional and national professional meetings (p. 3).

Faculty development is identified by other investigators as a legitimate function of the department head. McLaughlin, Montgomery and Malpass (1975) gathered information from 1,198 department heads at 32 Ph.D.-granting public institutions in the United States. They identified three roles of the department head: (1) the academic role which consists of involvement with students and research; (2) the administrative role of record keeping and a link with the rest of the institution; and, (3) a leadership role of personnel and program development.

Using data from the McLaughlin et al. study, Smart and Elton (1976) identified 27 department head responsibilities which they combined into four roles: (1) the faculty role of personnel development and morale building; (2) the coordinating role of planning and representing; (3) the research role of grant management and graduate student supervision; and, (4) the instructional role of teaching, advising, and record keeping.

In an unrelated investigation, Bragg (1980) identified four role orientations characterized by a primary focus on faculty, external relations, program, or management. Using information gathered from 39 department
heads at Pennsylvania State University, she examined the socialization of academic department heads to the headship role. Sixteen of the 39 heads interviewed were found to concentrate their efforts more on the faculty orientation role than the other three roles. These heads "...described their primary responsibilities as recruiting, developing, and evaluating faculty members, facilitating the work of the faculty, reducing intra-departmental conflict, and improving faculty morale" (p. 116).

Although department heads prefer the duties associated with professorial and development roles, they usually spend more time performing tasks of the managerial role (McLaughlin, Montgomery, & Malpass, 1975). This is substantiated by Waltzer (1975) who states that:

The chairman...agreed strongly that their time and energy are so consumed with clerical paperpushing and routines that they cannot adequately do the desired job of leading, planning, developing, relating, coordinating, and evaluation. The busy work is shoving out academic and professional leadership (p. 16).

These researchers and others (e.g., Baldridge, 1971; Bennett, 1982; Booth 1982; Bragg, 1980) suggest that role conflict is a major problem of department heads. "Indicative of this is the fact that department heads have variously been described as arms of management, arms of administration, the grass roots administration, liaison men, and forgotten men" (Sharma, p. 35,
It would appear from the research cited above that department heads are especially vulnerable to pressures resulting from role conflict because of differences in role perceptions and expectations. Others, however, challenge this notion.

Falk (1979) examined the role of department chairs as perceived by faculty, chairs and higher administrators at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not 46 activities were the responsibility of the department head. The 46 activities were divided into six categories: (1) production activities; (2) maintenance activities; (3) supportive activities; (4) boundary (institutional support) activities; (5) adaptive activities; and (6) selected managerial activities. Falk found a high level of agreement between the three groups questioned.

Siever, Loomis, and Neidt (1972) surveyed faculty and administrators to determine their perceptions of the role of department heads at two land-grant universities. The respondents were asked to rank characteristics of effective departmental chairmen. Again, faculty and administrators generally agreed on what chairman characteristics were most and least important. Those characteristics identified as most important centered around internal responsibilities of the chair, e.g., developing outstanding students, developing good teaching.
of least importance were characteristics centering around involvement outside the department.

Although these studies indicate general agreement as to appropriate functions of the department head, actual behaviors appear to confirm the presence of role ambiguity. Moses (1984) interviewed faculty in one Australian university to determine expectations and perceptions of their head's role. Faculty stressed the head's "encouragement" function, i.e., "... staff wanted their head to encourage good teaching in the department, to stimulate research and publications, and to take account of each staff member's special talents and interests" (np). In reality the majority of faculty contended that while research and publication was encouraged, department heads rarely noted excellence in teaching suggesting a difference between faculty expectations of the department head and demonstrated behavior.

On the basis of the research cited above, the department head role can best be described as multifaceted. Four separate sub-roles can be identified: a managerial role; a representer role; a development role; and a professorial role (Bragg, 1980). Since most heads were once faculty (Knight & Holen, 1985; Tucker, 1984), there is less difficulty associated with performing the professorial role (in spite of time restraints) because of known expectations. The three remaining roles, how-
ever, present department heads with a continuing search for clarification.

The representer role, for example, requires mental agility and acumen. Since a department head is usually a member of the university faculty and has at some point in time been a full-time teaching member of the faculty, he or she may feel comfortable representing the views of faculty to higher levels of administration. The department head, however, must advocate on behalf of the college's and university's interest to his faculty (Brann & Emmet, 1972). "He or she has the dual obligation of interpreting to the administration the needs and wishes of the department and of communicating to his colleagues the basis for decisions made by the dean..." (Corson, p. 251, 1975) and other administrative officers. This potential source of stress between the chairman and the members of his or her department has been identified by Caplow and McGee (1965) as the 'Swivel Effect' in which "...the chairman finds himself in the middle between his allegiance to his faculty on the one hand and his responsibility to and need in higher administration" (p. 167).

Although efficiency and effectiveness of the department head in the managerial role is more easily demonstrated and evaluated than success in other roles, it remains a source of ambiguity (Dressel, 1981). Since
most heads of academic departments are promoted from the faculty ranks, they have excelled in teaching and research rather than management. As manager, the department head assumes responsibility in faculty and support personnel actions, facilities and work scheduling (Millett, 1978), and administering the department budget (Tucker, 1984). It is not uncommon for department heads to spend more than 50 percent of their time in such administrative endeavors (Davidson, 1967). Although recent attention to the development of managerial competencies for department heads is apparent (Bennett, 1983; Booth, 1982; Tucker, 1984), the managerial role continues to be a source of stress and frustration.

"The department head's development role consists of planning and policy making in the areas of personnel, curricular and research programs, and budgeting" (Bragg, p.12, 1980). Expectations regarding the development role are especially unclear in the area of faculty development. Traditionally, faculty development was accomplished through participation in conferences, consulting, or an occasional sabbatical. The chair merely encouraged such participation and occasionally provided travel funds. Faculty often relied on the infusion of new ideas through the appointment of new faculty. With the advent of declining resources in higher education,
the traditional methods fall short of satisfying the needs of an immobile faculty.

At this point, research on the role of department heads has concentrated on describing the department's organization for decision-making (Caplow & McGee, 1965; Dressel, Johnson & Marcus, 1970; Hill & French, 1967; Gross & Grambsch, 1968); Murray, 1964). Other studies have examined the responsibilities of the department head (McLaughlin, Montgomery & Malpass, 1975; Smart & Elton, 1976; Tucker, 1984) identifying four separate sub-roles: a managerial role; a representer role; a development role; and a professorial role, (Bragg, 1980). While most investigators acknowledge the development of faculty as a legitimate function of the department head, few have examined specific behaviors used by effective chairpersons to assist faculty professionally.

Faculty Development in Higher Education

Background

Faculty development in higher education is a term used to describe programs and activities which help faculty to be more effective in their professional roles. In addition, it includes a concern for improving the conditions of student learning, awareness of changes in the role of the professor, and involvement in the over-
all effectiveness of the institution (Bakker, 1977; Freedman, 1973).

In the early years of the American university system, faculty were expected to be responsible for their own development. The institution encouraged this development providing sabbatical leaves, funds, and release time to pursue scholarly interests (Stinnett, 1962). Faculty, then, were to ensure their continued professional status through study, research and publishing. Although changes have occurred in faculty development programming during the intervening years, today nearly a century later, faculty continue to be primarily responsible for their own development. After reviewing the literature and identifying twenty-five institutions with professional development programs, Belker (1985) notes that most programs operate under traditional concepts of faculty development which place responsibility for development on the individual faculty member. Eash and Lane (1985) concur. "The chief way of dealing with faculty development appears to be on an individual basis with heavy reliance on individual faculty initiative to seek out professional growth..."(p. 133).

This section of the review of literature first examines the unique needs of faculty and conditions stimulating faculty development efforts. A discussion of approaches to faculty development with emphasis on par-
and ownership follows. A review of the chairperson's role in faculty development concludes the chapter.

Unique Needs of Faculty

Members of any profession need to maintain competence and keep abreast of new information, methods, and technologies in their fields. Faculty in institutions of higher education, however, face unique needs that must be addressed (Hapberg, 1981). First, there is little or no orientation upon entry into the profession. Second, the faculty role generally includes the components of teaching, research and service, each of which is in conflict with the other.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) note that most college professors are not trained to teach. In addition, teaching seems to hold low status in the reward structure (Astin, 1985). Moses (1985) supports this finding noting that "...higher education staff are expected to learn on the job with little extrinsic reward for participation in instructional improvement activities" (p. 81). Moses also found that new faculty desired more support for research activity through opportunities to work on research projects with senior professors. These and similar conflicts brought about by the various faculty roles should be the target of faculty development efforts.
In addition to these special needs of faculty, trends in the growth and direction of higher education also fostered the faculty development movement. In the mid-1960s increasing enrollment and high mobility resulted in accelerated growth and turnover in faculty. This new blood kept the atmosphere of the academic organization active and vibrant. During the 1970s, with fewer students entering institutions of higher education, the demand for faculty was reduced. This resulted in lower faculty mobility and hampered the university's ability to meet the changing needs of students by restricting the influx of new ideas. These and other dramatic changes reinforced the need for faculty development (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Hodgkinson, 1985; Schuster & Bowen).

**Conditions Stimulating Faculty Development Efforts**

During the 1970s, colleges and universities were faced with a significant change in both the student and faculty population (Nelson & Siegel, 1979). The movement toward mass education produced a more heterogeneous student population and the older student became a reality (Preus, et al., 1979). This increase in nontraditional students with different goals, expectations, and learning styles required faculty to make adjustments in the classroom. Significant changes also occurred in the faculty ranks. Faculty hired during the 1950s and 1960s
earned tenure and, for a variety of reasons, chose to stay, creating an aging professoriate. These professors entered higher education during the boom years and, consequently, had high expectations which have not, and are not likely to be fulfilled.

Those faculty who began their careers in the 1950s and early 1960s experienced another source of stress. Initially, their primary function was teaching. Today, faculty are expected to emphasize research leaving older faculty feeling disenfranchised and bitter (Lawrence, 1984). It has also created resentment in younger faculty who feel, justifiably, that expectations for promotion and tenure have been increased (Schuster & Bowen, 1985).

In the decade of the eighties, more than ever before, the condition of institutions of higher education in general, and of the professoriate in particular, is a major concern (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Kanter, 1979; Schuster & Bowen, 1985). The reality of declining enrollments and diminishing resources continues to cause concern on most college and university campuses across the country. These trends are likely to continue (Hodgkinson, 1985) resulting in lowered faculty mobility, a sharp decline in real earnings (Schuster & Bowen, 1985) and fewer opportunities for personal and professional development (Kanter, 1977). During any period of
change, a central issue which must be addressed is whether an organization can maintain academic excellence without fostering faculty vitality. Faculty development programs present institutions of higher education with opportunities to keep faculty current and build excellence from within.

Approaches to Faculty Development

A variety of approaches to faculty development exist in the literature. This diversity is healthy in that it permits advocates of faculty development to address very different faculties and to interact with them in various circumstances. Some generally accepted approaches are discussed in this section.

The first programs in the contemporary faculty development movement emphasized instructional improvement due, in part, to the efforts of a number of scholars engaged in research on college teaching (Centra, 1976; Hildebrand, Wilson & Dienst, 1971; McKeachie, 1969). These researchers and others attempted to redefine "good" teaching and instructional development became a major focus of effective teaching. Hildebrand, Wilson and Dienst (1971) attempted to measure effective teaching by supplementing traditional student surveys with collegial ratings and self-evaluations. The accuracy of rating instruments in the evaluation of teaching was also addressed by Hoyt and Howard (1978). These
studies reflect an emphasis on the empirical approach to evaluating instruction. Similar efforts have focused on instructional development.

In a survey of Illinois faculty and administrators at a public university, a private university, and a community college, Eash and Lane (1985) reported that most programs were aimed at improvement of instruction and failed to address the broader issues related to institutional mission or the conditions of declining resources and changing needs. Similar studies about the effectiveness of faculty development programs have been conducted (Braxton, 1978; Crow et al., 1976). All reveal that the instructional function has been overemphasized to the virtual exclusion of professional development. Nevertheless, Bergquist and Phillips (1981) advocate the improvement of instruction as the legitimate focus of faculty development programs "...we continue to emphasize instructional development and offer some of our own ideas about the ways in which a variety of instructional methods can be responsive to the increasing diversity of student needs, interests, and learning styles in the 1980s" (p. vii). Although instructional improvement is a valid part of faculty development, to conclude that instructional development is the only legitimate subject of faculty development is to suggest
that teaching is the only activity that faculty engage in professionally.

According to some researchers, one area of faculty responsibility which has not been adequately addressed within the framework of the faculty development movement is the research component (Wheeler & Creswell, 1985). Faculty research development efforts are generally limited to traditional activities such as sabbatical leaves, grant writing workshops, and travel to professional conferences. As institutions of higher education continue to emphasize the research role of faculty (Schuster & Bowen, 1985), the need for more broadly defined faculty development programs becomes apparent. New efforts which include activities focusing on research skills could enhance the scholarly productivity of faculty.

Another view of faculty development emphasizes the institution's responsibility to the growth and development of faculty. Blackburn and Baldwin (1983) note that the organizational development perspective is built on the assumption that individuals have an inherent capacity and desire for growth, and it is to the institution's advantage to promote that self-actualization. Numerous authors have written about such topics as managing change and organizational development in higher education (Argyris, 1962; Baldridge, et al., 1983; Etzioni,
Miles, 1965). All concur that persons working within an organization who are affected by its procedures, structures and methods should be involved in developmental programs.

Recent faculty development efforts address the needs of faculty as they pass through various stages of chronological maturation (Baldwin, 1984). Sometimes referred to as the developmental view, faculty development in this arena falls within the context of adult and career development (Baldwin, 1979; Freedman, 1979; Schein, 1978; Weathersby & Tarule, 1980) which maintains that adult development like adolescence, is characterized primarily by growth. From the works of Levinson (1978) Maslow (1970) and others, this approach has been widely publicized. Baldwin (1984) notes that "...professors progress through a series of sequential career stages characterized by different demands, motivations, rewards, and professional development needs" (p. 46).

Schein (1978) focuses attention on this approach identifying three basic career stages. In the first stage, the faculty member focuses on assuming the appropriate role, contributing to the organization, and attaining permanent membership. In the academic environment, tenure would represent completion of this stage. The second stage is marked by attention to one's specialty. In this stage the worker has to cope with
1961; Miles, 1965). All concur that persons working within an organization who are affected by its procedures, structures and methods should be involved in developmental programs.

Recent faculty development efforts address the needs of faculty as they pass through various stages of chronological maturation (Baldwin, 1984). Sometimes referred to as the developmental view, faculty development in this arena falls within the context of adult and career development (Baldwin, 1979; Freedman, 1979; Schein, 1978; Weathersby & Tarule, 1980) which maintains that adult development like adolescence, is characterized primarily by growth. From the works of Levinson (1978) Maslow (1970) and others, this approach has been widely publicized. Baldwin (1984) notes that "...professors progress through a series of sequential career stages characterized by different demands, motivations, rewards, and professional development needs" (p. 46).

Schein (1978) focuses attention on this approach identifying three basic career stages. In the first stage, the faculty member focuses on assuming the appropriate role, contributing to the organization, and attaining permanent membership. In the academic environment, tenure would represent completion of this stage. The second stage is marked by attention to one's specialty. In this stage the worker has to cope with
competition from newcomers, becomes a mentor, and focuses more attention on a balance between work and family responsibilities. In the last stage, tasks of stage two continue but time is spent on preparation for retirement and disengaging from the work environment. Others acknowledge the existence of faculty career stages characterized by specific motivations and needs (Baldwin, 1984; Lawrence, 1984). It must be cautioned, however, that individual differences exist within each career stage necessitating multiple development approaches.

From a major focus on instructional improvement to an emphasis on organizational development, programs today are moving toward development of the faculty member in all aspects of his or her professional and personal life with consideration to the needs of faculty as they pass through various career stages. Additionally, some now advocate development programs which extend to include faculty spouses (Hapberg, 1981). While the majority of authors conclude that faculty development approaches should seek to address issues involving the "total" person, on the whole, current faculty development programs continue to emphasize instructional improvement activities. In addition, faculty continue to be primarily responsible for their own development (Belker, 1985; Eash & Lane, 1985), a situation which...
suggests little significant departure from the approach of the early 1900s.

**Faculty Participation in Development Programs**

Centra (1976) examined the extent of faculty participation in various development activities, their perceived effectiveness, and how development programs were funded and organized in 756 institutions of higher education across the United States. Five categories of practices were identified: (1) workshops, seminars or similar presentations; (2) assessment procedures; (3) media, technology, or course development activities; (4) institution-wide practices including sabbatical leaves or teaching awards; and (5) a miscellaneous set of five practices. Data were collected from faculty development directors, faculty working part-time as coordinators of development activities, and deans. Centra concluded that there was a wide variation in programs in faculty development. Some colleges had a few uncoordinated practices, some had limited faculty development programs, while others reportedly had development programs which appeared to operate on the fringes of the institutions. Such peripheral efforts generally experienced minimal faculty participation.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) and Toombs (1983) note that participation in faculty development programs
has been hampered by the absence of any recognized connection between individual change and its subsequent impact on the institution. Changes in the individual affect the organization, and there are problems if programs change people without considering the impact on the organization. Too often, faculty have been trained to do something through an aggressive faculty development effort simply to find that the institution does not want it (Bergquist & Phillips, 1981).

Others suggest that participation in faculty development programs could be enhanced if more attention were focused on determining the needs of faculty (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Claxton & Murrell, 1984; Nelson, 1983). Tucker (1981), for example, notes that faculty must perceive the need to change before they will make a commitment to any development activity.

Lovett (1984) described a technique for determining the developmental needs of faculty called the Faculty Opportunities Audit. The audit includes two parallel sets of questions, one set to help faculty assess their professional situations and relationships to the institution and the other set to help administrators analyze how the institution provides for faculty growth and development. Lovett thought that the audit could lead to a clarification of both faculty and administrator expectations which could facilitate faculty development
program planning. Development activities based upon this and other needs assessment instruments could promote faculty participation. Belker (1985) challenges this notion. He contends that the faculty most in need of revitalization, as measured by poor student evaluations and sparse research activity, are the ones least likely to participate. Moses (1985) concurs that even when faculty are interested in development programs, their participation is not guaranteed.

One reason for this lack of interest may be the result of the mistakes made during the early stages of the contemporary faculty development movement. The method of initiating faculty development programs often created problems. For example, administrators brought in consultants to "deal with" faculty obsolescence. In addition, consultants often over-estimated the power of their ideas to bring about change (Nelson & Siegel, 1980). Such approaches left faculty justifiably skeptical and participation was disappointing. Although a valid segment of faculty development, instructional development became the primary focus of many programs in the 1970s to the exclusion of other segments of faculty life. This emphasis on instruction has been cited as the cause for nonparticipation in faculty development programs.
Blackburn and Baldwin (1983), however, suggest that the reason for low faculty participation may be the perceptions by faculty that they do not need faculty development programs. Surveys show that most faculty feel their performance in the classroom is above average, and student evaluations seem to bear this out. In addition, faculty may know how to meet their own learning needs outside of the formal structure of faculty development programs. The validity of the latter explanation is questionable. Nelson (1983) suggests that the need still exists but is receiving less attention because of other pressing issues.

Early programs in the contemporary faculty development movement focused on instructional improvement. This was followed by an emphasis on organizational development and today, programs are moving away from the institutional perspective toward development of the faculty member in all aspects of life. In spite of these significant changes in approaches to faculty development, participation remains low. In addition, the number of faculty development programs is decreasing. Bergquist reports that in the early 1970s, there were approximately 40 faculty development programs, 200 in the year 1975, and 1,000, as reported by Centra, in 1977. A computer search by the National Task Force on Faculty Development for Colleges of Agriculture of seven
databases and other literature during the first five months of 1985, revealed approximately 400 faculty development programs--a 150% decrease during the last eight years.

The factors that stimulated the initial growth of faculty development programs are still with us in the 1980s. Since the early 1970s, however, when the faculty development movement gained popularity, the ownership of programs has remained a major obstacle in sustaining faculty development programs in higher education.

Ownership

Neff (1976) examined the opinions of faculty and administrators regarding the appropriate ownership, priorities and emphasis of faculty development programs in higher education. His study, conducted in thirty-four branches of the State University of New York (SUNY) System, included colleges of liberal arts, specialized colleges, medical centers, technical colleges, and colleges of agriculture. Neff found that faculty believed that faculty development programs should be organized at the central administration level. This need for coordination and leadership from central administration was acknowledged by Maher (1981). Administrators in Neff's study, however, indicated that faculty development programs should be organized at all institutional levels.
Other researchers agree that the administration should have a role in the initiation and maintenance of faculty development programs, but consensus about the level of involvement is missing. Eash and Lane (1985), for example, suggested a need for administrative initiative to foster faculty awareness of the necessity for programs and expressed concern over the apparent lack of enthusiasm for faculty development. Hapberg (1981) also placed the responsibility for faculty development with the institution, submitting that the maintainence of faculty quality is ultimately the responsibility of the institution.

The role of administration toward faculty development in Nelson's (1981) opinion was the provision of funds and psychological support. Once the money was appropriated, and the program initiated, administrators should step aside and let faculty take ownership (Astin, 1985).

Have institutions taken responsibility for faculty development, pledging their resources in time and money? Gaff, (1975) notes that in the past twenty years, faculty development has been largely supported by funding from external sources. Private foundations such as the Lilly Endowment, the Danforth Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the Mellon Foundation have funded programs at many colleges (Eble & McKeachie, 1985).
When outside funding ends, the vast majority of programs are discontinued or operated with only a fraction of their previous services (Baldwin, 1981).

Placement of the programs for faculty development is another major issue. Although Neff (1976) and Maher (1981) promote the central administration as the suitable structure, others see the academic department as the appropriate location from which faculty development activities might originate (Moses, 1985; Nelson, 1981; Tucker, 1981; Toombs, Lindsay & Hettinger, 1985).

The academic department as the base for organizational development is the premise offered by Whitcomb and Beck (1980). They suggest that the purposes of organizational development include the improvement of communication within the various departments, and the teaching of participatory decision making and conflict resolution. Over a six year period in their faculty development center at California State University (Long Beach), organizational development focused on the department as a unit and agent of change.

Tucker (1984) maintains that "...an academic department's effectiveness depends largely on faculty development..." (p. 121), and considers the department an appropriate location for faculty self-development activities because "...faculty members can engage in such activities without great cost to the university and
without the assistance of elaborate service facilities or massive bureaucratic effort; and little effort beyond individual initiative is required in order to participate" (p. 127). If the academic department is to become the center of development activity, then the department head must assume some responsibility for faculty growth and development.

The Chairperson's Role in Faculty Development

To what extent is the department head responsible for the development of faculty? The role of the department head in faculty development has been identified by numerous investigators as a legitimate function. Tucker (1984) described the roles, functions, and responsibilities of department heads identifying several categories including professional development. McLaughlin, Montgomery and Malpass (1975) identified three roles which the department head performs including the leadership role of personnel and program development. Using data from the McLaughlin et. al., study, Smart and Elton (1976) identified 27 department head responsibilities which they combined into four roles including the faculty role of personnel development and morale building. In addition, Bragg (1980) identified four role orientations including one characterized by a primary focus on faculty. Those chairpersons who concentrated their ef-
forts more on the faculty orientation role "...described their primary responsibilities as recruiting, developing, and evaluating faculty members, facilitating the work of the faculty, reducing intra-departmental conflict, and improving faculty morale" (p. 116). Each investigator clearly recognized the chairperson's role of faculty developer. Other researchers have described specific methods chairs use to assist faculty growth and development.

Wheeler and Creswell (1985) identified strategies used by department chairpersons and faculty to encourage research development based on a research review of the faculty productivity literature. Specific strategies identified include mentoring and collaboration with colleagues. Wheeler, et al. (1986) described the roles and activities used by outstanding department heads to assist faculty growth and development. Seven roles were identified (communicator, facilitator, academic leader, motivator, counselor, politician and manager of "admin­istrivia") which are important to the development of faculty and department vitality.

According to Tucker (1984), the decision of department heads to act as developers "...depends on several factors such as career goals, self-image, or leadership skills" (p. 133). He identifies three approaches department heads might assume as faculty developers. The
"caretaker" recognizes a need but feels it is the responsibility of the faculty member. The "broker" makes faculty aware of available development services and encourages faculty participation. The "developer" actively assists faculty members to grow and develop professionally.

**Summary**

Today, conditions of the professoriate warrant special attention to the needs of faculty. The reality of declining enrollments and diminishing resources has caused faculty to see themselves as "stuck" in the career structure of the organization (Kanter, 1979). These and additional factors including the phenomenon of the aging professoriate, the drop in real pay, and the growing employment of part-time faculty may cause a substantial number of the best people to leave higher education (Schuster & Bowen, 1985). Those who remain may need help to remain vital, productive members of the institution.

The need for faculty development opportunities in institutions of higher education is well documented (As-tin, 1985; Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Hapberg, 1981; Moses, 1985). There have been many books and conferences suggesting specific ways to develop faculty. (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Centra, 1976; Cohen, 1973;
Gaff, 1975). Further, many colleges and universities have established programs, activities and centers designed to assist in the continued development of the faculty member (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Nelson and Siegel, 1980). The success of these efforts is questionable.

Numerous authors advocate integrating faculty development with ongoing administrative practices (Blackburn & Baldwin; Claxton & Murrell, 1984; Nelson, 1983; Tucker, 1981). Other researchers acknowledge the development of faculty as a legitimate function of the department head (Bragg, 1980; McLaughlin, Montgomery & Malpass, 1975; Smart & Elton, 1976). and even a preferred role (McLaughlin, et al., 1975). If as Dressel (1981) suggests "...the majority of faculty members find that their most immediate concerns and involvement in the institution are through their departments..." (p. 110), then department heads are in a particularly pivotal position to encourage, support, and recognize growth and development activities of their faculty. While department heads acknowledge their responsibility for the enhancement of faculty growth and development (Boice, 1985), many are poorly prepared to assume this role (Dilley, 1972; Knight & Holen, 1985; McKeachie; 1976; Tucker, 1984).
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

In Chapter I it was suggested that academic department heads are in a particularly pivotal position to encourage, support, and recognize growth and development activities of their faculty. In Chapter II the review of research on department heads suggested that while department heads acknowledge their responsibility for the enhancement of faculty growth and development, they are poorly prepared to assume this role. This inexperience intensifies the need for research about specific behaviors used by effective department chairpersons. The primary question for research, then, was how do excellent department heads assist faculty professionally? This chapter provides a description of the sample of subjects to be used for the study, the design and instrumentation to be employed together with the procedures for administering the survey and analyzing the information gathered.

Sample

The survey population for this research study was 30 academic department chairpersons from 10 of the 12 North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture. One of the non-participating universities was chosen as the site of the pilot for the survey instrument. The one
remaining institution was eliminated because the tenure of all chairpersons within the college was two years or less.

Each College of Agriculture dean and each chairperson were asked to identify three chairpersons who excel at assisting faculty professionally (see Appendix A). Chairpersons whose names appeared most often were selected for interviewing. Three chairpersons were selected from each of ten institutions (N=30). In most cases the selection process within each college was straightforward as three excellent chairs clearly dominated the voting. In a few cases, however, two candidates dominated the voting and two or more chairs received an equal number of votes. Under those circumstances, and in an attempt to achieve a broad disciplinary representation in the study, consideration was given to the disciplinary background in the selection of the third and final candidate. The thirty chairs interviewed in this study represent twelve disciplines.

Deans and chairs at the ten participating colleges identified sixty-one excellent chairpersons (Table 1). The number identified at each college ranged between four and ten. Data in Table 1 also shows the total number of votes cast at each institution and the number and percentage of votes received by the three excellent chairpersons selected for interviewing. The number of votes
received by the selected chairs, expressed as a percent of all votes cast, ranged from 61.9 percent to 84.6 percent, averaging 72.7 percent. These figures demonstrate a strong consensus among respondents concerning excellent chairpersons within their college. Of the thirty chairpersons selected for interviewing, twenty-three were identified by both deans and chairs. The remaining seven were identified by chairpersons only.

TABLE 1

Selection of Excellent Chairpersons by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>No. of Chairs Identified</th>
<th>Total Votes Cast</th>
<th>No. of Votes Received by Selected Chairs</th>
<th>Percent of Total Votes Cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Avg.)

Design

The research design employed in this study was descriptive research with major emphasis upon the interview
method of data collection and subsequent descriptive analysis. Best (1970) states that descriptive research "...describes and interprets what is...and involves an element of analysis and interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is described" (p. 116). Descriptive research was selected because of its potential to appropriately reflect the purpose of the study in determining the attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and attributes of the responding "excellent" chairs.

**Interview Method**

Festinger and Katz (1966) state that the interview method provides an economical and direct way of gathering information about the beliefs, feelings, past experiences, and future intentions of respondents. The interview method makes it possible to clarify questions asked, probe for more in-depth responses, and elicit feelings and perceptions. While the interviewing technique does present certain limitations, i.e., respondent bias based upon lack of understanding, memory lapse, possible damage to ego, interviewer bias in recording responses, and faulty probing, it remains a viable method of gathering information which cannot be observed directly (Beed & Stimson, 1985; Gorden, 1980; Hildum & Brown, 1965; and Rice, 1929).
Telephone Interviewing

The choice of a data collection method is a complex decision. Fowler (1984) states that the choice of data collection mode such as mail, telephone, personal interview, or group administration, is related directly to the research topic, characteristics of the sample, and available staff. Consequently, the decision has implications for response rates, question form and survey costs. The telephone method of the survey research process was chosen for this study. The advantages of this data collection procedure are its lower cost, higher anticipated response rate (than can be generated by mail surveys), and potential for a short data collection period (Babbie, 1979; Fowler, 1984). The potential limitation of telephone interviewing for this study was the lack of visual nonverbal interaction. Meaningful visual clues were missing making it more difficult for the interviewer to motivate the respondent. Despite this disadvantage, several studies have shown the telephone interview to be a valid and efficient communication mode (Assael & Eastback, 1966; Janofsky, 1971; Kegeles et al., 1969).

Some explanation regarding the structure of the telephone interview is warranted at this point. The two principal styles of interviews are the structured or standardized interview and the unstructured or nonstandardized interview. The structured interview may be sub-
divided into "scheduled" and "nonscheduled" interviews. These three together represent points along a continuum measuring interviewer control of the topic and questions.

In the scheduled structured interview, the interviewer reads the questions exactly as they are worded and in the order presented in the interview schedule. The advantage of this type is its assumed comparability of responses which provides greater ease of analysis. In the nonscheduled structured interview, the interviewer is afforded choices as to order and wording of questions. Here it is assumed that identical vocabulary does not necessarily produce identical meanings and responses from respondents. Questions, then, may be reworded by the interviewer in language each respondent understands in order to obtain comparable responses.

In the unstructured interview, the interviewer determines wording and sequencing of questions along with the topics of the questions as the interview progresses. This style of interview permits the interviewer the greatest flexibility. The interviewer is generally searching for a wide range of answers to establish reliable and valid answer categories. This style of interviewing is often used to prepare a more standardized interview for pilot testing. While the scheduled interview is more efficient and effective in obtaining uniform coverage, precision, and reliability of measurement (Gor-
den, 1980), it may be considered restrictive by some respondents. Richardson, Bohrenwend and Klein (1965) suggest that the "elites", i.e., those respondents who are well educated, articulate, and intelligent, "...resent the restrictions placed on them by the [structured] interview schedules..." and "...demand a more active interplay with the interviewer than the conventional [structured] schedule interview permits" (p. 304).

In addition to the styles of interviewing, two basic types of question structures, open-ended and closed, can be identified (Fowler 1984, and Gorden 1980). Questions which do not supply the answer categories are called "open-ended" and those that limit the answer choices are referred to as "closed". Patton (1982) states that the structured open-ended interview offers major advantages to the researcher by minimizing interviewer effects and bias and facilitating organization and analysis of the data. Since department heads were assumed to be "elites", as discussed above, and because comparability of data was required, a nonscheduled structured interview guide was developed for this study.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation for the study project consisted of three parts:

(1) The Advance Letter cosigned by the Dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Nebraska;
The Telephone Interview Schedule and the Protocol Sheet; and

(3) Thank-you letter with an executive summary of the data collected from all respondents as a result of the telephone interviews.

The Advance Letter

An advance letter explains the purpose of the project and encourages the respondents to participate. Dillman (1978) recommends the use of an advance letter. He suggests that respondents who are surprised by an unexpected telephone call and a request to be interviewed often react with suspicion. If they do agree to participate in the interview, responses are often guarded. The advance letter can allay those fears and convey to the potential respondent the importance of the interview and how the information will be used.

The potential information giver becomes a respondent or a nonrespondent primarily on the motivation established by the interviewer’s introduction. With the use of an advance letter to initiate the introduction, the respondent may become more positively involved in the survey. Benefits of the advance letter may not be limited to the respondent’s positive interview experience. For example, interviewers, even those skilled in conducting telephone surveys may feel uncomfortable during those first crucial seconds of the telephone interview. Sending an informative advance letter not only enlists the cooperation of
the respondent but also "...interviewers feel more confident, too" (Fowler, p. 52, 1984). In addition, Fowler states that when advance letters are possible, there is no difference between telephone and personal interview procedures with respect to response. Thus, sending an advance letter to notify the potential respondent of the impending telephone call is an appropriate way to counter possible difficulties.

The advance letter for this study included not only the purpose of the project but was also designed to build rapport by expressing appreciation to the respondents and assuring complete confidentiality (see Appendix B). The respondents were informed of the topic area to be covered and various issues which would be discussed. The intent of this procedure was to provide the participants with the opportunity to generally formulate their thoughts concerning the topics. In addition, the respondents were told how they were selected, the length of time required for the interview and when to expect the interviewer's call. Finally, the respondents were encouraged to contact the researcher if they had any questions. The exact time for the interview was scheduled in advance with the chairperson's secretary.

**Telephone Interview Schedule**

A nonscheduled structured interview schedule was developed for this study to afford the interviewer...
choices as to order and wording of questions. The validity and reliability of the instrument were tested in a pilot study in October, 1986. For reasons of time economy and the control of the initial research costs, six chairpersons were selected for the pilot test, three from one midwestern university and three from one eastern university. The Telephone Interview Schedule was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of preliminary data about the respondent's department. The second portion of the schedule consisted of questions that enabled the respondent to explain and describe specific behaviors used to assist faculty professionally and conditions which affect these behaviors. The telephone interviews of the respondents were accomplished by reading the designated portions of the Telephone Interview Schedule (see Appendix C).

**Techniques of Telephone Interviewing**

Some discussion regarding techniques of effective telephone interviewing is warranted at this point. To begin the procedure, the interviewer must identify himself or herself in such a way as to develop rapport with the respondent. Brief statements from the interviewer on the purpose of the study, how the respondent was selected, the confidential nature of the interview and the beneficial uses of the research findings may help over-
come any barriers to the interview in the respondent's mind. The interview can begin as soon as the interviewer has introduced himself or herself and completed this initial rapport-building process.

The structured nonscheduled interview such as the type used in this study "...gives the interviewer freedom to attempt alternative wordings of the same questions, and freedom to use neutral probes if the first response to a question is not clear, complete, or relevant" (Gorden, p. 46, 1980). During the course of the interview, some interviewers may unintentionally imply that certain responses are more acceptable than others. This often occurs due to the improper use of probes. Probing is the technique used by the interviewer to stimulate discussion and obtain more information. If the respondent gives an incomplete response or the interviewer needs additional information or clarification of a question, probing is used to motivate the respondent to communicate more fully. A list of neutral probes compiled from the literature was included on the Protocol Sheet of the Telephone Interview Schedule (see Appendix C) to assist the interviewer in obtaining complete and accurate responses.

To help compensate for the lack of visual cues during the telephone interview, Beed and Stimson (1985) suggest boosting feedback mechanisms. The interviewer is given 'harmless' things to say such as "I see", "I under-
stand", "Uh, uh" just to indicate that communication is in fact occurring.

The quality of the information obtained during an interview is largely dependent upon the interviewer (Patton, 1982). Interviewer training, then, was an essential ingredient in this study and was accomplished by the review of available literature on the topic of telephone interviewing and pretesting the specific interview situation (Gorden, 1980).

**Data Collection**

The advance letter was mailed to each of the 30 selected chairpersons during the week of November 10, 1986. The interview was scheduled through the chairperson's secretary for a time convenient to him. All 30 interviews were conducted during the period of November 24 through December 5, 1986.

The inventory of tools to implement each telephone interview included the Telephone Interview Schedule and Protocol Sheet. Answers by the respondent were recorded on the Schedule. In addition, all interviews were recorded on cassette tape with the permission of the subjects and transcribed by the researcher.
Data Analysis

The structured nonscheduled interview using open-ended questions as in this study can provide a wealth of information and a variety of responses. The analysis of the data produced by such a research project requires careful planning. Moreover, the selection of appropriate statistical analyses for interview data involves the same concerns and issues as the analysis of data by other procedures.

Nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio are four types of data which may result from interviews. "Nominal data results from questionnaire items which serve to classify, categorize, or label respondents. Almost all categorizations of open-ended responses to interview items result in nominal data" (Measurement Services Center, p. 18, 1978). Appropriate statistics for the nominal type of data include percentages, mode and chi-square.

The specific data analysis for this study was suggested by qualitative methods of interview interpretation (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Wolf, 1979) and included: (1) tape recording and transcribing each interview; (2) sorting the interviews for issues, concerns and factual information; (3) conceptualizing a model that visually represented major issues; (4) designating the coding unit as the entire interview due to the overlap of responses offered to questions; (5) formulating response categories
for content analysis of the interviews; (6) testing the coding instrument for intercoder reliability (three professors from one North Central Region Land-Grant College of Agriculture served as coders to verify the accuracy of the researchers observations); (7) presenting the responses in the narrative discussion as related to each research question. Frequency counts and percentages were used for this descriptive data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to identify behaviors used by excellent department chairpersons to assist faculty professionally and describe conditions which affect those behaviors (e.g., factors that influence behaviors, sources of information that helped chairpersons arrive at those behaviors, satisfactions and dissatisfactions, and advice to new chairs).

This chapter begins with a discussion of the preliminary data which includes the following eight sections: demographics of the sample; administrative career expectations; previous administrative experience; training; advice to new chairs; conditions which affect chairperson behaviors; sources of satisfaction; and sources of dissatisfaction. Next, six case studies are presented to demonstrate how excellent chairs assist "troubled" faculty. A framework for behaviors used to enhance the growth and development of faculty is then discussed followed by general observations gleaned from the study. A summary concludes the chapter.

As stated in Chapter III, the survey population was 30 department chairpersons representing ten of the twelve North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture. Names of academic department chairpersons, departments,
universities, and other personal information which might serve to identify the participants were eliminated.

Preliminary Data

Demographics of the Sample

Those excellent chairs selected for this study headed departments ranging in size from 11 to 69 faculty members with a mean of 30 (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Academic Staff (FTE)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The period of incumbency ranged from two to 26 years. As can be seen in Table 3, only 27 percent of the excellent chairs had served for five years or less. A number of participants emphasized the relationship between the length of term and the effective management of a depart-
One department head reflects the sentiments of several:

I don't think it's possible for a department head to have much impact on a department if he's only there three to five years.

The policy designating a department head's length of term in office was generally consistent throughout the departments represented in the study. In 27 of the departments, no set term is designated; department heads "serve at the pleasure of the dean." In three departments, the chair is voted on every year by faculty serving in an advisory capacity to the dean. While the chair review procedure varies, 12 department heads indicated they were formally evaluated every five years.

### TABLE 3

Length of Time in Present Position as Department Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Present Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Career Expectations

The administrative career expectations of the excellent chairs ranged from less than one to about ten years. A sizable minority (47 percent) expected to leave their current position within three years. Of this group, 64 percent had been in their position for more than five years. Several department heads indicated they did not believe that any administrator should remain in a position for a long period of time as illustrated by one department head who stated:

I want to stay in long enough to give it [department] some stability, but I want to leave when I'm still enthusiastic.

Of the 12 remaining department heads responding, six were uncertain or had no plans to leave as revealed in the following comments:

I frankly have never had an interest in moving into higher administration. I've had opportunities but I like what I'm doing. I like to be close to the action so I think I've got the best position in the university.

[I'm] not real sure...figured I'd stay at least five years but I'm actually considering something else right now....I don't think one should stay in these jobs too terribly long.

Three indicated they would remain in their present position until retirement, a period of from one to eight years. Only three revealed they were currently seeking other employment opportunities. Two of these department heads explained:
I'd like to move up in administration...I'd like to move up to more responsibility. 

[I'm] considering dean's and director's positions now, so I don't expect to stay more than two or three more years.

**Previous Administrative Experience**

Forty-three percent of the department heads reported prior administrative experience (Table 4), most commonly serving as department head, program head, or research project director.

**TABLE 4**

Prior Administrative Experience of Department Chairpersons (Multiple Responses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Administrative Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In education with responsibilities generally similar to current position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education with responsibilities generally different to current position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a field other than education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No previous experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Readers should note that some chairs had more than one response to certain questions.

Nine of the department heads had gained administrative experience in a field other than education. Positions
ranged from assignments in the federal government (USDA, AID, NSF, military service) to private industry.

Training

Since less than half of the department heads in this study reported prior administrative experience, it was important to ascertain how the excellent chairs acquired skills to assist faculty professionally. Forty-seven percent reported observation of department heads and other administrators as a major source of development (Table 5).

**TABLE 5**
Department Head Training
(Multiple Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation of department heads and other administrators</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals, books, newsletters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with department heads</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in workshops, courses or conferences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial and error</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One department head commented:

Many of the things that I did when I first got here were based on what I saw. I watched what was done to me or with me and some of my colleagues, and I guess I developed something of a philosophy on how I thought things ought to be done.

While most cases of administrative role modeling cited were positive, learning also occurred from observing negative actions as revealed by one department head who commented:

The department that I was in...communication was extremely poor...I really learned a whole host of things not to do.

In addition to observing other administrators, several (37 percent) of the department heads reported some reliance on journals, books, and newsletters for information about working with faculty. Others, however, questioned the usefulness of books as tools in department head development. One respondent stated:

On the whole I don't get much from them [books]. A lot of nonsense [is] written about academic administration.

Journals and books mentioned most often dealt with management and management styles, human relations and personnel management. The Harvard Business Review was cited as a helpful source of information on management and human relations. As a result of some of his reading, one department head developed a tool which allow faculty to give him feedback. He explained:
I devised a questionnaire that the faculty fill in anonymously every spring, kind of a report card. They rate me on technical...leadership...and human relations skills...then [there is] a section: tell me what you want to tell me. I pay a great deal of attention to that. I've made some adjustments....

Several respondents indicated a preference for newsletters as a source of information on personnel management. This was due in part to the succinct manner of presentation. Newsletters mentioned by department heads in this study included "The Administrator", "Academic Leader", "Office Today", "Personal Report for the Executive", and "Working Smart, '87".

Interaction with department heads was cited as an important method of chair development by 30 percent of the respondents. Excellent chairs reported meeting with other department heads in their college to discuss common problems. One participant related:

I gossip a lot with chairs in terms of administrative styles, practices, things they've used that worked.

Formal meetings within the North Central Region were mentioned by several department heads as an important forum for exchanging problems and concerns as described by one department head who stated:

Listening to what others have to say is helpful...At these meetings I can get a real feel for what other department heads are doing....
Other methods of development reported by respondents were workshops, courses, and conferences. Ten department chairs reported some level of participation in at least one of these activities. Several chairs indicated a reluctance to participate in workshops, citing the time away from the office as the principal reason. Others suggested that getting off campus for formal training was essential for maximum benefit.

For some respondents, the North Central Region New Administrators Workshop was particularly helpful. One department head, who depicted the NCR workshop as "extraordinarily helpful", observed:

It gave me some tools and insight that I just didn't have. That was probably the greatest gift the college ever gave to me.

Not all department heads had the benefit of participating in this or a similar development activity. Several respondents indicated they were somewhat disappointed that their college administration did not send them through a formal training workshop at the outset.

"On the job training" was reported by 30 percent of the department heads as an important method of development. One respondent commented:

I guess I've primarily developed what skills I have through experience and a very sincere interest in working with people.

Another respondent stated:

It was a gradual continuing process. There was learning as I went along.
several department heads credited their administrative assistants and head secretaries with helping them "learn the ropes."

Finally, when asked how they had developed their skills in assisting faculty professionally, 20 percent of the department heads reported trial and error, or as one respondent stated:

...probably by committing every deadly sin... basically I've sort of gone with what seems to work.

Although trial and error was considered a legitimate means of development, one department chair cautioned:

If you don't learn from your mistakes you don't last long as a department head.

All department heads recognized the need for training. Several, however, complained of too little time for formal development activities.

Advice to New Chairs

As can be seen, one of the most important means of learning the headship role appeared to be through interaction with other department heads. Several excellent chairs spoke of advice they had received from fellow chairs that helped them learn their new responsibilities and establish a management style with which they were comfortable. When asked what advice they would give a new department chair who asked this question, "What should I concentrate on--what should I do--to assist faculty pro-
professionally?" excellent chairs offered six recommendations (Table 6). "Encourage, support and motivate" (70 percent) and "know your faculty" (53 percent) were reported most often by the respondents. Additionally, according to 30 percent of the excellent chairs, department heads should help faculty identify goals and set job direction. Twenty percent identified "hiring the best" as advice to new department heads. This low response rate may reflect the current fiscal situation in many Colleges of Agriculture. While excellent chairs consider the recruitment of new faculty important to the vitality of the department, fewer today have the opportunity to hire due to the scarcity of funds.

TABLE 6
Advice to New Chairs
(Multiple Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage, support and motivate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to know your faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help identify goals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire the best</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and reward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Evaluate" was reported by six department heads interviewed. Most advised new chairs to provide frequent or continuous feedback. Five of the excellent chairs would remind new heads to recognize and reward their faculty. Finally, a few respondents emphasized the value of learning the policies and procedures of the university; factors which may govern a department head's approach to the development of faculty.

Conditions Which Affect Chair Behaviors

"There are campus and college policies and directions and priorities that will influence the direction I'll help a faculty member." This comment is reflective of others made by excellent chairs when asked to identify conditions which influence the way they assist faculty professionally. Several respondents discussed university policy as it relates to attendance at professional meetings. Some institutions' policies were very generally written with interpretation left to the department chairman, which, as one department head suggested "is where it ought to be." Others had no written policy and "insufficient travel funds."

The institution's attention to faculty development needs was cited by several respondents as affecting the way in which they assist faculty. One department head suggested that the lack of a strong development program
on campus means that "if you do anything, you do it on your own."

Other factors cited by department heads as most directly affecting their behavior were resources, and support from higher administration. With regard to resources most comments were similar to the following:

The availability of money is probably the first factor that I would cite that effects the way I assist faculty.

One of the real problems is that the base of operations [has] been eroded and as a result we've had to cut back on research and teaching assistants.

The authority and flexibility of department heads is changing right now. In times of contracting resources like we're in now, the decision-making and the activity of those in the central administration becomes greater...the impact of the central administration is increasing each year.

We've had to start using Hatch money to run the department because I've used all the state money for salaries. That's been a little bothersome. Definitely, resources is a factor.

Comments reflective of the other condition cited by department heads, "support from higher administration", included the following:

The philosophy of the administration at the college and experiment station level and above has a significant influence on the development of faculty and the way they perform. If you've got an administration that is verbally supportive and demonstrates confidence in your faculty, then faculty are going to feel good about themselves...

We have a very cooperative administration. I've got a fantastic administration here to
work with. I feel they are very supportive. They are people who are looking for good ideas and if they like it they say go with it. Then we kind of try to work out the funding.

We have a very positive dean. The job of budgeting and faculty management is influenced heavily by the dean's office. Our dean is positive, expects you to be positive...it's a pleasure to work under those circumstances.

In addition, the unionization of faculty was cited by excellent chairs at one university as having a direct impact on behaviors used to assist faculty. According to one department head, collective bargaining brought about the formalization of many of the interactions between faculty and administration, i.e., evaluation became institutionalized, promotion and tenure relationships were given structure. These changes were deemed beneficial to both faculty and administration. The effect on salary decisions, however, was considered detrimental. One department head described the negative impact.

It has done a lot toward defining what salary policy is going to be rather than what the department head would like to see it...They are death on merit.

Satisfactions of Department Heads

Despite various frustrations associated with the role of academic department chairperson, e.g., ambiguity of the position, proliferation of paperwork, fear of becoming professionally obsolete, the excellent chairs in this study generally expressed satisfaction with their
administrative position. Seventy-seven percent cited the accomplishments of faculty as their greatest satisfier (Table 7). One respondent stated:

Just getting recognition for my faculty gives me a lot of satisfaction.

Another department head commented:

I get as much satisfaction in having a faculty member recognized or succeed as if it happened to me.

TABLE 7

Satisfactions from Administrative Role (Multiple Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments of faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring outstanding faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building department of national reputation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround of faculty member</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiring outstanding faculty was identified by 30 percent of the department heads studied as a source of satisfaction while 26 percent reported building a department of national reputation as satisfaction. One respondent stated:

This department has been fairly progressive in the past but I think with the advent of biotechnology I saw the opportunity to make a mark on the department by taking a leading position in that area. My greatest
satisfaction has come from being able
to do that without taking away resources from
existing programs.

Another department head commented:

Over the last five years the national stature
of this department has increased because we've
taken a high visibility stance.

The turnaround of faculty was cited as a major satisfac-
tion by several department heads. One respondent stated:

Probably the greatest personal satisfaction is
the turn-around of the one faculty member. He
will never thank me for what I did... that has
still been the most gratifying.

**Dissatisfactions of Department Heads**

Overall, excellent chairs in this study were satis-
fied in their positions. Several, however, expressed
frustration with certain aspects of their administrative
role as seen in Table 8. Half of the respondents, for
example, were dissatisfied with budget reductions as
evidenced by the following comments:

Since I've been on the job, all we've done is
cut budgets--lost positions.

Probably the biggest frustration is the budget.
You never have enough money to do the things
that you would like to accomplish. So you're
continually scampering around and trying to
generate funds...

The main thing is the inability of the
university to come up with resources to meet
pressing needs. I think that's my real
dissatisfaction.

Most respondents were particularly concerned with funding
cuts as they adversely affected their ability to hire and
reward good faculty. One department head commented:

Money has not been there to bring in the young faculty that we need for our vitality as a department. I've had to function and compete nationally with almost one hand tied behind my back because of the budget situation.

Another department head concluded:

It's never completely satisfying not to be able to reward your best performers.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget cuts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to motivate faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proliferation of paperwork</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with multiple roles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as the turnaround of faculty was cited as a major satisfaction by department heads, the inability to motivate faculty was viewed as a major frustration. Twenty-six percent of the respondents reported that keeping certain faculty productive was a constant challenge. One department head observed:
I guess I've had a couple of people who are just satisfied with where they're at, and I can't get them motivated to excel...Somehow I feel like I missed the boat, that I can't find the right trigger to really turn them on and get them going.

Several of the respondents indicated that the institution had not accepted its share of the responsibility for "burned out" faculty. Two excellent chairs proposed the establishment of a faculty job placement service to assist in counseling faculty out of the academic environment.

For some department heads, "administrivia" or the various paperwork was a source of frustration keeping them from more important activities. One department head observed:

The proliferation of paper work--the menial type paper work that we have to do keeps us from being as creative as we should be.

Seventeen percent of the excellent chairs studied cited salary decisions as a source of frustration. One respondent stated:

The highest pressure point of the year is salary time...particularly when you have people who are not performing.

Department heads are particularly vulnerable to pressures resulting from role conflict because of differences in expectations. Department heads have been described as "...arms of management, arms of administration, the grass roots administration, liaison men, and forgot-
Seventeen percent of the excellent chairs in this study cited role conflict as a major source of frustration. One respondent observed:

You have to work the fence at many times realizing you have an obligation to the administration and to the organization and yet you are not only a chairperson, but a professor. So you feel much like a faculty member. That's probably the most frustrating part of it.

Another department head stated:

If you're going to serve the faculty well, it means you have to be like a second lieutenant in the army. You have to carry out the college policy but at the same time you have to represent the concerns of your faculty to college administration.

Conflict is especially apparent as department chairs attempt to assume their faculty role as scholars. Few department chairs of larger departments (15 FTE and above) had time to aggressively pursue scholarly activity after assuming the role of chair. One respondent elaborated:

You have no program of your own if you're dealing with a large department. You have no time to do research, you have no time to teach—you must get your kicks out of your department and individual's accomplishments.

Another department head commented:

I had to realize psychologically that I was no longer a pro in my profession. I had to sacrifice my long suit in order to be a department head.

One department head who will soon be returning to the faculty ranks observed:
I think your own personal interests have to be subjugated to the interests of the department and to the interest of individuals of the department. You do not really have much of a professional identity because you don't have time to do scholarly research, I think, if you're doing your job right. Very frankly I've missed some of that and I'm looking forward to getting back.

Another respondent who administers a large department and chose to continue his scholarly activity, felt discouraged by the college's pressure to have department heads work mostly on administrative tasks and limit their own professional program. He related a consequence of continuing his scholarly activity:

I've had some signals that you should be doing more in certain areas. My decision to have my own professional program has cost me some salary here.

**How Department Heads Assist Faculty Professionally: Case Studies**

The major purpose of this study was to identify ways in which excellent chairs assist their faculty members professionally so they are more effective in teaching, research and service. To what extent is the department head responsible for the development of faculty? Researchers have acknowledged faculty development as a legitimate function of the department head (Bragg, 1980, 1980; McLaughlin, Montgomery & Malpass, 1975; Smart & Elton, 1976; and Bragg, 1980) and even a preferred role
Tucker recognized the importance of chairperson involvement in the development of faculty and identified three approaches department heads might assume as faculty developers: the "caretaker", the "broker", and the "developer". The "caretaker" recognizes a need but feels it is the responsibility of the faculty member. The "broker" makes faculty aware of available development services and encourages faculty participation. The "developer" actively assists faculty members to grow and develop professionally. As expected, chairpersons in the study reported here exhibited the characteristics of the "developer".

It was assumed that department heads who had been identified as "developers" would perform specific behaviors to enhance the growth and development of faculty. To identify these behaviors, department chairs were first asked to focus on one faculty member who had grown professionally over the last few years, and then to identify how they had assisted him or her. Second, the department heads were asked to describe behaviors used with the whole department. Twenty respondents described specific situations then cited behaviors used to assist the faculty member professionally. Ten expressed some difficulty with this approach and chose, instead, to give examples of behaviors used with all faculty.
Several of the specific cases reported by the excellent chairs were of new faculty or tenured unproductive faculty who were exhibiting varying degrees of difficulty in their positions. This was exemplified by unsatisfactory performance in their teaching and/or research assignments or the presence of student/faculty conflict. In general, problems with new faculty were addressed early and often resolved through frequent and frank discussion between the chairperson and faculty member. Several of the established faculty discussed by excellent chairs appeared to be experiencing difficulty in the position due to changing interests or professional goals often complicated by a dynamic environment. Others, whose responsibilities had remained unchanged for a number of years were approaching "burn out". Although chairpersons identified these faculty as their "major frustration", they also characterized this group as their "principal challenge". Generally, by building on the strengths of the faculty member and providing encouragement and support, help was prescribed or appointments adjusted to effect the appropriate change in faculty behavior. Analysis of the interview responses indicated the excellent chairs did, indeed, perform particular behaviors in their efforts to enhance the professional growth and development of faculty as reflected in the six case studies presented here.
case Study #1: "Front Line Troops"

One "fresh Ph.D." with an extremely good academic record was described by his chairperson as "a little arrogant," and this was impeding his effectiveness with students and colleagues. This behavior was especially detrimental in the classroom and it was this faculty activity which the department head targeted for change. The department chair described two overriding beliefs which enabled him to "confront the issue straight on."

First, he manages the department in such a way that there is a tone of "trust and openness and confidence on the part of all faculty." Second, he views the faculty as the "front line troops" and serves the faculty "by providing them the environment, the resources, what they need to get the job done." Within this helpful environment, the chair talked with the faculty member directly about the situation. He elaborated:

We didn't beat around the bush...we just sat down and chatted about it. Then the question is, what can we do to effectuate some change. It turns out that there were on-campus and off-campus training programs. One of them dealt with teacher effectiveness, the other dealt more with interpersonal relationships. So we agreed that it would be a good thing to take some time and money and do some of those things.

In addition to identifying and supporting these faculty development opportunities, the department chairperson
visited with the faculty member on a regular basis. The department head continued:

We chatted about how things were going and what else needed to be done to improve the situation. Over the next couple of years, those student evaluations began to turn around pretty dramatically.

At the same time, the chair did not ignore the individual's research responsibility which was 50% of his appointment. While effecting change in the teaching area, the chair supported his research program by limiting his committee assignments, providing resources for a graduate student, and allocating sufficient operating money. This young man is now a productive, tenured associate professor.

Case Study #2: "Talking to Young Faculty"

A similar situation was described by another department chair who hired an "extremely bright" individual with a "fairly large ego." From the outset, the department chair anticipated possible problems and during a six year period there were some professor/graduate student conflicts. The department chair first identified two major factors which were creating this behavior, the faculty member's "aggressive nature" and his "inexperience." This administrator's approach is based upon the philosophy that "problems don't solve themselves." Thus, once the problem and causes had been identified, the
department head initiated a plan to effect the appropriate change in both faculty and graduate student behavior. He first sat down with the faculty member and discussed the situation. Next, the student involved was counseled by the department head, and finally, both the faculty member and student were brought together. There were several sessions and through continuous dialogue, the conflict was resolved. The graduate student remained and completed his program, and the major professor grew as a result. The department head summarized his approach:

Communicate, listen, avoid taking sides, be fair to both sides in a situation like that. At the same time, there may be a desired outcome...you have to counsel in that direction...It's different with each faculty member but particularly it's a developmental process that really never ends.

Case Study #3: "Publication Productivity and Shifts in Resources"

Another case shared by one excellent chair involved a faculty member who was three years toward tenure when the chair arrived. In the process of acquainting himself with his new staff, the department head became aware of this particular individual's difficulty performing all the functions that the job description demanded. Specifically, his performance in research was inadequate. There were no publications and "some real questions about
whether this individual was going to be tenured in the
department." The department head assessed the situation:

I was not familiar with the individual before I came...spent some time visiting with him and
others who were knowledgeable about the situation. What were the limitations? Why was
he having problems with research?

The department head investigated and identified two major
factors which were restricting productivity, limited re-
sources and a very heavy teaching load. Once identified,
these problems were addressed from several directions.
First, the department head talked with the faculty member
about the importance of research and publications. He
questioned the individual about his Ph.D. thesis which
had never been published, offered encouragement and sug-
gestions on where the thesis research could be published.
The chair identified specific journals "that would be out
reasonably quickly since the tenure decision was coming
up, and journals which are more important from the stand-
point of the promotion and tenure committee." In addi-
tion, the chair asked the faculty member's former major
professor to encourage him to get the data written up for
publication.

Next, to provide the faculty member time to fulfill
his research responsibilities, the department chair made
some shifts in resources. He explained:

I made sure that the individual got a graduate
research teaching assistantship assigned to
him...a research technologist on a half time
basis...who could really do the work and wouldn't require a lot of training or close supervision. In addition, I gave him more time to do research by relieving him of a major teaching assignment for one semester. I got another faculty member to pick up that load for a semester so he'd have about an eight month period where he could intensively work on research and try to improve productivity.

Finally, the chair supported this individual by continuing to provide adequate salary increases and a peer mentoring situation. The department head assessed the faculty member's progress:

The individual has developed, I think, a good research program, has got two graduate students working with him right now and still has the technologist, will probably get a visiting scientist working with him in the not too distant future...I think the program is certainly moving in the right direction. He has published and continues to be interested in publishing...I continue to watch the situation. I can't see any further problems.

When asked if he would do anything differently if he were faced with the situation today, the department head commented:

I guess if I were doing it again, I would have moved sooner. Maybe I assessed the situation too long or I assumed I didn't have the flexibility that I eventually found. I was trying to decide, during the first year I was here, whether it was our problem or the individual's problem...eventually it was clear to me that it was our problem. We just hadn't provided the resources that were needed to give the individual a fighting chance....I took the responsibility for the situation.
Case Study #4: "Extension Appointment"

The necessity of matching the position to the faculty member's skills was illustrated in one case involving a tenured professor who held a research and teaching appointment in a large department (more than 15 FTE). The individual had been in the department nine years when the current department head arrived. In the process of acquainting himself with his new staff, it became clear to the department head that the faculty member was neglecting his research responsibility. The situation had deteriorated to the point where the experiment station director had communicated to the department head that he lacked confidence in this faculty member's ability to conduct a successful research program. The department head described the situation:

He was known for his excellent teaching... the undergraduates really love him, but his appointment was fifty percent research and he just wasn't getting any research done.... with each individual I see what they are doing, what their responsibilities are and what they want to do and how it fits into the overall program. So I counseled with him, of course, and encouraged him... I suggested that we build on his strengths. That's the role I've taken with all my faculty. In this case, his appointment was the critical thing.

The individual had worked effectively with industry in the state and the department head chose to build on these strengths. His appointment was adjusted to reflect his abilities; the faculty member now carries a teaching/ex-
tension appointment and is a productive member of the department. Although the department head emphasized the importance of counseling and offering frequent encouragement, he suggested that in this case, the key was seeing that the job description was suited to the person. He continued:

The key I think is the job description. Be sure the job description is suited to the person and get the people doing what the job description says...Then, get the support for them, try to facilitate their work and try not to put roadblocks in front of them.

Case Study #5: "Incentive Money"

Another case involved two faculty members in one department who were described by the new department head as "...two people who were in danger of floating off the rest of their careers without doing too many new things". The department head attempted to break this pattern and "get them thinking about something new." Extensive counseling ensued and then the department head tried an unorthodox approach. He explained:

I went to the dean and asked for a special salary allocation for both of them. Then, independently I told them that the dean gave it to me because I had faith in them, and that I was giving it to them even though I didn't think they had earned it yet; but because I thought they would earn it.

In addition, the department head worked with both faculty to help them set priorities. When asked if this approach
helped turn things around, the department head described the outcome:

I'm batting 500. One did. One didn't. So the one who didn't continues to be a problem that I'm concerned about everyday. We don't have complete success.

Case Study #6: "Redirection of Burned-Out Faculty"

Another situation involved a tenured full professor with a teaching and research appointment who had been a member of a small department (15 or less FTE) for 20 years. Because of his expertise in biometrics, he was in constant demand for assistance in research design and analysis of data in addition to his normal duties. This faculty member had been identified as one of the better teachers doing an excellent job at the beginning level reaching between 150 and 200 students per year. The department head discussed the problem:

About four years ago it became apparent that I had a staff member who was approaching the burn out stage. He was involved not only with the students that were in his classes, but he was involved on a consultation basis with many graduate students and other personnel. He just couldn't say no. As a result, his performance in the research area was definitely being adversely impacted.

After assessing the situation the department head took action. He explained:

I wrote a formal memo to him indicating that I thought his performance was declining— that we either needed to revamp his research or begin looking at some other areas that were high priority statewide. I made some suggestions
for redirection. I was looking at introducing him to a new area that might rejuvenate his interest. He wrote me a formal letter back indicating he liked what I had to offer, but he felt burned out and needed to do something before he would be competent enough to undertake a new research area.

At that point, the chair and faculty member started talking about possible alternatives. The chair recommended that he take a year in which he had just a half-time appointment. During this period he would meet his classes but the rest of the time would be his. At the direction of the chair, he severed many of the commitments on campus and cut back on committee assignments and consulting. He restricted his consultations in the area of biometrics to students in this department. In addition, he did some reading in the new area and identified colleagues at other universities who were currently working in the proposed redirected area. He made some personal visits to labs on his own time and on his own money and was sent as a departmental representative to other types of meetings that would be profitable for him in his reorientation and redirection. The department head continued:

I carried the remaining part of his old research project for about a year and a half before we phased out our commitment in that area. I sat in on a few of his classes that year to monitor...and after a half dozen of these unannounced visits, I was perfectly satisfied that I'd made the right decision. I continue to monitor his commitments very closely and today, I have an extremely produc-
tive scientist. He no longer feels burned out. He has found that he can say no. His teaching has held up. He's now publishing.

When asked if there were other things that he might have done to assist this person, the department head concluded that he could have used the conventional route of the straight leave of absence. In fact, the faculty member and the department head discussed that possibility, but the individual felt he wanted to keep his class commitments. This and other considerations led the department head to propose the more unorthodox leave.

Summary

These case studies provide evidence of a pattern of behavior used by excellent chairs to assist "troubled" faculty. From the identification of a problem, the determination of contributing factors, the continual dialogue and counseling, to the implementation of an appropriate action plan, department heads offered support and encouragement to develop new faculty and revitalize the "dozer".

On the whole, chairpersons were convinced that many potential problems could be averted by frequent interaction and continual monitoring of faculty performance. However, their concern was not only for troubled faculty. Excellent chairs identified behaviors to help keep productive faculty vital. These behaviors will be discussed next.
Behaviors Used for Faculty Development

The process used by department heads to assist "troubled" faculty has been presented with emphasis on the implementation of specific actions. In addition to designating behaviors which facilitate the growth and development of "troubled" faculty, many chairpersons identified specific behaviors used to maintain the vitality of productive faculty. Three questions combine to provide a framework for the organization of these behaviors. As mentioned previously, each participant was asked to focus on one faculty member who had grown professionally over the last few years, and then to identify how he assisted him or her. Second, the department heads were asked to describe behaviors used with the whole department. Finally, the excellent chairs were asked what advice they would give a new department head on how to assist faculty professionally. An emerging pattern of behavior was identified commencing with the establishment of the appropriate departmental climate, a "supportive open environment" marked by "honesty and openness" on the part of the department chairperson. It was within this environment that department heads felt they could most effectively assist faculty. One chairperson suggested that "...certainly, in a helpful environment, I can talk to faculty in trouble with better results."
The pattern of ongoing behaviors identified by excellent chairs serve to support the "movers", reduce the number and magnitude of faculty problems, and foster early detection of those that did occur (See Table 9 on the following pages). Respondents offered numerous recommendations which were sorted into the following six categories:

1. Recruitment
2. Communication
3. Goals Identification
4. Support
5. Evaluation
6. Recognition

A discussion of these behaviors follows.

**Recruitment**

First, excellent chairs viewed faculty recruitment as a major deterrent to faculty problems. One department head commented:

The first thing is, of course, hiring the right people. To me that's a high priority of the job. Because people make the department and if you don't hire the best people you're not going to have the best department.

The recruitment of faculty was also viewed as an opportunity to establish new direction in the department. Eighty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they had hired during their administrative tenure and emphasized the importance of recruiting "top personnel." According to several respondents, hiring new people served
## TABLE 9

### Excellent Chairperson Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>- Hire faculty with excellent skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Communication**         | - Establish open door policy  
                           |   - Interact frequently, especially with non-tenured faculty  
                           |   - Discuss problems  
                           |   - Manage by walking around, visit offices and labs often  
                           |   - Demonstrate a personal interest in faculty research and other activities  
                           |   - Inform faculty of important administrative issues  
                           |   - Schedule regular planning meetings or retreats |
| **Goals Identification**  | - Develop and communicate reasonable expectations  
                           |   - Prepare departmental goals with faculty  
                           |   - Encourage faculty to identify short- and long-term goals  
                           |   - Help faculty to identify area of expertise  
                           |   - Counsel, encourage faculty to take training courses, etc.  
                           |   - Treat faculty as individuals |
TABLE 9, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Support     | - Encourage creativity, establish necessary environment  
- Encourage faculty participation in campus activities and committees  
- Encourage faculty interaction with appropriate peer groups at local, regional, and national level  
- Help identify funding sources for faculty  
- Assist faculty in grant proposal preparation  
- Expect faculty to obtain grant funds  
- Provide support for research program,  
- Encourage international opportunities and expect participation  
- Support travel to professional meetings  
- Encourage and expect participation in professional societies  
- Encourage sabbaticals and faculty development leaves  
- Stress team concept with faculty  
- Appoint a mentor for new faculty  
- Guard faculty time, eliminate trivia  
- Show confidence in faculty by accepting advice and recommendations  
- Take faculty from "where they are" versus "remolding"  
- Advocate for faculty accomplishments, needs, and concerns |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation/Intervention | - Conduct rigorous and comprehensive annual evaluation  
- Provide continuous feedback to faculty on their performance  
- Use peers to review faculty performance  
- Conduct exit interview with students on faculty performance  
- Use positive reinforcement  
- Set timetable for faculty to accomplish goals  
- Use shifts in work assignments to challenge faculty  
- Change appointment or counsel faculty out of appointment  
- Adjust base salary for inequities  
- Use salary to reward and motivate  
- Give zero salary increases for unproductive faculty |
| Recognition | - Compliment faculty, write letters of appreciation to faculty with copy to administrators  
- Promote early  
- Appoint to "select" committees  
- Nominate for awards  
- Publicize faculty achievement to university, state, and nation  
- Reward teaching, research, and extension on an equal basis |
motivate unproductive faculty. One department head observed:

When you hear footsteps behind you, you push a little harder yourself.

In addition, faculty morale could be bolstered by hiring outstanding personnel as related by one department head:

...we did a lot of that [hiring] during the economic crunch. In every case, we got our first choice, and they've been great. The thing that was most rewarding about it was not that in itself, but the effect it had on the morale of the rest of the faculty...They saw these good young people coming in and they were very proud that we as a unit were able to attract them.

Thus, recruiting competent faculty was considered essential as a management tool.

**Communication**

In addition to "hiring the best", "getting to know your faculty" was cited by the thirty department heads in this study as fundamental in assisting the growth and development of faculty as demonstrated by one department head who commented:

I guess the single most important thing that one can do at the department level is to know the people. Listen to what faculty are saying about themselves and about their career.

Knowing one's faculty was described by another department head as a process which requires both "time and willingness to listen with understanding and empathy". Excellent chairs are proactive in this two-way communication pro-
cess, and identify specific behaviors to facilitate interaction.

While the annual evaluation offers one mechanism for exchange, excellent chairs appear to interact on a much more frequent and informal basis. In addition to the formal evaluation process, orientation of new faculty, and crisis intervention, excellent chairs communicate with faculty frequently and on a regular basis (76 percent), offer suggestions, "do lots of listening", and often use these opportunities to reinforce good work or to diagnose or discuss problems. Some department heads identified their administrative style as "managing by walking around," and endeavored to visit with faculty in their office or lab. Others mentioned their "open door policy" and indicated that they attempt to interact with faculty "whenever they need me." The frequency of communication facilitated early conflict intervention which appeared to be characteristic of all excellent chairs.

Formal communication was also deemed important and attention was given to the internal and external communication process. Internal communication was viewed as particularly crucial in maintaining high morale and productivity. Formal communication modes identified by excellent chairs included faculty meetings, newsletters, memos, and retreats or planning sessions. The departmental newsletter was cited as an effective channel for
administrative information, announcements and accomplishments of faculty and staff by 36 percent of the excellent chairs. Most were distributed monthly.

Frequency of faculty meetings ranged from every two weeks to "only as needed." One department head felt that providing an opportunity for faculty to communicate was so important that he scheduled faculty meetings even if "high powered activities were not going on". No relationship between frequency of faculty meetings and size of department was apparent.

It can be seen that frequent communication between department head and faculty was viewed as critical to the growth and development of faculty and was facilitated by the excellent chairs. Communication among faculty, however, was viewed by several respondents as difficult to foster, due in part to the faculty members' belief that they were well informed of one another's activities. One respondent, upon moving into administration in his department, was astonished at how little faculty knew about their colleagues. He explained the circumstances and described his attempt to rectify this problem as follows:

When I was a faculty member, I thought that I knew exactly what other people in the department were doing...It was a real shock to me when I moved into administration in the same department to find out that I knew much less about the other people than I thought I did. I realized that if I had this problem that it was very likely that other people had the same problem...I thought it might be useful for each
faculty member in the department to know as much as possible about the other faculty members... So each year after we've gone through the faculty evaluations, I distribute a small booklet to each faculty member that includes as much as possible about what each of them is doing... they can look in there and compare themselves to their peers in just about any category. This gives them a goal to shoot for.

Goals Identification

Excellent department heads considered goal identification as another important management strategy. Helping faculty identify goals, assess opportunities and set departmental direction was cited by respondents as a major responsibility of department heads and critical to the professional development of faculty. The job description was viewed as integral in this goal identification process. One department head commented:

The best thing you can do for anybody in any job is to define the job description completely. The duties, the expectations and the methods that you're going to use to evaluate that person's performance... If you don't do that... I think anything else that you do is pretty much cosmetic.

Eighty-four percent of the excellent chairs indicated that new faculty are given more individual attention in this process due in part to the rigorous promotion and tenure evaluation. Department heads met with new faculty as often as needed to assist in goal assessment prior to the promotion and tenure decision. For established faculty, goal assessment generally occurred during the an-
annual evaluation. According to the excellent chairs, identification of a faculty member's long- and short-term goals could be accomplished most effectively through open discussion only after the department's direction was established. Often, to facilitate departmental goal development, retreats were scheduled to allow faculty to collectively focus on the future of the department.

To help faculty determine job direction, excellent chairs first identified their own expectations and those of the institution. Department heads then encouraged faculty to define areas of expertise, asked faculty how they felt they could best contribute to the department, and how they wanted to make their mark.

Chairpersons helped faculty identify their strengths and weaknesses in open discussions and worked with them to promote the strengths and eliminate the weaknesses. By identifying specific forms of development (e.g., toastmasters, campus instructional improvement opportunities, departmental mentoring), excellent chairs provided faculty the opportunity for professional growth.

Support

Providing frequent encouragement and support was viewed by excellent chairs as another action essential to keep faculty vital and productive members of the department. Several chairpersons characterized their role as
"coach" in this process of assisting faculty professionally. Numerous approaches were cited by department heads as effectively enhancing faculty morale and performance. One fundamental form of assistance identified by department heads as critical to the professional development of faculty was financial support. Providing adequate facilities, equipment, technicians and graduate students, for example, was considered imperative, but increasingly difficult due to the current fiscal situation at several universities represented in this study.

Another major form of support cited by several respondents was demonstrating confidence in faculty. Chairs showed confidence by delegating responsibility and authority to the faculty member, by seeking their advice and counsel, and by listening to and accepting the recommendations emanating from committees in which the faculty member played a substantive role. Participatory decision making was encouraged and facilitated, and served to strengthen faculty morale.

Participation within the department and at the college and university level was selectively encouraged and supported by excellent chairs as evidenced by one respondent who stated:

I watch for situations that can further that person's professional development and for situations that can be detrimental. Then, I either encourage or discourage participation.
Fifty-seven percent of the excellent chairs indicated they cautioned faculty about overcommitment to committee work and other campus activities and limited committee assignments for new faculty. Other forms of assistance for new faculty included providing release time, encouraging and assisting participation in professional societies, assisting in grant writing and editing, and helping faculty define research direction. Most department heads viewed assisting new faculty a high priority as evidenced by the following comment:

In my view they are the future of the department and I feel that I can have a greater impact by putting the emphasis on the young people that are going to be the future...If a choice has to be made, I bank on new faculty.

When dealing with the older unproductive faculty member, some respondents indicated they encourage them to consider early retirement. A few of the participants in the study counseled "stuck" faculty out of the academic environment. One department head commented:

There comes a time when some faculty clearly know that their career is not going well...they know they're frustrated with research and their teaching is not that good. I have actually worked with two of our faculty very recently to get them jobs outside the university. I usually try to work hard to get people out of the system as well as to improve them.

Others helped faculty find a "better fit" at another institution.
I knew of some positions that were available that I thought the person would be good at. I encouraged other people to call and let them know about the positions.

Additionally, the excellent department chairs studied supported all faculty by removing obstacles and shoulder-ing added responsibilities. One department head commented:

...I've assembled one of the best groups of scientists in the country...they can more productively spend their time doing science and I can more productively spend my time helping them do it...that means keeping a lot of paper work off their desks.

Some department heads in the study indicated they support faculty by serving as mentors to their assistant professors or by appointing a senior faculty member to serve as a role model. Others encourage interaction with senior faculty on an informal basis. One department head commented:

I assign a full professor to work with each assistant and associate professor in preparing their [promotion and/or tenure] documents. I actually change those individuals from year to year to get different input and different concepts across.

Another department head stated:

I unofficially appoint a mentor. I do that because I do not want a superior/inferior relationship to develop in the department...and I want it to be relatively informal.

Generally speaking, the department heads studied supported sabbaticals, and research and development leaves for their faculty particularly for their mid-
career and senior faculty. Several, however, expressed frustration at how few of their faculty were willing to participate. To encourage participation in sabbaticals, one department head has given each faculty member $1,000 if they will take a sabbatical. Another respondent who administers a larger department facilitated leaves by encouraging faculty to plan ahead two or three years before the scheduled leave. As more faculty participate, more want to become involved. The department head stated:

I try to have 3 or 4 gone every year. That has really become a norm...people pick up and change their role.

In addition to supporting participation in sabbaticals and other leave programs, the respondents cited altering faculty appointments and helping the mid-career or senior faculty member, whose productivity has declined, focus on a new interest. One department head commented:

The mid-career person who is in a rut...I try to see if I can get them into something that excites them. I try to change the direction, as long as what they're doing can be dropped. Once, for example, I got him into the department leadership in computers and assisting other faculty. Encourage them to get into something they really excel at.

For the more vital and productive faculty member, "getting out of the way" was voiced by several department chairs as the best assistance. One department head commented:
My basic philosophy...is to get out of the way and let them develop. Oftentimes that's more helpful than becoming actively involved.

Several department heads indicated they promote change whenever feasible to encourage faculty vitality and productivity. Whenever a vacancy occurred in the department, one respondent encouraged faculty to "make shifts...to pursue new areas of interest". He facilitated this change by developing "discussion starters", a role description sent to each faculty member every fall for the following year. For each faculty member, the department head states the general functions of their role and introduces some variation. He elaborated:

I propose a mixture of percentage of time each would have in research, service, and teaching. I propose specifically which classes they might teach the following year and on most people I would put in some surprises...I'd put in a course that they maybe have not done to get them to think differently. I send this out to all faculty...once they see other people start doing things differently, they come in and say maybe I ought to renegotiate my role.

As discussed earlier, the practice of changing a faculty member's direction is sometimes used for the mid-career person who is "in a rut". While several chairs indicated their willingness to support shifts within the department, redirecting a faculty member is not always possible in smaller departments. One department head noted:

The striking thing in coming to a small department in a university is how few
supportive resources the department chair really has compared with other places I've been--government and industry. They are staffed thinly, one deep. The idea of being able to shift people around just isn't there.

The excellent chairs in the study often support faculty by anticipating potential problems and initiating change. One department chair, for example, greatly reduced the trend toward "empire building" within the department through his departmental committee structure. He explained:

I have a system of committees in the department, and I shake them up every two or three years so that people don't become entrenched in a certain area. Because I move them around often enough, I've never seen a problem with people feeling that something is just their turf.

All excellent chairs viewed themselves as strong advocates of their faculty and of their department. Several department heads stated that they supported faculty by communicating frequently with the appropriate dean concerning their departmental and individual accomplishments and, simultaneously, determined the "mood" of the administration in matters relating to the department. This was accomplished through meetings scheduled specifically for this purpose, chance meetings on campus, and by distributing the department newsletter. One department head illustrated the importance of communicating department accomplishments to higher administration when he observed that "an informed dean is a supportive dean."
This advocacy role required department heads to know about their faculty's programs, reinforcing the need for continual dialogue. In addition to higher administration, several department heads stated that they actively campaigned on behalf of their department throughout the university, the state, and beyond.

Finally, all of the excellent chairs encouraged involvement in professional organizations. Most were able to support faculty participation by providing travel funds to regional and/or national meetings.

**Evaluation**

As mentioned previously, excellent chairs advocate frequent or continuous feedback to assist faculty professionally. The rigorous and comprehensive annual evaluation process, however, was considered essential for the growth and development of faculty. The significance of the annual performance appraisal was evidenced by the emphasis placed on preparation by the excellent chairs. Most department heads, for example, expected and often required their faculty to complete an evaluation form stating their activities for the year. Several department heads required each faculty member to state specific goals for the year and held them accountable for goals set the previous year. One department head uses a practice which facilitates this information gathering which he calls "feeding the file." He explained:
I ask all faculty to continually "feed the file". For the new assistant professors, I knew they had no basis for the ground rules and I knew how difficult it was to document everything without keeping a current file. This has worked out quite well. It sets an expectation and allows faculty members to see continual progress. All they need to do at the year end when the annual conference comes up is to supplement the file in any way they choose.

Whitman and Weiss (1982) suggest that "...if there exists one conventional wisdom in the field of faculty evaluation it is that using multiple data sources is desirable" (p. 2). Similarly, several excellent chairs "distributed the burden of faculty evaluation" through the use of student evaluation for classroom instructors, peer evaluation or review and, in some cases, self evaluation. In one large department (over 15 FTE) faculty rank themselves on the same scale as the department chair and defend or discuss their rankings during the annual conference. Another department head has initiated a peer review process for all faculty members who have yet to be tenured or promoted. He elaborated:

I annually send around a very simple two question form. How close are you to this individual? Do you feel very highly or very negatively? Every faculty participates—even the non-tenured people evaluate other non-tenured people. I review these with the tenure and promotion committee and with the individual faculty member and it becomes, in the case of the young faculty, probably the first thing they want to see.

The department head interprets the comments to the faculty to ensure confidentiality. In one situation, four or
five people commented that a young faculty member was particularly harsh in dealing with graduate students. The department head, by carefully questioning this faculty member about his interaction with graduate students, was able to use the information from the peer evaluation to effect a behavior change. The department head continued:

It turned out he was just very impatient. We hire very outstanding people. You get people who want everyone else to be as good as they are. He was coming down a little hard on graduate students. That was completely solved.

Another method of obtaining information for the evaluation process was the exit interview with graduating seniors. The department head discusses courses and instructors with each student, summarizes the comments, and compares them with the teacher evaluation form. This information is then used along with the other data.

Department heads identify and address problems throughout the year but often use the formal evaluation process to tackle major issues relating to faculty productivity. Most chairpersons in this study indicated that they scheduled a formal meeting with each faculty member to discuss their goals and accomplishments, their strengths and weaknesses, specific problems and suggested remediation. Thus, the annual conference was often the springboard for initiating significant changes in faculty activity.
Merit salary decisions were closely tied to the evaluation process by excellent department chairs. Most agreed that withholding salary increases for faculty who don't achieve rarely of itself promotes productivity. Several, however, use this practice. One department head suggested that "...it may not be effective, but it frees up additional funds for productive faculty."

Recognition

Finally, recognizing and rewarding faculty was viewed as a deterrent to faculty problems and a reinforcement for faculty productivity. While strongly tied to the annual evaluation process, excellent department heads reinforce faculty productivity throughout the year. One department head commented:

If I have a faculty member who is extremely productive...I don't ignore the fact that they are doing a superior job except once a year. Pat them on the back. Publicly praise them. I think we have to encourage even those who are doing very very well to continue to do so.

Forms of recognition reported by the excellent chairs were early promotion, salary increase, additional funding, appointment to "select" committees, and nomination for awards. Several department heads stated that they organized award committees within their department to facilitate the nomination of faculty. Excellent chairs reinforce the award winner with a letter in the file and
some publicity within the department and to higher administration.

**Conditions Related to Behaviors**

The major purpose of this study was to identify behaviors used by "excellent" department chairpersons to assist faculty professionally and describe conditions which affect those behaviors. Several general observations can be made regarding how department heads enhance the growth and development of their faculty. As the case studies and other description of strategies and behaviors indicate, excellent chairpersons in this study perform specific behaviors to assist faculty professionally.

Most of these behaviors were learned "on the job" and from other department heads. Further observations presented here include differences in behaviors based on size of department and career stage, sources of satisfaction, and factors which influence department head behaviors.

**Large vs. Small Departments**

Few differences were noted between strategies and behaviors used in larger (greater than 15 FTE) versus smaller (less than 15 FTE) departments. One major distinction of the larger department was the flexibility to adjust and shift appointments among faculty, a strategy
which was often used to redirect the efforts of a "dozer" or "stuck" faculty member. Another notable difference between large and small departments was in the channels of communication. In larger departments, more formal communication was utilized by department heads. Memos and newsletters were used frequently and responsibility delegated or information disseminated through committee chairs and section leaders. Chairs of smaller departments relied more on informal communication, easily visiting with their faculty "several times a week."

**Career Stage**

Some variance in excellent chair behavior was noted based upon the career stage of faculty. Baldwin (1984) notes that "...professors progress through a series of sequential career stages characterized by different demands, motivations, rewards, and professional development needs" (p. 46). Although several of the excellent chairs had some knowledge of the adult and career development literature, it appears that it was more difficult for most chairs to identify developmental issues for mid-career and older faculty than for those beginning a career. Excellent chairs generally spent time with faculty regardless of career stage. New faculty, however, were given more individual attention due in part to the "rigorous promotion and tenure evaluation." Most chairs
did indicate concern about the few "stuck" faculty members (usually identified as senior faculty) but admitted-ly spent more of their time on productive faculty. One department head acknowledged that he didn't devote a large amount of time to people who are burned out because "I wouldn't, then, have time to spend time on people who are productive."

**Personal Satisfaction**

Tucker (1984) notes that most chairs are generally satisfied with their administrative role and gain "... personal satisfaction from helping others with their professional development and from helping to guide and build an effective academic program" (p. 389). Despite various frustrations associated with the role of academic department head, e.g., ambiguity of the position, proliferation of paperwork, fear of becoming professionally obsolete, the excellent chairpersons in this study expressed satisfaction in their administrative position. Over 75 percent of the excellent chairs cited "accomplishments of faculty" as a major source of satisfaction. "Hiring outstanding faculty", "building a department of national reputation" and "the turnaround of troubled faculty" were also viewed as major job satisfiers providing excellent chairs sufficient motivation to continue in the headship role.
Factors Which Influence Department Head Behaviors

A factor that was cited by most excellent chairs both as influencing the way in which they assist faculty, and a major source of dissatisfaction, was the declining resource base. Most respondents were particularly concerned with funding cuts as they adversely affected the department chair's ability to hire and reward good faculty. One department head commented that "...money has not been there to bring in the young faculty that we need for our vitality as a department." Another concluded that "...it's never completely satisfying not to be able to reward your best performers." Additionally, diminishing resources was viewed as challenging the authority of the department head as exemplified by the comment "...in times of contracting resources, the decision-making and the activity of those in the central administration becomes greater." Finally, several chairs concluded that the declining resource base had forced them to assume a more active role of fund raising just to keep their departments and faculty competitive.

Another factor identified by most excellent chairs as influencing their ability to enhance the growth and development of faculty was support from higher administration. One department head reflected the sentiments of several suggesting that "...the philosophy of the admin-
istration at the college and experiment station level and above has a significant influence on the development of faculty and the way they perform..." Most excellent chairs characterized their deans as "very positive and supportive."

**Specific Behaviors**

Further analysis of the data indicated that excellent chairpersons perform particular behaviors to enhance the professional growth and development of faculty. An emerging pattern of behavior was identified commencing with the establishment of the appropriate departmental climate; a "supportive open environment" marked by "honesty and openness" on the part of the department chairperson. It was within this environment that excellent chairs felt they could most effectively assist faculty. One department head suggested that "...certainly, in a helpful environment, I can talk to faculty in trouble with better results."

Faculty were generally characterized by the excellent chairs as either "vital and productive", or "troubled". Although excellent chairs emphasized the individuality of faculty, troubled faculty were assisted by excellent chairs through the implementation of specific actions irrespective of type of problem or the faculty's career stage. Once a problem had been identified, excellent chairs then gathered the pertinent information
and acted promptly to rectify the problem. On the whole, excellent chairs were convinced that many potential problems could be averted by frequent interaction and continual monitoring of faculty performance. However, their concern was not only for troubled faculty but also for the vital and productive members of their departments. Many excellent chairs identified specific behaviors that would support the "movers", reduce the number and magnitude of faculty problems, and foster early detection of those that did occur.

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to identify behaviors used by excellent academic department chairpersons to assist faculty professionally. This chapter began with a discussion of the preliminary data which included demographics of the sample, administrative career expectations, previous administrative experience, training, conditions which affect chairperson behaviors, and sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Data revealed that excellent chairpersons headed departments ranging in size from 11 to 69 members. The period of incumbency ranged from two to 26 years with the administrative career expectations from less than one to about 10 years. Less than half of the excellent chairs reported prior administrative experience most commonly serving
as department head, program head, or research project
director. Department heads reported various methods of
training and development for their role in assisting the
growth and development of faculty. However, most adminis-
trative behaviors were learned "on the job" and from
other department heads. According to the excellent chairs
several factors influence the way in which they assist
faculty. The two conditions having the most direct
impact were the declining resource base and support from
higher administration. Despite various frustrations,
chairpersons were generally satisfied in their adminis-
trative role.

Following a discussion of the preliminary data, six
case studies were presented to demonstrate how excellent
chairs assist "troubled" faculty. Chairs were convinced
that many potential problems could be averted by frequent
interaction and continual monitoring of faculty perfor-
mance. Their concern, however, was not only for troubled
faculty. Department heads identified behaviors to sup-
port the "movers", reduce the number and magnitude of
faculty problems, and foster early detection of those
that did occur.

Next a framework for the organization of these
behaviors was offered drawing on responses from three
questions including "Advice to New Chairs". Chairpersons
offered numerous recommendations which were sorted into
the following six categories: recruitment, communications, goals identification, support, evaluation, and recognition. Conditions related to behaviors concluded the chapter.
CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON BEHAVIORS:
ENHANCING THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF FACULTY

A college or university is only as good as its faculty. As Dressel (1981) writes, "The major work of the university is done by the faculty...and coordinated by administrative sources" (p. 27). Indeed, the faculty together with academic department heads in particular, are key to the successful operation of the university. Given the importance of faculty within the institution, their development and continued productivity becomes critical to the vitality of the university.

In the decade of the eighties, more than ever before, the condition of institutions of higher education in general, and of the professoriate in particular, is a major concern (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1983; Kanter, 1979; Schuster & Bowen, 1985). The reality of declining enrollments and diminishing resources continues to cause concern on most college and university campuses across the country. These trends are likely to continue (Hodgkinson, 1985) resulting in lowered faculty mobility, a sharp decline in real earnings (Schuster & Bowen, 1985) and fewer opportunities for personal and professional development (Kanter, 1977). During any period of change, a central issue which must be addressed is whether an
organization can maintain academic excellence without fostering faculty vitality. Faculty development programs present institutions of higher education with opportunities to keep faculty current and build excellence from within.

One promising and economical approach to faculty development builds on the current institutional structure by working through first-line managers in higher education, the academic department chairperson. If, as Dressel (1981) suggests, most faculty find that their immediate concerns and involvement in the institution are through their departments, then department heads are in a particularly pivotal position to encourage, support, and recognize growth and development activities of their faculty.

While department heads acknowledge their responsibility for the enhancement of faculty growth and development (Boice, 1985), they are poorly prepared to assume this role. Most department chairs are promoted to these positions through the academic ranks with little or no leadership training and without a clear understanding of the skills of managing and facilitating the growth of faculty and staff. Knight and Holen (1985) contend that this inexperience "...intensifies the need for information concerning the behavior characteristics of department chairpersons who are perceived to be effective"
(p. 685). It should be possible, then, to gain valuable information about how chairs assist faculty by studying behaviors of chairpersons who have been identified as significantly enhancing the professional growth and development of faculty in their departments. This assumption was the guiding principle of the present study.

The Chairperson's Role in Faculty Development

Numerous authors have labeled the academic department as vital to the functioning of the university (Corson, 1975; Dressel, et al. 1970; Euwema, 1953; Heimler, 1967; McHenry, 1977; Waltzer, 1975) and key to the successful achievement of the university's mission of teaching, research, and public service (Anderson, 1968; Dilley, 1972; Ikenberry & Friedman, 1972; Roach, 1976). As Bennett (1983) asserts, "It is at the department level that the real institutional business gets conducted" (p. 1). Given the importance of the academic department within the institution, the department head becomes a critical link, fostering the professional and intellectual development of his or her faculty while providing leadership to accomplish the university's mission.

To what extent is the department head responsible for the development of faculty? Faculty development has been identified by numerous investigators as a legitimate function of the department head. Tucker (1984) described
the roles, functions, and responsibilities of department heads based on data collected from over 1,000 administrators since 1980. In a project funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Tucker designed and tested a model for planned change in higher education that would enhance the planning, management and leadership competencies of department chairs within the nine institutions of the state university system of Florida. Subsequently, information was gathered from department chairs in colleges and universities outside of Florida. Based on this data, Tucker identified several categories of responsibilities for department chairs. These include department governance, instruction, faculty and student affairs, external communication, budget and resources, office management, and professional development.

Faculty development has also been identified by other investigators as a legitimate function of the department head. McLaughlin, et al., (1975) gathered information from 1,198 department heads at 32 Ph.D.-granting public institutions in the United States. They identified three roles of the department head: (1) the academic role which consists of involvement with students and research; (2) the administrative role of record keeping and a link with the rest of the institution; and, (3) a leadership role of personnel and program development.
Using data from the McLaughlin et al. study, Smart and Elton (1976) identified 27 department head responsibilities which they combined into four roles: (1) the faculty role of personnel development and morale building; (2) the coordinating role of planning and representing; (3) the research role of grant management and graduate student supervision; and, (4) the instructional role of teaching, advising, and record keeping.

In an unrelated investigation, Bragg (1980) identified four role orientations characterized by a primary focus on faculty, external relations, program, or management. Using information gathered from 39 department heads at Pennsylvania State University, she examined the socialization of academic department heads to the headship role. Sixteen of the 39 heads interviewed were found to concentrate their efforts more on the faculty orientation role than the other 3 roles. These heads "...described their primary responsibilities as recruiting, developing, and evaluating faculty members, facilitating the work of the faculty, reducing intra-departmental conflict, and improving faculty morale" (p.116). All studies cited above clearly recognized the chairperson's role of faculty developer. Other researchers have described specific methods chairs used to assist faculty growth and development.
Wheeler and Creswell (1985) identified strategies used by department chairpersons and faculty to encourage research development based on a research review of the faculty productivity literature. Specific strategies identified include mentoring and collaboration with colleagues. In another study, Wheeler, et al. (1986) described the roles and activities used by outstanding department heads to assist faculty growth and development. Seven roles were identified (communicator, facilitator, academic leader, motivator, counselor, politician and manager of "administrivia") which are important to the development of faculty and department vitality.

Research Questions

Given that the development of faculty is seen as a legitimate function of the department head (Bragg, 1980; McLaughlin, Montgomery, & Malpass, 1975) Smart & Elton, 1976) and even a preferred role (McLaughlin, et.al., 1975; Tucker, 1984), that department heads are poorly prepared to assume this role, and that past studies have limited their discussions to the identification of roles, functions and responsibilities, this study focuses on describing behaviors used by academic department chairpersons to enhance the professional growth and development of faculty in their departments. More specifically, this study identifies excellent department chair behav-
iors that assist faculty professionally, and describes conditions which affect these behaviors, (e.g., factors that influence behaviors, sources of information that helped chairpersons arrive at these behaviors, satisfactions and dissatisfactions, and advice to new chairs).

**Method**

**Subjects**

Thirty academic department chairpersons from ten of the twelve North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture participated in this study. One of the non-participating universities was chosen as the site of the pilot for the survey instrument. The one remaining institution was eliminated because the tenure of all chairpersons within the college was two years or less.

College of Agriculture deans and chairpersons identified three chairs who had excelled at assisting faculty professionally. Chairpersons whose names appeared most often on the lists were selected for interviewing. Deans and chairs at the ten participating colleges identified sixty-one excellent chairpersons (see Table 1, p. 46). The number identified at each college ranged between four and ten. The data in Table 1 shows the total number of votes cast at each institution and the total number and percentage of votes received by the three chairpersons selected for interviewing. The number of votes received
by the selected chairs, expressed as a percent of all votes cast, ranged from 61.9 percent to 84.6 percent, averaging 72.7 percent. Of the thirty chairpersons selected for interviewing, twenty-three were identified by both deans and chairpersons. The remaining seven were identified only by chairs.

Instrument

A nonscheduled structured interview schedule was developed for this study to afford the interviewer choices as to order and wording of questions. The validity and reliability of the interview schedule were tested in a pilot study using six chairpersons, three from one midwestern university and three from one eastern university.

The interview schedule consisted of five sections and 20 questions. The first section asked for background information including number of faculty in the unit, method of chair's selection, number of years in the position, administrative career expectation, previous administrative experience, and mission of the department.

The second section sought behaviors used by the chairs to assist faculty professionally. First, participants were asked to focus on one faculty member who had grown professionally over the last few years, and then to identify how he or she, as the head, had assisted him or her. Second, the department heads were asked, "In retro-
spect, what other things might you have done to assist this person?" Third, department heads were asked to describe behaviors used with the whole department and to identify approaches tried that did not work. Finally, the chairs were asked if their behaviors varied for faculty at different career stages.

The third section of the instrument consisted of questions about conditions which could influence the way chairs assist faculty. Both positive and negative factors and factors inside and outside the department were investigated.

The fourth section included two questions about chairperson development. Chairs were asked, "How have you developed your own skills and methods in this area?" and "Where do you go to get information about working with faculty?"

The questions in section five asked, "During your administrative career, what are the two or three greatest satisfactions from your role as chair, and what are the two or three greatest dissatisfactions?"

The question in the last section asked participants what advice they would give new department heads who asked, "What should I concentrate on--what should I do--to assist faculty professionally?"
procedure

Data was collected through telephone interviews of the thirty department chairpersons. The interview required 30 minutes to one hour to complete. Prior to the interview, the chairpersons were sent an introductory letter describing the purpose of the project, the topic area to be covered and various issues which would be discussed during the interview. In addition, they were told the process by which they were selected, the length of time required for the interview, and when to expect the interviewer's call. The exact time for the interview was scheduled in advance with the chairperson's secretary.

The specific data analysis for this study was suggested by qualitative methods of interview interpretation (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Wolf, 1979) and included: (1) tape recording and transcribing each interview; (2) sorting the interviews for issues, concerns and factual information; (3) conceptualizing a model that visually represented major issues; (4) designating the coding unit as the entire interview due to the overlap of responses offered to questions; (5) formulating response categories for content analysis of the interviews; (6) testing the coding instrument for intercoder reliability (three professors from one North Central Region Land-Grant College of Agriculture served as coders to verify the accuracy of
the researchers observations); and, (7) presenting the responses in the narrative discussion as related to each research question. Frequency counts and percentages were used for this descriptive data.

Results

Preliminary Information about Chairpersons

Those chairpersons selected headed departments ranging in size from 11 to 69 members with a mean of 30 members. The period of incumbency ranged from two to 26 years. Only 27 percent had served for five years or less. The administrative career expectations of the excellent chairs ranged from less than one to about ten years. A sizable minority (47 percent) expected to leave their current position within three years. Of this group, 64 percent had been in their position for more than five years. Forty-three percent reported prior administrative experience, most commonly serving as department head, program head, or research project director. Nine of the department heads had gained administrative experience in a field other than education. Positions ranged from assignments in the federal government (USDA, AID, NSF, military service) to private industry.

Training Methods. Chairpersons reported various methods of training and development for their role in assisting the growth and development of faculty.
Forty-seven percent cited observation of department heads and other administrators as a major source of development. Thirty-seven percent reported some reliance on journals, books and newsletters. Others questioned the usefulness of books as tools in department head development. "I don't get much from them [books]. A lot of nonsense is written about academic administration."

Journals and books mentioned most often dealt with management and management styles, human relations and personnel management. The *Harvard Business Review* was cited as a helpful source of information on management and human relations. Several respondents indicated a preference for newsletters as a source of information on personnel management due in part to the succinct manner of presentation. Newsletters mentioned by "excellent" chairs included "The Administrator", "Academic Leader", "Office Today", "Personal Report for the Executive", and "Working Smart, '87".

Interaction with department heads was cited as an important method of chair development by 30 percent of the respondents. Chairs reported meeting with other department heads in their college regularly to discuss common problems and concerns. Formal meetings within the North Central Region were mentioned by several department heads as an important forum for exchanging problems and concerns. One department head suggested that "...listen-
ing to what others have to say is helpful...at these meetings I can get a real feel for what other department heads are doing..."

Other methods of development reported by respondents were workshops, courses, and conferences. Ten department chairs reported some level of participation in at least one of these activities. For some respondents, the North Central Region New Administrators Workshop was particularly helpful. One chairperson depicted the NCR workshop as "extraordinarily helpful" and observed, "...it gave me some tools and insight that I just didn't have. That was probably the greatest gift the college ever gave to me."

Several respondents indicated they were somewhat disappointed that their college administration did not send them through a formal training workshop at the outset.

"On the job training" was reported by 30 percent of the department heads as an important method of development. Several credited their administrative assistants and head secretaries with helping them "learn the ropes."

Finally, when asked how they had developed their skills in assisting faculty professionally, 20 percent of the chairpersons reported trial and error, or as one stated, "...probably by committing every deadly sin...basically I've sort of gone with what seems to work." Although trial and error was considered a legitimate means of development, one department chair cautioned that
"...if you don't learn from your mistakes, you don't last long as a department head." All chairpersons recognized the need for training. Several, however, complained of too little time for formal development activities.

Conditions. A factor that was cited by most chairs as influencing the way in which they assist faculty was the declining resource base. Most respondents were particularly concerned with funding cuts as they adversely affected the department chair's ability to hire and reward good faculty. One department head commented that "...money has not been there to bring in the young faculty that we need for our vitality as a department." Another concluded that "...it's [dissatisfying] not to be able to reward your best performers." Additionally, diminishing resources were viewed as challenging the authority of the department head as exemplified by the comment, "...in times of contracting resources, the decision-making and the activity of those in the central administration becomes greater." Finally, several chairs concluded that the declining resource base had forced them to assume a more active role in fund raising just to keep their departments and faculty competitive.

Another factor indentified by most chairs as influencing their ability to enhance the growth and development of faculty was support from higher administration. One department head reflected the sentiments of several
suggesting that "...the philosophy of the administration at the college and experiment station level and above has a significant influence on the development of faculty and the way they perform..." Most excellent chairs characterized their deans as "very cooperative" and "supportive."

**Job Satisfaction.** Despite various frustrations associated with the role of academic department head, e.g., ambiguity of the position, inability to motivate faculty, proliferation of paperwork, fear of becoming professionally obsolete, chairs were generally satisfied in their role as first-line administrators. Tucker (1984) notes that most chairs are generally satisfied with their administrative role and gain "...personal satisfaction from helping others with their professional development and from helping to guide and build an effective academic program" (p. 389). Over 75 percent of the department heads cited "accomplishments of faculty" as a major source of satisfaction. "Hiring outstanding faculty", "building a department of national reputation" and "the turnaround of troubled faculty" were also viewed as major job satisfiers providing most chairs sufficient motivation to continue in the headship role.

**Behaviors Used for Faculty Development**

Three questions combine to provide a framework for the organization of behaviors used by excellent chair-
persons to enhance the growth and development of faculty. First, participants were asked to focus on one faculty member who had grown professionally over the last few years, and then to identify how they had assisted him or her. Second the department heads were asked to describe behaviors used with the whole department. Finally, the excellent chairs were asked what advice they would give a new department head on how to assist faculty professionally. Chairs identified numerous behaviors that would support the "movers", reduce the number and magnitude of faculty problems, and foster early detection of those that did occur (See Table 9, pp. 92-94). Recommendations were sorted into the following six categories:

1. Recruitment
2. Communication
3. Goals Identification
4. Support
5. Evaluation
6. Recognition

**Recruitment.** Chairpersons viewed faculty recruitment as an opportunity to motivate unproductive faculty, to bolster faculty morale, and to establish new direction in the department. Department heads cited the recruitment of "top personnel" as one of their most important tasks; some labeling it "...the highest priority of the job."

**Communication.** Once new faculty were in position, their development of faculty continued as chairs established open channels of communication, a process requir-
ing both "time and willingness to listen with understanding and empathy". These department heads communicate with faculty frequently and on a regular basis, offer suggestions, "do lots of listening", and often use these opportunities to reinforce good work or to diagnose or discuss problems. Some chairpersons identified their administrative style as "managing by walking around," and endeavored to visit with faculty in their office or lab. Others maintain an "open door policy."

Formal communication was also deemed important and included faculty meetings, newsletters, memos, and retreats or planning sessions. Larger departments often have more formal methods of communication such as memos and newsletters. Information was also often disseminated through committee chairs and section leaders. One department head distributes a small booklet to each faculty member annually that includes "...as much as possible about what each of them is doing...they can look in there and compare themselves to their peers in just about any category. This gives them a goal to shoot for." Chairs of smaller departments rely more on informal communication, easily visiting with their faculty "several times a week."

**Goals Identification.** Department chairpersons cited goal identification as a major responsibility of the head. Eighty-four percent indicated that new faculty are
given more individual attention in this regard. Goal assessment for established faculty generally occurred during the annual evaluation process.

**Support.** Chairs provided frequent encouragement and support to faculty to ensure vitality and productivity. Several chairpersons characterized their role as "coach" in this process of faculty development. Providing financial support, adequate facilities, equipment, technicians and graduate students, for example, was considered imperative, but increasingly difficult due to the current fiscal situation at the ten universities represented in the study. Other forms of assistance for new faculty included providing release time, encouraging and assisting participation in professional societies, assisting in grant writing and editing, and helping faculty define research direction. All respondents are strong advocates of their faculty and communicate frequently with the appropriate dean concerning their departmental and individual accomplishments.

Chairpersons support faculty regardless of career stage by anticipating potential problems and promoting change whenever feasible. Several behaviors were cited by the department heads as having some degree of effectiveness with "stuck" (Kanter, 1979) faculty. Whenever a vacancy occurred in the department, one respondent encouraged faculty to "...make shifts, to pursue new areas of
He facilitated this change by developing "discussion starters", a role description sent to each faculty member every fall for the following year. For each faculty member, the department head states the general functions of their role and introduces some variation. "I send this out to all faculty...once they see other people start doing things differently, they come in and say, maybe I ought to renegotiate my role." A few of the chairs counseled "stuck" faculty out of the academic environment. Others helped faculty find a "better fit" at another institution. For the more vital and productive faculty member, "getting out of the way" was voiced by several department chairs as the "best assistance".

**Evaluation.** Department heads advocate frequent or continuous feedback to enhance faculty growth and development. Rigorous and comprehensive annual evaluation, however, is considered a key to faculty vitality and productivity. Chairpersons augment the college's system of evaluation with their own assessment techniques. In one department, faculty rank themselves on the same scale as the department chair and defend or discuss their rankings during the annual conference. In another department, a peer review process was initiated for all faculty members who have yet to be tenured or promoted. One department head indicated that during the annual evaluation meeting, "...this is the first thing they want
to see." Whitman and Weiss (1982) concur with such approaches stating that "...if there exists one conventional wisdom in the field of faculty evaluation, it is that using multiple data sources is desirable" (p. 2).

**Recognition.** Recognizing and rewarding faculty was viewed as a deterrent to faculty problems and reinforcement for faculty productivity. Forms of recognition reported by chairs included early promotion, salary increases, additional funding for teaching and research programs, appointment to "select" committees, and nomination for awards.

**Discussion**

The present study aimed to identify the behaviors used by excellent chairpersons to enhance the professional growth and development of faculty. Analysis of the interview responses provide evidence of a pattern of behavior used by department heads to assist "troubled" faculty. From the identification of a problem, the determination of contributing factors, the continual dialogue and counseling, to the implementation of an appropriate action plan, chairpersons offered support and encouragement to develop new faculty and revitalize the "dozer".
Averting Problems

On the whole, department heads were convinced that many potential problems could be averted by frequent interaction and continual monitoring of faculty performance. However, their concern was not just for troubled faculty. Chairpersons identified behaviors that would support the "movers", reduce the number and magnitude of faculty problems, and foster early detection of those that did occur. Most of these behaviors were learned "on the job" and from other department heads.

Variation in Chairperson Behaviors

In the view of several researchers (Demerath, Stephens, & Taylor, 1967; Hobbes & Anderson, 1971), the developmental role of the department head is likely to vary from department to department and may be contingent, to some degree, on its size (Murray, 1964). In general, few differences were noted in strategies and behaviors used in the 30 departments represented in this study. One advantage of a larger department (greater than 15 FTE) was the flexibility to adjust and shift appointments among faculty, a strategy which was often used to redirect the efforts of a "dozer" or "stuck" faculty member. Another notable difference between large and small departments was in the channels of communication. In larger departments, more formal communication was utilized by
department heads. Memos and newsletters were used frequently and responsibility delegated or information disseminated through committee chairs and section leaders. Chairs of smaller departments relied more on informal communication, easily visiting with their faculty "several times a week."

Some variance in excellent chair behavior was noted based upon the career stage of faculty. Baldwin (1984) states that "...professors progress through a series of sequential career stages characterized by different demands, motivations, rewards, and professional development needs" (p. 46). Although several of the excellent chairs had some knowledge of the adult and career development literature (Baldwin, 1979; Freedman, 1979; Levinson, 1978; Schein, 1978; Weathersby & Tarule, 1980), it appears that it was more difficult for most chairs to identify developmental issues for mid-career and older faculty than for those beginning a career. Excellent chairs generally spent time with faculty regardless of career stage. New faculty, however, were given more individual attention due in part to the "rigorous promotion and tenure evaluation." Most chairs did indicate concern about the few "stuck" faculty members (usually identified as senior faculty) but admittedly spent more of their time on productive faculty. One department head acknowledged that he didn't devote a large amount of time
Factors Influencing Chairperson Behaviors

Declining Resources. A factor that was cited by most chairpersons both as influencing the way in which they assist faculty, and a major source of dissatisfaction, was the declining resource base. As diminishing resources and other environmental conditions in higher education continue to deteriorate (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Kanter, 1979; Schuster & Bowen, 1985), department heads are faced with the phenomenon of an aging professoriate, a drop in real pay and the growing employment of part-time faculty (Schuster & Bowen, 1985). These factors, which cause faculty to see themselves as "stuck" in the career structure of the organization (Kanter, 1979), challenge department heads to keep faculty vital, productive members of the department. Most respondents were particularly concerned with funding cuts as they adversely affected their ability to hire and reward good faculty.

Additionally, diminishing resources was viewed by department heads as challenging their power and authority. One respondent noted that "...in times of contracting resources, the decision-making and the activity of those in the central administration becomes greater", a phenomena which may adversely affect the development of
faculty (Hill & French, 1967). Gross and Grambsch (1968) concur stating that "...where chairmen are powerful (relative to their counterparts at other universities); the well-being of the faculty receives heavy stress...and the professional development of the faculty are matters of concern" (p. 93). This phenomena of diminishing power is particularly distressing to the academic department head as he confronts seemingly limitless roles. Several chairs concluded that the declining resource base had forced them to assume yet another role as "institutional fund raiser" just to keep their departments and faculty competitive. These and other additional responsibilities brought about by the declining resource base severely limit the amount of time a department head can spend on the development of faculty.

**Administrative Support.** Another factor identified by most excellent chairs as influencing their ability to enhance the growth and development of faculty was support from higher administration. The importance of effective communication between the chairperson and the academic dean in this process is difficult to overemphasize (Bennett, 1983). One department head noted that "...an informed dean is a supportive dean", and stressed the importance of communicating department accomplishments to higher administration. Several department heads stated that they communicated frequently with the appropriate
dean in an effort to determine the "mood" of the administration in matters relating to the department and were careful to avoid actions which might be perceived as "end runs" around the administration.

Implications and Recommendations

The implications of the findings combined with limitations of the study suggest a need for further research in several areas. These needs relate primarily to training and support of academic department chairpersons and include implications for institutional policy and practice.

The sample in this study was restricted to chairs from ten of the twelve North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture which may not be representative of all department chairpersons. Thus, research should be expanded to include chairpersons from other colleges in land-grant and non-land-grant institutions, both public and private. In addition, the study was limited to the identification of behaviors used by chairpersons to assist faculty professionally. The research should be expanded to include faculty perceptions of chair behaviors.

Despite various frustrations associated with the role of academic department head, most participants in this study gained sufficient personal satisfaction to continue in the headship role. Some, however, were
anticipating a return to faculty ranks. Research focusing on the special needs of chairs as they return to the ranks of faculty is warranted.

While much has been accomplished in meeting the evolving development needs of faculty, attention to the state of the professoriate is especially critical today as environmental conditions in higher education continue to deteriorate (Blackburn & Baldwin, 1983; Schuster & Bowen, 1985). Although several of the chairpersons had some knowledge of the adult and career development literature (Baldwin, 1979; Schein, 1978; Weathersby & Tarule, 1980), most did not. Both chairs and faculty would be advised to become more attuned to developmental literature and methods of enhancing the growth and development of mid-career and senior faculty. Future research should explore ways in which chairpersons could effectively identify the unique needs of these faculty and assist them in redirecting their talents in such a manner as to once again become vital, productive members of the department.

Furthermore, the results of this study suggest that chairpersons' effectiveness as faculty developers could be enhanced by stronger institutional support. In this regard, deans and other administrators in Colleges of Agriculture can assist chairpersons in their efforts to enhance the professional development of faculty. This can be accomplished in several ways. First, institutions
should select academic department heads based as much on management qualifications as the person's reputation as a scholar. To help determine the prospective department head's management orientation, search committees should develop a series of questions to be used in the interview process to determine the candidate's approach to human resource management. In addition, the job announcement should reflect the value placed upon human resource management skills by the institution.

Next, the development of pre-service and in-service training directed toward faculty development and other issues confronting academic department chairs is warranted. One proven training ground is the North Central Region New Administrator's Workshop. Support for this or a similar activity is recommended. New chairperson orientation focusing on human resource management and involving deans, vice chancellors, experienced department heads and administrative staff development experts is also suggested. Deans would be advised to cover university and college policies and procedures as part of this orientation process.

Additionally, chairpersons should be evaluated for their efforts to successfully foster the professional development of faculty. Finally, recognition of these efforts would demonstrate to both faculty and chairpersons the value the institution places on the faculty member and his or her professional growth and development.
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APPENDIX A

Sample Letter to Deans and Chairpersons
Dr. ______
Department of ______
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

October 17, 1986

Dear Dr. ______:

A research project has been initiated at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to study the practices used by "excellent" department chairpersons in Colleges of Agriculture to assist faculty growth and development. We are asking the Deans of Resident Instruction and Academic Department Chairpersons in the North Central Region Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture to identify three academic department chairpersons in their college who have significantly enhanced the growth and development of faculty.

The department head role can best be described as multi-faceted. Four separate sub-roles can be identified: a managerial role; a representer role; a professorial role; and a development role. We would like you to focus on the development role as you identify chairpersons who are "excellent" at enhancing the growth and development of faculty in their unit.

Telephone interviews will be conducted; therefore, consideration should be given to the availability of the department chairpersons to visit with us in late November and early December. Please forward the names, addresses and phone numbers of the department chairpersons in the envelope provided by November 7, 1986.

You help and that of other Deans and Chairpersons is essential to the success of this study. We appreciate your assistance.

If you have any questions, please direct them to the project leader, Myra Wilhite at (402) 472-2541.

Cordially,

Myra S. Wilhite
Project Leader
104 Agricultural Communications
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0918

T.E. Hartung, Dean
College of Agriculture
103 Agricultural Hall
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0702
APPENDIX B

Advance Letter
November 7, 1986

Dear Dr. _____:

A research project has been initiated at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to study the practices used by "excellent" department chairpersons in Colleges of Agriculture to assist faculty growth and development. You have been identified by your colleagues and administrators within your university as a department chair or head who has significantly assisted faculty professionally.

During the period of November 17 through December 4, 1986, the project director, Myra Wilhite, would like to interview you on the telephone to obtain information concerning specific practices you use to assist faculty in your unit and the conditions which influence these practices. We will be asking you to think of a faculty member in your department who you assisted in his or her professional growth; and through this method, to discuss specific practices you used in this process and conditions which influenced these practices. In addition, I'd like to address ways in which you have developed your skills in this area and finally what advice you would give to new department chairpersons.

The interview should take about 30 minutes and will be scheduled through your secretary for a time convenient to you. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. A summary of the findings will be provided at the completion of the study.

Your help and that of the other "excellent" chairpersons is essential to the success of this study. I appreciate your participation.

If you have any questions, please telephone Myra Wilhite at (402) 472-2541 or write me at the address below.

Cordially,

Myra S. Wilhite
104 Ag Communications
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0914

T. E. Hartung, Dean
College of Agriculture
103 Agricultural Hall
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0702
APPENDIX C

Telephone Interview Schedule
PROTOCOL SHEET

"Excellent" Chair Study

1. The questions in this interview are open-ended. Record the respondent’s replies right in the questionnaire in the spaces provided for each question.

2. After you finish the interview, go back over the notes and make them as understandable as possible.

3. If the chair identifies particular materials (books, checklists) make sure you get the specifics and examples if they are available.

4. When it is necessary to clarify questions, repeat the entire question or relevant part.

5. Use neutral probing if necessary when the respondent gives an incomplete response or when additional information is needed. Examples of appropriate probes:

   (a) a pause
   (b) Would you tell me more about your thinking on that?
   (c) Are there any other reasons you feel that way?
   (d) What do you think? OR What do you expect?
   (e) What do you mean? OR How do you mean?
   (f) Are there any other reasons why you feel that way?
   (g) Can you think of any other reasons?
   (h) Is there anything else?
   (i) Can you be more exact?

6. Thank the department chair and indicate that people will not be identified.

7. Enter institution and respondent codes and note date and length of interview.

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. INSTITUTION CODE _______ 3. DATE _______
2. RESPONDENT (R) CODE _______ 4. LENGTH OF INTERVIEW _______ (min)

Thanks for agreeing to be interviewed this morning/afternoon. As we indicated in our letter, our purpose in this study is to identify ways that department chairs assist their faculty members professionally, so they are more effective as teachers, as scholars/researchers, and in service.

You are one of 3 chairs in your college who were specifically identified in our preliminary inquiries as being “excellent”—in that you’re very successful in assisting and encouraging faculty professionally. We’d like to find out just what you do to assist faculty, so we can provide advice to department chairs generally through the preparation of a handbook. The information you give us will be treated in strict confidence. I anticipate that the interview will last about 30 minutes.
I want to tell you about the structure of the interview, but before we start do you have any questions about the project or the interview?

There will be four sections to the interview. First, I have a few background questions about the department.

Then I want to focus on one or two faculty members who have really grown professionally over the past two or three years, and how you, as the head, assisted them.

Next, I have some general questions about how you assist faculty and conditions that influence your practice.

Then, I want to talk about your own development, greatest satisfactions and dissatisfactions during your administrative career and finally, what advice you would give to a new department head. If you’re ready, let’s begin with some preliminary descriptive questions about your department.

**SECTION A: PRELIMINARY DATA**

A1. How many faculty are in your department? (FTE)
A2. How were you selected?
A3. How long have you been in this position?
A4. How long do you expect to stay in this position?
A5. Have you had training or previous administrative work to prepare you for this position?
A6. What is the basic mission of your department? (undergraduate, graduate, both)

**SECTION B: PRACTICES**

B1. Think of a faculty member in your department who you assisted in his/her professional growth.

O.K. Can you tell me about this person? (Probe if necessary to get understanding of the person and his/her development).

B2. Now let’s focus on your role as a chair in assisting this person. What was the main way in which you helped?

B3. What other things did you do? (probe as necessary)

B4. In retrospect, what other things might you have done to assist this person?

**REPEAT THIS PROCEDURE FOR A SECOND FACULTY MEMBER IF TIME PERMITS**
We've been talking about one person (two people) in your department. Now I want to consider the whole department.

B5. What practices do you use to assist your faculty professionally?

B6. What approaches have you tried that did not work? (Probe: Why do you feel they didn’t work?)

B7. Do your practices vary for faculty at different career stages?

| new faculty | mid-career | senior |

SECTION C: CONDITIONS

C1. Are there any factors which influence the way you assist faculty? SEEK BOTH POSITIVE FACTORS (e.g. a very supportive dean who highly values faculty growth), and NEGATIVE FACTORS (e.g. lack of resources).

- factors within the department? (e.g. faculty, nature of discipline)
- factors outside the department? (e.g. dean, academic administrators, institutional policies or expectations, trends in higher education)

C2. What would be the most helpful thing that could be done that would enable you to assist faculty?

SECTION D: CHAIRPERSON DEVELOPMENT

Now I want to look at your own development in, or preparation for, assisting faculty.

D1. How have you developed your own skills and methods in this area? (e.g. trial and error, reading [what?], workshops or courses, observation of other chairs)

D2 Where do you go to get information about working with faculty? (books, journals, workshops, and so forth)

SECTION E: DISSATISFACTIONS/SATISFACTIONS

E1. During your administrative career, what are the 2 or 3 greatest dissatisfactions from your role as chair?

E2. During your administrative career, what are the 2 or 3 greatest satisfactions from your role as chair?

The last question is about advice you might give.

SECTION F: ADVICE

F1. What advice would you give a new department chair who asked this question, "What should I concentrate on—what should I do—to assist faculty professionally? (seeking the most important/effective activities or strategies)

This concludes the interview. I really appreciate your time and efforts. Thanks!