



The Role and Function of Academic Department Chairmen in Two Land-Grant Institutions

Richard G. Siever, Director

FACILITY FORM 602

N70-36927
(ACCESSION NUMBER) (THRU)

97
(PAGES) (CODE)

CR-112866
(NASA CR OR TRXX OR AD NUMBER) (CATEGORY)

Reproduced by
**NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE**
Springfield, Va 22151

C. O. Neidt and Ross Loomis
Human Factors Research Laboratory
Colorado State University

**The Role and Function of
Academic Department Chairmen in
Two Land-Grant Institutions**

Richard G. Siever, Director

C O Neldt and Ross Loomis
Human Factors Research Laboratory
Colorado State University

NASA GRANT NGL 06-002-038

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgments	i
Abstract	ii
Chapter 1. Role and Function of the Chairman	1
Chapter 2. Goals of the Study	13
Chapter 3. Method	20
Chapter 4. Results	28
Chapter 5. Discussion and Recommendations	35
Chapter 6. Summary	42
Appendix A. Tables 8 through 32	44
Appendix B. Sample Questionnaire, Deans' Effectiveness Rating Form, Cover Letters	69
Appendix C. Detailed Results for Colorado State University	74
Appendix D. Detailed Results for Kansas State University	81
Bibliography	88

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research team would like to acknowledge the financial assistance provided for this project from the Office of University Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Mr. Richard Stephens, NASA project officer, played a significant role in the development of this study.

ABSTRACT

A sample of faculty and administrators at two land-grant universities ranked a series of questionnaire items reflecting characteristics of effective departmental chairmen. There was a marked tendency to agree on what chairman characteristics were most and least important. Agreement held up across differences in rank, college, broad academic discipline groups, years of experience, and number of publications. Characteristics ranked as important included support of good teaching, reputation for achieving goals, ability to recruit promising faculty, good organization of faculty duties, a personal reputation for scholarship, and a capacity for decisive thinking and action. Typical low rated characteristics involved being highly identified with one's own discipline; identifying as one of the faculty, first among equals; maintaining a low turnover rate in faculty; and fund raising along with other extradepartmental involvement with broader university groups, community organizations, and government agencies.

Agreement among participants in the study was most marked for items involving professional activities and administrative responsibilities. Less agreement was found over personal characteristics of chairmen.

Other outcomes of the investigation indicated little relationship between a dean's rating of the effectiveness

of a chairman and the amount of agreement between chairman and dean on the chairman characteristics questionnaire. Likewise, no relationship existed between the dean's effectiveness rating and the amount of agreement between chairmen and their faculty over characteristics contained in the questionnaire.

A final observation of the study was that chairmen appointed on a limited term basis view important characteristics of their role in about the same manner as chairmen placed on a lifetime appointment.

Findings of the study were discussed in terms of the need for clearer understanding of the styles of leadership in academic administration, relations of the chairman to groups outside the department, criteria for evaluating chairmen, the need for chairmen training or internship programs, better definitions of personal characteristics that lead to effective performance, and expansion of the survey to include a greater range of institutions.

CHAPTER ONE

ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE CHAIRMAN

The chairmanship of an academic department represents a critical leadership position in a college or university. As an individual with administrative responsibilities, the chairman is the leader of his unit. As a scholar, however, he is the agent of the faculty members comprising his department. Thus, the role of the chairman can be viewed from the perspective of a dean or from the perspective of the faculty. Since the views from these two perspectives may be discrepant, ineffectiveness within the department may result. This ineffectiveness is likely to influence faculty productivity, morale, and instructional quality, as well as the department's ability to conduct funded research. The present study of the role and function of the department chairman has been undertaken to gain insight about both administrative and faculty perceptions of this critical position. Once these perceptions are known, meaningful decisions about the selection and training of department chairmen can be made and research agencies can more nearly assess the likelihood that research can be completed successfully within a particular department.

A characterization of department chairmen by Caplow and McGee is presented on the following page as a preface

to a detailed review of the literature on the departmental chairmanship. Although humorous in nature, the characterization had its origin in observations made on the higher education scene.

OBSERVATIONS ON A DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN

The Robber Baron. Holding forth in a large and independently wealthy department, often of physical science, the robber baron is an absolute autocrat within his domain and a holy terror to the surrounding territories. He rules his sovereign principality with an iron hand and wages aggressive warfare against his neighbors in an unceasing attempt to annex their budgets, if not their territories, and to bring them under submission. He acknowledges only a very loose allegiance to any larger political unit or overlord and often has the latter scared to death of him. He spends most of his time behind his battlements, snarling and planning future conquests.

The Lord of the Mountain Fief. Like the robber baron, the lord rules a large department; but unlike him, he is apt to be a benevolent despot, and his department is more often old and prestigious than wealthy. He is often a historian, economist, or linguist by upbringing, and he prefers, from disciplinary bias and from taste, to retire behind his natural ramparts and let the world go its way while he gently dominates his quiet valleys. He is a crusty old bird, but is no villain, and unobtrusive unless attacked. Very frequently he is an elder statesman in campus affairs.

The Yeoman Farmer. The pillar of the university's workday program, the honest yeoman and his plowman ask little except that they be left alone to raise their annual crop of undergraduates and, in return for their inarticulate allegiance, receive a small but just share of any spoils. Seldom terribly exercised about anything except an immediate threat to his freehold, he toils in his fields with his men and is distinguishable from them only occasionally when he speaks up to ask another hand or a more equitable division of tasks.

The Gentleman Adventurer. A carefree and somewhat irresponsible sort, the adventurer is a late-comer on the academic scene and wanders from realm to realm singing, telling stories, and doing well-sponsored contract research. When his record of being able to secure foundation support is sufficiently gaudy to emblazon his shield, he becomes chairman, and he is frequently picked up by departments composed largely of brave but unimaginative veterans in need of glamour and the repute of published research. He eventually finds his way out of active teaching and becomes an administrator. In his declining years, he is sometimes called to be a president of a small college.

FROM: Theodore Caplow and Reese J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958), pp. 196-197.

The role of the academic department chairman has been discussed by a number of authors; i.e., Fellman (1967), Anderson (1968), Creek (1950), Patton (1961), Hoag (1962), Angiolillo (1965), and MacLeod (1954). As in the amusing typology of Caplow and McGee (1955), there is a strong tendency to discuss and type the kinds of chairman behaviors encountered according to one's personal experiences. At best, such works represent well-defined position papers (Crandall, 1961; Browning, 1962; Heimler, 1967; Ahmann, 1969; and Jasinski, 1961) and at worst little more than outlets for frustration generated in dealing with chairmen or in having been in a chairmanship. Another type of position paper has dealt with a particular issue such as whether a department leader should be an appointed head or elected chairman (Taylor, 1962; Porter, 1961; and Bowler, 1962). From such general discussions some ideas concerning the role of the chairman can be collected. However, this

type of work is based more on personal experience than on formal research.

The background literature on academic department chairmen can also be viewed in terms of articles dealing with problems and tasks of academic chairmen. In these papers the emphasis has not been on defining the responsibilities as much as on focusing on specific issues of concern in the administration of a department. Such an inventory provides an indirect way of cataloging duties and problems which go into the definition of a chairman's role.

McKeachie (1968) has anticipated many of the problems faced by a new chairman which include: dealing with his dean, developing faculty committees that aid in department decision making, and recruiting new staff. McKeachie also stresses the importance of allocating responsibilities, scheduling courses, and performing other housekeeping duties in a manner that develops faculty potential. The chairman also has responsibility for developing department research, encouraging good teaching, and selecting new staff that represent high quality.

A number of other papers have reviewed specific problems of chairmen, some of which problems overlap with McKeachie's list. Monson (1968) has summarized the effects of a training program for new chairmen at the University of Utah. Considering the complexity of responsibilities facing a new chairman, some kind of management training or at least general orientation would be called for.

Sessions in the Utah program centered around peer leadership, budget problems, student-faculty relations, recruiting, and definition of a good chairman. In addition, Monson indicated how the training program changed and evolved over a three-year period.

Although designed primarily for local use, several handbooks for academic departmental chairmen have been published by institutions of higher education. Illustrative of these manuscripts is the comprehensive guidebook by Hotchkiss (1967). In general, such publications combine general administrative recommendations with specific local procedures.

Dressel and Dietrich (1967) have addressed themselves to the importance of a department's having a program of review and self-evaluation. Their paper presented a formal outline of review topics used in departmental evaluation at Michigan State University. In addition, a pattern for initiating self-review was indicated. A more specific kind of review procedure has been developed by Richardson (1967) for evaluating faculty work load. Since a major task of any chairman is equitable assignment of staff responsibilities, Richardson's paper has provided a structured guideline for evaluating faculty duties and work assignments. Sample forms as well as guidelines used at Arizona State University were included in the report.

Topics dealing with personnel administration have also been discussed in individual papers. Brown (1966) has

covered in some detail the job of faculty recruiting with specific attention given to developing a vacancy, searching for the right candidates, final selection of a new staff member, and selling the selected candidate on the merits of one's department. Wispe (1969) has investigated the effects of a related problem to recruiting, namely that of staff turnover. In a sample of psychology departments his major finding was that departmental productivity, in terms of research produced, was unrelated to turnover. In addition, his observations included the changes in departmental productivity by kind of department over the past forty years.

In a paper also related to department personnel administration, Lippincott and McLaughlin (1958) have developed a formal guide for organizing the personnel decisions and administration of the Department of Political Science at the University of Minnesota. Their guide included principles for making appointments, definitions of kinds of positions, procedures for determining promotions, duties of the staff, definitions of departmental officers (other than chairman) and policy concerning leaves of absence.

Pollard (1964) has given a number of suggestions for helping the head of a department keep active in the laboratory. While somewhat humorous in format, Pollard has touched on a very serious problem for most chairmen. One expectation of a successful chairman is that he maintain his own standing as one of the department's most capable scholars.

The press of administration and usually some teaching assignments compete with time needed for research, resulting in the chairman's feeling he is saddled with an impossible task of performing the joint roles of scholar, teacher, and administrator.

How a department should be developed and what kind of organizational structure should exist has been covered in a number of papers. Murray (1964) has suggested that departmental organization varies as a function of academic prestige. Departments lowest in prestige are characterized by autocratic chairmen. Those highest in prestige move toward a bureaucratic unit handling routine matters. The ultimate stage of development could be the elimination of departments as administrative units. Two other writers, McConnel (1967) and Euwema (1953) have taken a somewhat more pragmatic approach to departmental organization by listing problems the department must deal with, such as definition of purposes, decisions as to size, the kind of internal government that will be used and the method of selecting a chairman.

McKeachie (1969) has discussed the organizational problems peculiar to large departments. Using the Department of Psychology at Michigan as an example, he has outlined the kind of committee structure which has permitted the department to grow in many directions and yet maintain some central identity as a single department. In a large department authority must be delegated and yet some central

organization maintained through a strong faculty executive committee and the chairman.

One of the major problems facing the chairman is the relationships he must have with his dean and other individuals and groups outside the department. Numerous papers have been written about the role of the dean. Typical of these have been the work of Dearing (1964) on the relationship between the dean and faculty, Hanzeli (1966) who has reviewed the educational leadership role of the academic dean, and Bevan (1967) with a review of typical problems of the deanship. Horn (1964) has stressed the relationship between the deans and the university president and the function of dean in developing institutional goals through his departmental chairmen. Korfmacher (1967) has reviewed the tie between central administrations and departments and concluded that with the rapid growth of universities the department must become a reasonably autonomous unit and the major unit of stability and continuity of programs. With this emphasis on the department, it follows that the leadership role of the chairman was viewed as increasing in importance. Finally, Morrow (1963) has reported on the faculty participation in university government. This participation, at least at the University of Pennsylvania, has ranged from departmental advisory committees to major university-wide organizations such as a faculty senate.

From the review of papers on specific problems of the chairman, it can be seen that such problems appear

to cluster around:

1. The kind of organization a department will use.
2. The importance of the chairman as developer of long range goals for the department.
3. The kinds of personnel administration problems which must be dealt with, such as recruitment and turnover.
4. The identity of a chairman as an individual scholar and teacher.
5. The need for chairman training programs.
6. The equitable organization of faculty assignments and responsibilities.

Most of the papers presented thus far have not involved empirical research. They have been commentaries or position papers on some aspect of the academic chairmanship. A few empirical studies have been completed, most frequently as dissertation topics, with the departmental chairman's role studied directly or indirectly.

Some of these studies have dealt with specific aspects of the chairmanship. For example, Hemphell (1955) has looked directly at the leadership role of the chairman and noted that the successful chairman must take initiative in solving departmental problems while at the same time develop warm, considerate relationships with his faculty. Schroeder (1969) has discovered that chairmen in general do not exert as much leadership as desired of them by both faculty and deans. Some conflict was observed in that

faculty wanted chairmen to exert more leadership than their deans desired from them.

The chairman as a source of social power has been investigated by McKenna (1957) and Hill and French (1967). McKenna noticed that a chairman's perception of his power potential was related to his style of leadership. As an example, a chairman who considered himself to have high power for planning long range goals tended toward a more impersonal leadership. Hill and French considered the chairman's power to be derived from the way he plays his role, and for his power to come primarily from his possession of sanctions over his faculty and from his interpersonal relationships with higher administrators, colleagues, etc., that provide him with critical information. It is interesting to note that with all the discussion of the assumed importance and power of the chairman, in the Gross and Grambsch (1968) study into the perceived power structure of the university, chairmen received a fairly low rating and as a group were viewed as less powerful than the faculty taken as a group.

Four study projects have tried to define the important functions of chairmen. In an early study Doyle (1953) considered the chairman as a staff or line officer of the university with an ever-growing list of responsibilities. With the growth of departments, the chairmanship has increased in importance and participation in policy making behavior. In a report prepared for Pennsylvania State

University by Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, a comprehensive list of chairman responsibilities was catalogued. These responsibilities were summed under the following nine functions:

1. The chairman's primary role is that of an administrator.
2. He is also a scholar and teacher.
3. He must lead in planning.
4. He must also lead in the academic program.
5. The chairman must provide direction to department tasks.
6. He must be able to attract good human resources in recruiting staff and students.
7. He must attract and manage financial and material resources.
8. The chairman should be capable of leading the people who work for him.
9. He should take part in university government and development.

A similar list of functions and responsibilities has been prepared by Aldmon (1959). Using a clever but fairly complex technique of analysis of reported critical incidents, Aldmon organized a system of effective and ineffective behaviors for chairmen. The most frequently reported effective behavior was the ability to take initiative in promoting needed action. The most frequently cited ineffective behavior was failing to discuss problems with

those persons involved. The fourth study was done by Stuart (1966) and dealt with value orientations of chairmen. Differences were found in the way high level administration and faculty valued certain situations. For example, administrators tended to have more favorable orientations than faculty toward perceived mobility and management controls and less favorable orientations toward security and government control. Chairmen tended to parallel faculty orientations more than administrators.

Other research projects have dealt with overall studies of the academic institution, as represented by Leffland (1959) and Parsons and Platt (1968). Rosenblum et.al. (1968) have prepared a career history guide for a sample of high level administrators. One general study of university functioning with emphasis on department chairmen was that of Gunter (1964) who found differences between small and large universities in the amount of control given to chairmen. Examples included procedures for selecting faculty, preparing budgets, control of curriculum, and participation in determining faculty tenure.

The background literature provided an ample supply of characteristics that could be considered important in defining the role and function of chairmen. The major task was to organize these characteristics into a workable format to assess which ones were most important for an effective chairman to possess.

CHAPTER TWO
GOALS OF THE STUDY

The primary goal of the study reported herein was to determine what characteristics would be ranked as most important for the effective performance of the role of academic departmental chairman. Setting for the investigation was the land-grant university as represented by two medium-sized institutions.

As already indicated in the background, a large list of chairman characteristics has been identified in the literature and in some cases studied. To make such a large supply of characteristics manageable, a threefold classification system of chairman functions was devised for the present study. The first group of characteristics centered around professional activities; i.e., areas in which a professional person could achieve in the academic institution. The second part of the classification included direct administrative responsibilities which a departmental chairman is expected to perform. A third classification dealt with personal characteristics of individuals in the leadership role of chairman. The construction of the questionnaire used in the current investigation involved selecting specific characteristics and fitting them into one of the three classifications.

Items selected made up the three subscales and are shown in Tables I through 3, pages 17 through 19. Selection was based on the review of background literature and a series of interviews with faculty and administrators at the institutions to be sampled. Once the final groups of characteristics were assembled, another round of interviews was conducted to obtain feedback on the subscale.

The final questionnaire provided a fairly rapid way to measure reactions to various characteristics, and the use of a ranking format required respondents to decide what characteristics were most important for an effective chairman to have. Persons completing the ranking were to think of the chairmanship in general and were not asked to rank the characteristics of particular chairmen. In this way the study avoided the major problem of faculty resistance to instruments that force them to reveal feelings about their own chairmen. Furthermore, the instrument was designed with only positive statements and did not request critical or negative evaluations.

Specific information needed to achieve the primary aim of the study called for comparisons between a number of groups on the ranking of characteristics and included:

1. Differences between the two sampled universities.
2. Changes in the ranking of characteristics as a function of academic and administrative rank.
3. Differences between colleges within the universities sampled.

4. Contrasts among broad subject discipline groups such as natural science compared with professional groups.
5. Changes across levels of age.
6. Comparisons between years of experience.
7. Comparisons between years of experience at the same institution.
8. Differences in ranking of characteristics as the number of personal publications increase.

Several secondary goals were also followed up in the research. Deans were asked to make effectiveness ratings of their department chairmen. These ratings were correlated with difference scores derived from comparing the responses of deans and chairmen on the 36 questionnaire items. The degree of difference between a dean and his chairman provides an index of congruence in their viewpoints about characteristics of effective chairmen. The rating weights were assigned in such a manner as to cause judged lower effectiveness to relate positively with higher difference scores. A high positive correlation between ratings and difference scores for a given dean and his chairmen indicates high agreement or congruence was associated with a rating of high effectiveness. Likewise, a low effectiveness rating went with high difference score or little congruence between a dean and his chairman. The following prediction was made regarding congruence and effectiveness ratings:

The most effective chairmen will be more congruent with their deans' views than will less

effective. This will be shown by a high positive correlation between effectiveness ratings and difference scores.

Difference scores were also calculated between chairmen and faculty sampled from their department and a second congruency prediction made:

The most effective chairmen will be more congruent with their faculty views than will less effective. Again, a high positive correlation between effectiveness ratings and difference scores would support the prediction.

Both the above expectations were based upon a view of leadership that stresses the development of common views and goals among members of a work organization. Hence, the effective chairman has communicated and accepted orientations toward his job that stress congruence with those in organizational levels above and below him.

Two other secondary goals of the research included comparing the rankings of chairmen with high effectiveness ratings to those with low ratings and contrasting viewpoints of chairmen appointed on a lifetime basis with those receiving limited term appointments.

Colorado State University in Fort Collins, Colorado, and Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas, constituted the two institutions involved in the research. Both schools approved and supported the study and assisted in making the data collection possible during 1969.

TABLE 1

RANKING ITEMS FOR SUBSCALE A:
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. High visibility in professional organizations.
2. Noted for producing outstanding students.
3. Strong reputation as a creative and productive scholar in his field.
4. Established reputation for planning and achieving program goals.
5. Membership on federal government agency committees.
6. Reputation established as a successful fund raiser.
7. Known as a good teacher.
8. Work experience in a government agency.
9. Prior membership on university service committees, such as student life, etc.
10. Trained in professional management.
11. Knowledge in dealing with funding agencies outside the university.
12. Visible achievements in community leadership outside the university.

TABLE 2

RANKING ITEMS FOR SUBSCALE B:
ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Participates and is influential in faculty government at the university level.
2. Understands and communicates to the department faculty expectations of the university administration.
3. Develops sound procedures for assessing faculty performance.
4. Shows effective and equitable organizations of faculty responsibilities such as committee assignments, teaching loads, etc.
5. Maintains a low turnover rate in his faculty.
6. Attracts and recruits promising faculty.
7. Promotes the development of a good teaching faculty.
8. Succeeds in stimulating faculty research activity and growth of research productivity in his department.
9. Negotiates successfully with university on such matters as department budget, faculty tenure, and promotions, etc.
10. Raises funds from sources outside the university.
11. Guides curriculum development skillfully to a point of completion.
12. Represents the department well in the total university community.

TABLE 3

RANKING ITEMS FOR SUBSCALE C:
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Highly identified with his academic field of specialization.
2. Extremely sensitive to the department's needs in the broader context of the total university.
3. Willing to delegate decision making to individual faculty and department committees.
4. Capable of making a strong and positive impression on people.
5. Identified himself as one of the faculty, first among equals.
6. Interested in the needs of the students.
7. Highly motivated to achieve as a departmental chairman and educational leader.
8. Tends to make decisive decisions and use faculty as advisors.
9. Personally effective at resolving and preventing conflicts in the department faculty.
10. Oriented towards long range goals of the department more than immediate needs.
11. Capable of decisive thinking and action.
12. Concerned with helping each faculty member to find his place in the program.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Reliability of the Questionnaire

Reliability of the questionnaire was assessed by means of a test-retest administered two weeks apart to thirty Colorado State faculty not included in the final sample. Results of the test-retest are displayed in Tables 4, 5, and 6. In Table 4, rank order correlations are shown for the average test-retest values for each subscale. In this case the average values given to every item were ranked within the appropriate subscale and a rank order correlation performed between the first and second administrations. Such an analysis yields a measure of the stability of the average value given an item. The average rho for the three subscales was .94.

Another way of looking at reliability consisted of creating a distribution of individual rank-order correlations between test and retest administrations for all thirty subjects. The correlation coefficients were then converted to standard scores and descriptive statistics calculated. Results of this analysis are given in Table 5 which shows the median rho and the range of coefficients for each subscale.

A final measure of reliability is provided by product moment correlations between the first and second administrations for each of the thirty-six items. Subscale C, describing

TABLE 4

AVERAGE RANK ORDERS FOR
TEST-RETEST OF SUBSCALES (N=30)

Subscale A: rho = .98

Subscale B: rho = .94

Subscale C: rho = .93

TABLE 5

MEDIAN OF RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS
FOR TEST-RETEST OF SUBSCALES (N=30)

Median rho Subscale A = .74 Range .03 - 1.00

Median rho Subscale B = .64 Range -.13 - 1.00

Median rho Subscale C = .71 Range .04 - 1.00

Overall median rho = .70

TABLE 6

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR THE
THIRTY-SIX INDIVIDUAL ITEMS TEST-RETEST (N=30)

<u>Subscale A</u>		<u>Subscale B</u>		<u>Subscale C</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Pearson</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Pearson</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Pearson</u>
1	** .59	1	** .63	1	** .70
2	** .57	2	* .35	2	.33
3	* .35	3	* .37	3	** .56
4	** .86	4	* .38	4	* .43
5	* .39	5	.30	5	* .42
6	.33	6	* .38	6	* .36
7	** .54	7	** .58	7	** .78
8	** .74	8	.30	8	** .69
9	** .48	9	** .60	9	** .53
10	** .74	10	* .43	10	** .49
11	.27	11	.32	11	** .53
12	.32	12	* .44	12	** .59

* Significant at the .05 level or better

** Significant at the .01 level or better

personal characteristics, contained the best set of item test-retest correlations.

Selection of the Sample

Faculty used in the study were selected at random from the staff rosters of colleges included in the survey. An attempt was made to maintain balance among the different faculty ranks and include all chairmen within a given college.

Colleges were selected to provide for a comparison among different educational emphases found in a typical land-grant institution. Colleges of veterinary medicine, agriculture, engineering, and home economics were included from both Colorado State and Kansas State. The traditional liberal arts emphasis was represented by the college of arts and sciences at Kansas State. This emphasis at Colorado State was represented by two newly-divided colleges called humanities and social sciences and natural sciences. Both of these new colleges at Colorado State were sampled in the survey. In addition, the college of forestry and natural resources at Colorado State was included with the final sample.

Sample return data are contained in Table 7. Considering that very low return rates are not uncommon for mailed questionnaires, the obtained rate of return was considered good. Overall rate of return was about the same at each institution. Likewise, the different levels of faculty were about equally responsive in returning the questionnaires.

Only those questionnaires that were usable and complete were counted as returned data. Approximately thirty-five questionnaires were returned that could not be used.

TABLE 7

COMBINED QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE AND
RETURN DATA FOR KSU AND CSU

<u>RANK</u>	<u>SIZE OF SAMPLE</u>	<u>NUMBER RETURNED</u>	<u>PERCENT RETURNED</u>
Dean	14	12	85%
Chairman	88	74	84%
All Faculty Ranks	550	395	71%

Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed simultaneously on both campuses during late spring and early summer, 1969. Each questionnaire was enclosed in an envelope addressed to the respondent and sent through campus mails. Cover letters from the academic vice presidents encouraging support for the research project accompanied the questionnaire. The required information items on the first page were printed in different orders making it possible to code the questionnaires by kind of respondent, such as deans, chairmen, etc. Materials sent to each respondent are contained in Appendix A.

Following the distribution of questionnaires, deans of the colleges in the sample completed chairman effectiveness ratings. It was possible to have deans complete the rating during their regular meetings. Example ratings forms are found in Appendix A. In addition to the forms shown, deans were given a list of their current chairmen.

Reminder letters were sent to faculty who had failed to return questionnaires and calls were made to administrators who had not responded.

A special computer program was written for analyzing all results. Because the size of colleges sampled varied greatly, all deans ratings of chairmen were converted to a standardized five-category scale. It was also necessary to divide departments into broad discipline groups in order to complete one questionnaire comparison. Two judges sorted the departments

using catalog descriptions when necessary to determine the correct discipline grouping.

The first phase of the data analysis provided a descriptive presentation of all rankings. In addition, for data combined across the schools, coefficients of concordance were calculated over various subgroupings. In the second phase, rank order correlations between Colorado State and Kansas State staff subgroups were performed. Difference scores on items of the questionnaire were calculated between chairmen and their deans. By summing the item differences it was possible to get a measure of agreement between deans and chairmen on the questionnaire. This difference score was correlated with deans effectiveness ratings. The difference scores were also prepared for comparisons between chairmen and their faculty, Colorado State and Kansas State chairmen, and chairmen with high and low effectiveness ratings.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Rankings of Chairmen Characteristics

The primary goal of measuring how respondents would rank chairman characteristics led to a number of comparisons. The first such comparison was between the two universities for the entire sample. Statistical data on which conclusions from the project are based are shown in Appendix A. Tables of data are numbered without regard to their location in the report. Tables 8 through 10 contain the rankings for all respondents combined and are broken down by Colorado State and Kansas State Universities. As in all of the tables showing ranked data, both the average rank of each item and the rank of that average are shown. Rankings in Table 8 indicate what professional activities should be shown by the effective chairman and involve developing outstanding students, acquiring a reputation as an able scholar in his field, and a reputation for planning and achieving program goals. Of least importance are characteristics centering around involvement with outside organizations, such as the non-university community and government agencies.

Table 9 reveals that the effective chairman was viewed as being skillful in organizing faculty responsibilities, recruiting promising faculty members, and developing good teaching. Raising funds from outside the university, keeping

a low staff turnover, and participating in university government were given the lowest ranks for items of administrative responsibilities. Low ranks do not necessarily mean that an item is regarded as unimportant. All characteristics were chosen because they represented significant features of a chairman's role and function. The ranking procedure requires an individual to make a choice among a set of important characteristics and indicate those which he feels are most critical.

In Table 10 it can be seen that the most important personal characteristics were the ability to think decisively and to take action; consider the department needs in the broader context of the total university; and be interested in the needs of students. Of least importance were being highly identified with one's academic specialty; identifying oneself as one of the faculty, first among equals; and making strong and positive impressions on people.

There was a great deal of agreement between Colorado State and Kansas State respondents. Spearman rank-order correlations for the ranks of the average are high for all subscales ($\rho = .97$ for the ranks of Table 8; $\rho = .91$ for Table 9 ranks; and $\rho = .96$ for Table 10 data). All these coefficients are well above chance outcomes ($P > .01$, $df = 12$).

Rank-order correlations between subgroups of faculty and administrators of the two universities are displayed in Table 11. Coefficients reported are for the ranks of the

averages for each item within a subscale. High agreement occurred for the characteristics of professional activities and administrative responsibilities. A great deal of disagreement developed over personal characteristics. When one keeps in mind that the correlations are between ranks of the averages, the coefficients shown in that part of Table 11 are quite low.

In summary, respondents at the two schools were in general agreement over the importance of chairman characteristics. Least agreement occurred among subgroups over personal characteristics of chairmen.

Other comparisons involved combining the samples for the two schools and breaking them down into sets of subgroups. Results specific to each university are contained in Appendix B for Colorado State University and Appendix C for Kansas State.

A second comparison asked whether administrative and faculty position made any difference in the ranks assigned characteristics. The most general answer would have to be no. Agreement was high across rank subgroups ($W = .94$ for subscale A, Table 12; $W = .90$ for subscale B, Table 13; and $W = .77$ for subscale C, Table 14).¹ As with the comparison between schools, there is a trend toward less agreement over personal characteristics.

¹All coefficients of concordance reported are above chance level with $P > .01$ or greater unless noted otherwise.

Characteristics ranked highest and lowest are the same as for the combined sample by schools. There is some tendency for deans to select different ranks on specific characteristics. For example, deans ranked having been trained in professional management lower in importance than most faculty groups. Likewise, deans gave a little more importance to being on government committees than did the faculty. Other slight differences can be seen by inspection of Tables 12 through 14. Two of the most dramatic shifts occurred in the personal characteristics subscales where deans valued prevention of departmental faculty conflicts and high personal motivation to achieve as a chairman as being among the most important characteristics.

In general, an overall pattern of agreement was also shown when different colleges were compared. Table 15 gives the rankings for professional activities. Consistency among colleges was indicated by a significant coefficient of concordance ($W = .87$). Tables 16 and 17 display the other two subscales and also contained significant agreement ($W = .89$ for Table 16 data and $W = .62$ for Table 17). For the college data, the chairman's ability to negotiate with the university came out among the top three rankings. While there was some disagreement among colleges on individual items, they were not dramatic; and the overall pattern was one of agreement.

The same pattern of agreement was true between broad discipline groups (Tables 18 - 20). Coefficients of concordance were even higher yielding values of .91, .92, and

.74 for the three respective subscales. As in the college grouping, the chairman's intrauniversity negotiating responsibility was ranked among the more important aspects of his administrative responsibilities.

Two comparisons involved differences in time between respondents. The first centered around differences in age level, and the second compared years of experience. Once again the pattern was one of agreement. Age factors, whether in terms of experience or actual age, did not dramatically change the rankings of important characteristics for effective chairman. Age levels are compared in Tables 21 - 23. Consistency across age levels is shown by high coefficients ($W = .89, .92, .74$ for Tables 21, 22, 23). Similar values were found for years of experience shown in Table 24 ($W = .69$). While some specific item shifts did take place, for example, those with greatest experience felt being identified with one's specialty was of greater importance than did persons with less career experience, the overall pattern is still fairly consistent. As has been true for most comparisons, more disagreement occurs over personal characteristics.

The number of years at the same institution apparently did not change the basic views of important chairman characteristics. Significant coefficients ($W = .85$ for Table 27, $W = .87$ for Table 28, and $W = .64$ for Table 29) again indicated consistency between subgroups. Furthermore, the same items tended to be ranked as most and least important.

Finally, the number of publications was used as a grouping for comparison. Here again little disagreement was found. While some shifts occurred on individual items, in general the amount of publication activity did not seem to dramatically alter perception of the effective chairman's role. This can be seen by inspection of Table 30 ($W = .94$), Table 31 ($W = .95$), and Table 32 ($W = .82$).

Overall, the respondents were in agreement as to what features they considered important in the effective chairman. Only in the case of personal characteristics does disagreement begin to show up.

Congruence of Rankings and the Deans Effectiveness Ratings

An average product-moment correlation of .14 occurred between the deans' ratings of chairmen and the congruency (difference scores) measure. The range, however, was from -.67 to .99. One dean had a zero correlation between the measures.

A similar outcome resulted in the case of faculty-chairmen difference scores and effectiveness ratings. A correlation of .11 resulted and indicated no significant relationship between effectiveness of a chairman, as judged by his dean, and congruency of views with his faculty over the chairmanship role.

Lifetime Versus Limited Appointments

Chairman were in fairly high agreement over rankings whether they held potential rotating (limited) or lifetime

appointments. Rank order correlations between the two groups of chairmen were .82 for professional activities; .98 for administrative responsibilities; and .54 for personal characteristics (all were $P > .05$ outcomes). In general, chairmen of both kinds of appointments ranked the items the same way. As has been the pattern, most disagreement involved rankings of personal characteristics.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion and Recommendations

Discussion

In general, high agreement among raters was observed over the most and least important characteristics of chairmen. While some disagreement was found among different subgroups, it was not great enough to alter the basic pattern of agreement among respondents. The most marked amount of disagreement occurred when subjects were asked to rank personal characteristics. While the combined sample was in agreement on such characteristics, breakdowns into subgroups revealed less agreement than for chairman behaviors centering around administrative and professional responsibilities.

The greater disagreement over critical personal features of effective chairmen raises an important issue of defining the nature of leadership. Namely, is there more than one set of personal characteristics that can assist a chairman in the effective execution of his job? Instead of looking for individuals with a standardized personal background, a number of clusters of personal characteristics might be identified. Leadership needs could capitalize on individual differences in potential leaders to fit the particular situation of a department or time stage in its pattern of growth. It should be recalled that the third subscale had the best set of

individual item reliability coefficients. Individual subjects seem to know what personal characteristics are important to them. Disagreement occurs across different subgroups. Factor analysis of the thirty-six items tends to support this conclusion. While the third subscale appears to be at least as reliable as the other two, it does not have as clear a grouping of items.

The variability of correlations between the dean's ratings and congruency of views also can be interpreted in terms of an individual differences viewpoint of leadership. Some deans evaluated chairmen high who had very similar views, as shown by high positive correlations. Still other deans had chairmen rated most effective who disagreed with their dean's views on important chairmen characteristics. More work needs to be done with a larger sample of deans and additional criteria for evaluating their style of leadership. If the present findings hold up, this could indicate a wide range of dean leadership behavior and that the difference score procedure is useful in getting a clue to a particular dean's leadership style.

Specific characteristics ranked high in the study were fairly well anticipated in the background literature. Behaviors such as encouraging good teaching, recruiting strong faculty, etc., are generally regarded as highly important expectations for a successful chairman.

Considering the great amount of discussion over the leadership style of departmental chairmen, it is interesting to observe that ability to make decisions and take action was ranked high while identifying oneself as one of the faculty, first among equals, received a low rank. This outcome adds support to the results reported earlier that faculty feel that chairmen should use more of their power and also support the observation that how a chairman uses his decision making power is very important.

When one considers the wide range of activities that go into the definition of the role and function of the chairman, it is possible that the following quote from Churchman (1969, pp. 51-53), speaking of the research administrator, could also be said of "Academic" chairmen:

In any event, the scientist's philosophy makes most of organization theory irrelevant. For him, the most important organization with respect to science is a scientific community, which is essentially non-hierarchical. There may be distinguished men in it, of course, but they have neither the authority nor the responsibility to tell anyone what he should do; they may play a role in judging another's work, but no one person by himself is the ultimate court of appeals.² Consequently, in his conscious life the scientist is fundamentally opposed to hierarchy. If he were forced to state who was really "in charge" or "on top" he might well choose himself rather than the manager.

But I am mainly interested in the moral background of the scientists' position, namely, that scientists ought not to be used as instruments of management only. The immorality becomes patent when scientists

²There is, of course, the old Germanic idea of a professor and his flock of student followers, and the professor often did dominate. No doubt some of this concept of the research community does occur today, but few researchers would like to admit it if it does.

are used to create destruction either for defense or aggression. But the immorality is there in less dangerous form whenever managerial goals dominate basic research to the detriment of research goals.

The division manager needs to be a moral man as well as a management man. Now although morality is admittedly elusive, the scientist's moral prescription is clear enough, namely, that he shall not be used as a means only. To this prescription, the division manager is committed as firmly as he is to serving the organizational goals. But the two commitments in today's society often clash. If the basic research reveals a beautiful piece of knowledge but apparently has no application, what then? More to the point, microbiology may find the way to clone humans (make replicate organisms from the cell of the original organism). Should the frightening prospect stop basic research?

There is no adequate answer to this question. Anyone who uses a full fledged "systems approach" will inevitably have to become immoral, by using people as means only. Anyone who doggedly follows the moral law will interfere with other people's happiness. Since social welfare and morality are both ideals of the human race, both must be sustained. It's people like the division chief,³ who so vividly see the clash, who must learn that greatest hallmark of the mature mind: a persistent unwillingness to give in completely to either ideal, merely because such a concession would make life peaceful.

Recommendations

1. Evidence from the investigation indicates that personal characteristics of effective chairman can vary and that congruency of viewpoints can also vary between deans and chairmen. Additional work needs to be done to

³Or dean; the main distinction between the research director and the dean seems to be mainly a matter of emphasis. A college dean of a science department is emphatically committed to the scientist's philosophy, and his problem is how to be a good administrator at the same time, while a research director may be more emphatically committed to management's goals, and his problem is how to serve the scientists as well.

identify styles of leadership and the kinds of situations in which a given type of leadership proves effective. Instead of looking for one type of leader, the emphasis should be on variations of leadership behavior. These variations should be identified as clusters of characteristics that add up to effective leadership.

2. Though not directly seen in the results, the investigators in the current study were left with the distinct impression that administrators and faculty vary in the importance and role they assign to evaluation of programs and personnel. In light of this, the following recommendations are made:

a. What are the attitudes of administrative personnel (vice president, deans, chairmen) toward the importance of evaluation of the performance of programs and people. In the present study there are indications that there is a wide range of opinions by administrators regarding the importance of evaluation.

b. Define styles and formats that academic administrators use in performing evaluation, emphasizing such things as the degree of formalized goals and the specific criteria used in evaluation. Some of these criteria have been hinted at in the present study.

c. Relate the two above to a set of criteria for success or effectiveness of the academic administrator.

These criteria could include the research visibility of his unit, the teaching reputation of his department or college as well as administrative success in implementing programs and gaining space, budget, etc.

3. Faculty turnover should be more fully studied.

While some research has indicated that high turnover may not hurt research productivity, other criteria such as cost to the department and disruption of planned programs should be investigated. The importance of the chairman's behavior in staff turnover should be assessed.

4. A similar study to the one just mentioned should be done on the role of chairman as fund-raiser. In an age when funding external to the university is of major importance to many departments, it seems unrealistic that fund raising characteristics should receive such a low ranking. Again, knowledge and skill in this area can help a chairman achieve program goals.

5. Investigations should be made that stress the importance of chairman training programs. The current investigation showed that relatively little importance is given to formal management training of academic chairmen.

6. In a modern university the relation of the department chairman to outside research organizations and other community groups can be a major source of critical information and thereby increase the power of a chairman. Likewise, involvement in university government can increase a chairman's

knowledge about the university and increase his effectiveness. However, these characteristics were ranked low by respondents. More work is needed to determine just how critical these behaviors are.

7. Expand comparisons to more and different types of institutions to include--a large enough sample of university administrators to make comparisons possible among vice presidents, deans, etc.

8. Evidence from this study indicates the possibility that predictive material can be obtained that will enable granting agencies an opportunity to predict effectiveness of given departments or institutions. By analyzing the effectiveness of the departmental chairman and his respective areas of purview, the granting agency could increase the value received from grants awarded the institution.

a. It is recommended that the predictive techniques be tested in several institutions that have a track record with a granting agency. The methods developed in this study plus the recommendations in this section would enable the investigators to determine the predictive effectiveness of the institutions, particularly if these institutions have conducted research projects for a given agency over several years.

b. It would be desirable to conduct these studies on a regional geographic basis.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY

A sample of faculty and administrators at two land grant universities ranked a series of questionnaire items reflecting characteristics of effective departmental chairmen. There was a marked tendency to agree on what chairman characteristics were most and least important. Agreement held up across differences in rank, college, broad academic discipline groups, years of experience, and number of publications. Characteristics ranked as important included support of good teaching, reputation for achieving goals, ability to recruit promising faculty, good organization of faculty duties, a personal reputation for scholarship, and a capacity for decisive thinking and action. Typical low rated characteristics involved being highly identified with one's own discipline; identifying as one of the faculty, first among equals; maintaining a low turnover rate in faculty; and fund raising along with other extradepartmental involvement with broader university groups, community organizations and government agencies.

Agreement among participants in the study was most marked for items involving professional activities and administrative responsibilities. Less agreement was found over personal characteristics of chairmen.

Other outcomes of the investigation indicated little relationship between a dean's rating of the effectiveness of a chairman and the amount of agreement between chairman and dean over the chairman characteristics questionnaire. Likewise, no relationship existed between the dean's effectiveness rating and the amount of agreement between chairmen and their faculty over characteristics contained in the questionnaire.

A final observation of the study was that chairmen appointed on a limited term basis view important characteristics of their role in about the same manner as chairmen placed on a lifetime appointment.

Findings of the study were discussed in terms of the need for clearer understanding of the styles of leadership in academic administration; relations of the chairman to groups outside the department; criteria for evaluating chairmen; the need for chairmen training or internship programs; better definitions of personal characteristics that lead to effective performance and expansion of the survey to include a greater range of institutions.

APPENDIX A

Tables 8 to 32

TABLE 8

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
 BY TOTAL CSU AND KSU SAMPLES.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

ITEM	CSU N=223	KSU N=169
1. High Visibility	5.80 (5)	5.19 (5)
2. Produces Students	4.19 (3)	4.18 (3)
3. Productive Scholar	3.57 (2)	2.99 (2)
4. Achieves Goals	2.39 (1)	2.62 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	9.56 (12)	9.16 (12)
6. Fund Raiser	7.66 (8)	7.61 (7)
7. Good Teacher	4.82 (4)	5.00 (4)
8. Nonacademic Experience	8.57 (10)	8.88 (11)
9. University Service	8.08 (9)	8.04 (8)
10. Management Training	7.50 (7)	8.49 (9)
11. Funding Knowledge	6.69 (6)	6.22 (6)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	9.13 (11)	8.82 (10)

TABLE 9

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES
 BY TOTAL CSU AND KSU SAMPLES.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

ITEM	CSU N=223	KSU N=169
1. In Faculty Government	8.46 (10)	9.36 (12)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	6.13 (6)	6.45 (7)
3. Assessment of Faculty	5.90 (5)	6.25 (6)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.65 (2)	4.46 (2.5)
5. Low Turnover	8.97 (11)	8.37 (10)
6. Attracts Faculty	5.19 (4)	4.46 (2.5)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.40 (1)	3.57 (1)
8. Stimulates Research	6.28 (7)	4.68 (5)
9. Good Negotiator	4.74 (3)	4.64 (4)
10. Raises Funds	9.77 (12)	9.22 (11)
11. Curriculum Development	7.11 (2)	7.64 (8)
12. Represents Department	7.26 (9)	7.94 (9)

TABLE 10

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
 BY TOTAL CSU AND KSU SAMPLES.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

ITEM	CSU N=223	KSU N=169
1. Identified with Specialty	8.78 (12)	8.07 (12)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	5.50 (3)	5.72 (4)
3. Delegates Decision Making	6.20 (5)	6.07 (6)
4. Makes Strong Impression	7.83 (11)	7.70 (10)
5. First Among Equals	7.11 (10)	7.91 (11)
6. Interested in Students	5.06 (2)	5.32 (2)
7. Motivated to Achieve	6.83 (8)	6.85 (9)
8. Decision Maker	5.91 (4)	5.66 (3)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	6.53 (7)	5.98 (5)
10. Long Range Goals	6.86 (9)	6.67 (8)
11. Decisive Action	4.74 (1)	4.92 (1)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	6.28 (6)	6.20 (7)

TABLE 11

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GROUPS OF KSU AND CSU
FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS BY EACH SUBSCALE.

Rank	Deans	Chairmen	CSU			Instructors	
			Prof.	Assoc.Prof.	Asst.Prof.		
Professional Activities							
Deans	.82	.85	.86	.83	.81	.80	
Chairmen	.86	.85	.96	.94	.90	.92	
Professors	.92	.94	.98	1.00	.94	.96	
Assoc.Prof.	.87	.92	.94	.94	.87	.95	
Asst.Prof.	.82	.83	.92	.92	.89	.92	
Instructors	.78	.80	.90	.90	.83	.94	
Administrative Responsibilities							
Deans	.78	.87	.72	.74	.81	.77	
Chairmen	.92	.99	.78	.91	.97	.95	
Professors	.70	.83	.93	.91	.88	.86	
Assoc.Prof.	.70	.79	.94	.81	.83	.91	
Asst.Prof.	.69	.81	.94	.88	.87	.88	
Instructors	.66	.69	.92	.80	.74	.83	
Personal Characteristics							
KSU	Deans	.51	.20	.33	.31	.43	.36
	Chairmen	.76	.53	.52	.73	.63	.36
	Professors	.66	.72	.68	.78	.77	.53
	Assoc.Prof.	.12	.53	.52	.55	.44	.18
	Asst.Prof.	.31	.55	.46	.55	.46	.21
	Instructors	.33	.80	.74	.64	.74	.33

TABLE 12

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES BY LEVELS
OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY RANK FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

RANK:	Dean	Chairman	Professor	Assoc.Prof.	Asst.Prof.	Instructor
N =	12	74	92	79	87	47
1. High Visibility	4.25 (3)	4.73 (4)	5.03 (4)	5.77 (5)	6.10 (5)	6.81 (6)
2. Produces Students	4.58 (4)	3.68 (3)	4.12 (3)	4.23 (3)	4.59 (3)	4.30 (4)
3. Productive Scholar	2.33 (1)	3.16 (2)	3.04 (2)	3.71 (2)	3.33 (2)	3.77 (2)
4. Achieves Goals	2.67 (2)	2.42 (1)	2.51 (1)	2.46 (1)	2.60 (1)	2.43 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	8.92 (9)	9.34 (11)	9.25 (12)	9.13 (12)	9.39 (12)	10.47 (12)
6. Fund Raiser	8.50 (8)	8.32 (8)	7.63 (7)	7.75 (7)	6.92 (7)	7.66 (8)
7. Good Teacher	5.50 (6)	4.86 (5)	5.16 (5)	4.75 (4)	5.14 (4)	4.17 (3)
8. Nonacademic Experience	9.25 (10)	8.50 (10)	9.20 (11)	8.62 (10)	8.37 (9.5)	8.83 (11)
9. University Service	7.50 (7)	8.42 (9)	7.89 (8)	7.89 (8)	8.37 (9.5)	7.87 (9)
10. Management Training	10.25 (12)	8.03 (7)	8.37 (9)	7.91 (9)	7.62 (8)	7.04 (7)
11. Funding Knowledge	4.75 (5)	6.81 (6)	6.55 (6)	6.65 (6)	6.33 (6)	6.43 (5)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	9.50 (11)	8.99 (12)	9.09 (10)	9.10 (11)	9.24 (11)	8.26 (10)

TABLE 13

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES BY LEVELS
OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY RANK FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

	Rank: N =	Dean 12	Chairman 74	Professor 92	Assoc.Prof. 79	Asst.Prof. 87	Instructor 47
1. In Faculty Government		9.33 (11)	9.49 (11)	8.36 (10)	8.85 (11)	9.02 (11)	8.55 (10)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations		5.08 (4)	6.84 (7)	5.86 (6)	6.28 (7)	6.38 (6)	6.36 (8)
3. Assessment of Faculty		6.83 (7)	6.31 (6)	5.91 (7)	5.82 (6)	6.24 (5)	5.85 (5)
4. Administration of Tasks		5.67 (5)	4.82 (4)	4.87 (3)	4.42 (2)	4.21 (2)	4.32 (2)
5. Low Turnover		8.92 (10)	8.77 (10)	9.10 (11)	8.48 (10)	8.40 (10)	8.96 (11)
6. Attracts Faculty		2.75 (1)	3.41 (2)	5.29 (4)	5.28 (4)	5.29 (4)	5.57 (4)
7. Develops Good Teaching		3.92 (3)	3.15 (1)	3.96 (1)	3.18 (1)	3.86 (1)	2.79 (1)
8. Stimulates Research		3.83 (2)	4.03 (3)	5.77 (5)	5.77 (5)	6.57 (7)	6.15 (6)
9. Good Negotiator		5.92 (6)	4.93 (5)	4.59 (2)	4.81 (3)	4.33 (3)	4.83 (3)
10. Raises Funds		9.42 (12)	9.61 (12)	9.41 (12)	9.66 (12)	9.33 (12)	10.02 (12)
11. Curriculum Development		6.92 (8)	6.92 (8)	7.73 (9)	7.59 (8)	7.76 (9)	6.30 (7)
12. Represents Department		8.67 (9)	7.96 (9)	7.16 (8)	7.68 (9)	7.15 (8)	8.09 (9)

TABLE 14

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS BY LEVELS
OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY RANK FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Rank: N =	Dean 12	Chairman 74	Professor 92	Assoc.Prof. 79	Asst.Prof. 87	Instructor 47
1. Identified with Specialty	7.42 (9)	8.42 (12)	8.21 (12)	9.10 (12)	8.34 (12)	8.72 (12)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	5.92 (7)	5.61 (5)	5.16 (2)	6.04 (5)	5.62 (3)	5.66 (3)
3. Delegates Decision Making	8.00 (11)	5.55 (3)	6.79 (8)	5.73 (4)	6.11 (5)	6.21 (5)
4. Makes Strong Impression	7.67 (10)	8.12 (11)	7.98 (11)	8.05 (11)	7.24 (10)	7.51 (11)
5. First Among Equals	9.08 (12)	8.00 (10)	7.76 (10)	7.11 (10)	7.01 (9)	7.13 (8)
6. Interested in Students	5.67 (3.5)	5.11 (2)	5.64 (4)	5.23 (2)	5.30 (2)	4.02 (1)
7. Motivated to Achieve	5.58 (2)	6.65 (9)	6.97 (9)	6.95 (9)	6.82 (8)	7.19 (10)
8. Decision Maker	5.83 (6)	5.91 (6)	5.51 (3)	5.68 (3)	5.84 (4)	6.45 (6)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	4.83 (1)	6.27 (7)	6.16 (6)	6.53 (7)	6.56 (6)	6.19 (4)
10. Long Range Goals	6.58 (8)	6.36 (8)	6.58 (7)	6.63 (8)	7.37 (11)	7.17 (9)
11. Decisive Action	5.75 (5)	4.81 (1)	4.96 (1)	4.61 (1)	4.34 (1)	5.64 (2)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	5.67 (3.5)	5.59 (4)	6.14 (5)	6.51 (6)	6.78 (7)	6.34 (7)

TABLE 15

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES BY DIFFERENT COLLEGES FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

COLLEGE: N =	Eng. 45	Home Ec. 30	Vet.Med. 34	Agri. 51	Arts+Sci. 88	Nat.Sci. 40	Hum.+Soc. 86	Forestry 16
1. High Visibility	5.56 (5)	5.17 (4)	6.03 (5)	5.86 (5)	5.08 (5)	5.95 (5)	5.74 (5)	4.94 (2.5)
2. Produces Students	4.04 (3)	4.43 (3)	3.50 (3)	4.14 (3)	4.31 (3)	4.40 (3)	4.14 (3)	5.25 (4)
3. Productive Scholar	3.31 (2)	2.70 (2)	2.91 (2)	3.12 (2)	3.05 (2)	2.88 (2)	3.99 (2)	5.38 (5)
4. Achieves Goals	2.51 (1)	2.23 (1)	2.53 (1)	2.25 (1)	2.89 (1)	2.85 (1)	2.26 (1)	1.88 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	9.07 (11)	9.23 (11)	8.74 (10)	9.82 (12)	9.10 (11)	9.27 (11)	10.01 (12)	9.56 (12)
6. Fund Raiser	7.64 (7)	9.00 (10)	7.68 (7)	6.98 (7)	7.59 (7)	7.50 (8)	8.06 (9)	5.81 (6)
7. Good Teacher	5.36 (4)	5.23 (5)	4.82 (4)	5.06 (4)	4.90 (4)	4.50 (4)	4.28 (4)	7.19 (7.5)
8. Nonacademic Experience	7.82 (8.5)	9.47 (12)	9.26 (12)	8.39 (9)	9.15 (12)	8.60 (9)	8.64 (10.5)	7.94 (9)
9. University Service	9.22 (12)	7.47 (7)	8.47 (8)	7.94 (8)	7.69 (8)	8.75 (10)	7.53 (8)	8.88 (10)
10. Management Training	7.82 (8.5)	7.80 (8)	8.53 (9)	8.67 (10)	8.53 (9)	7.13 (7)	7.33 (6)	7.19 (7.5)
11. Funding Knowledge	6.27 (6)	7.03 (6)	6.06 (6)	6.25 (6)	6.10 (6)	6.65 (6)	7.40 (7)	4.94 (2.5)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	8.96 (10)	8.17 (9)	9.21 (11)	9.59 (11)	9.07 (10)	9.55 (12)	8.64 (10.5)	9.06 (11)

TABLE 16

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES BY DIFFERENT COLLEGES FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

College: N =	Eng. 45	Home Ec. 30	Vet.Med. 34	Agri. 51	Arts+Sci. 88	Nat.Sci. 40	Hum.+Soc. 86	Forestry 16
1. In Faculty Government	9.13 (10.5)	9.93 (12)	8.97 (11)	9.10 (11)	8.89 (11)	8.30 (10)	8.43 (10)	8.75 (11)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	5.93 (6.5)	5.37 (5)	5.76 (6)	5.33 (5.5)	7.41 (7)	6.10 (7)	6.36 (6)	6.75 (7)
3. Assessment of Faculty	5.93 (6.5)	7.53 (8)	5.79 (7)	6.14 (7)	5.98 (6)	5.85 (5)	5.83 (5)	6.19 (6)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.80 (3)	4.17 (2)	4.18 (2)	5.33 (5.5)	4.51 (4)	4.67 (3)	4.24 (2)	5.00 (3)
5. Low Turnover	9.22 (12)	8.57 (10)	8.71 (10)	9.43 (12)	8.06 (10)	8.85 (11)	8.56 (11)	10.06 (12)
6. Attracts Faculty	4.33 (2)	5.50 (6)	5.15 (4)	5.18 (4)	4.26 (2)	5.45 (4)	4.98 (4)	5.63 (4)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.78 (1)	3.17 (1)	3.32 (1)	3.73 (1)	3.82 (1)	3.50 (1)	3.00 (1)	3.44 (1)
8. Stimulates Research	4.87 (4)	6.07 (7)	5.24 (5)	4.04 (2)	5.02 (5)	6.00 (6)	7.28 (9)	6.06 (5)
9. Good Negotiator	5.89 (5)	5.10 (3)	4.85 (3)	4.59 (3)	4.30 (3)	4.22 (2)	4.84 (3)	3.69 (2)
10. Raises Funds	9.13 (10.5)	9.83 (11)	9.79 (12)	9.02 (10)	9.25 (12)	10.20 (12)	10.37 (12)	7.06 (8)
11. Curriculum Development	7.24 (8)	5.17 (4)	8.18 (9)	8.29 (9)	7.85 (8)	7.77 (9)	6.69 (7)	7.13 (9)
12. Represents Department	7.60 (9)	7.60 (9)	7.94 (8)	7.73 (8)	7.97 (9)	7.07 (8)	7.17 (8)	7.19 (10)

TABLE 17

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS BY DIFFERENT COLLEGES FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

College: N =	Eng. 45	Home Ec. 30	Vet.Med. 34	Agri. 51	Arts+Sci. 88	Nat.Sci. 40	Hum.+Soc. 86	Forestry 16
1. Identified with Specialty	7.93 (11)	7.70 (9)	8.71 (12)	8.78 (11)	7.86 (11)	8.80 (12)	9.17 (12)	9.06 (12)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	7.20 (10)	5.17 (3)	6.06 (8)	5.55 (3)	5.72 (4)	4.47 (1)	5.26 (3)	5.00 (4)
3. Delegates Decision Making	6.78 (8)	5.53 (4)	5.47 (3.5)	7.39 (10)	5.86 (5)	6.35 (5)	6.03 (6)	4.75 (1.5)
4. Makes Strong Impression	6.44 (5)	8.37 (12)	8.06 (11)	6.92 (9)	8.25 (12)	8.05 (11)	8.02 (11)	8.56 (11)
5. First Among Equals	8.04 (12)	8.03 (10)	7.29 (10)	8.88 (12)	7.48 (10)	6.38 (6)	6.71 (8)	7.94 (9)
6. Interested in Students	4.84 (2)	4.73 (1)	5.47 (3.5)	5.86 (5)	5.22 (2)	5.55 (3)	4.90 (1)	4.81 (3)
7. Motivated to Achieve	6.11 (4)	8.20 (11)	5.94 (7)	5.61 (4)	6.99 (9)	7.20 (10)	7.74 (10)	5.81 (6)
8. Decision Maker	5.16 (3)	5.70 (5)	4.65 (1)	5.10 (2)	6.23 (6)	6.72 (8)	6.40 (7)	5.06 (5)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	7.09 (9)	6.47 (7)	5.85 (6)	6.55 (6)	5.70 (3)	6.85 (9)	5.92 (5)	8.13 (10)
10. Long Range Goals	6.69 (6.5)	6.23 (6)	7.24 (9)	6.86 (8)	6.70 (8)	6.25 (4)	7.00 (9)	7.75 (8)
11. Decisive Action	4.76 (1)	5.13 (2)	4.94 (2)	3.88 (1)	5.08 (1)	5.07 (2)	4.95 (2)	4.75 (1.5)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	6.69 (6.5)	6.73 (8)	5.79 (5)	6.82 (7)	6.26 (7)	6.57 (7)	5.55 (4)	6.38 (7)

TABLE 18

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN TO PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
 BY BROAD DISCIPLINE GROUPS FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Broad Discipline: N =	Arts+Hum. 74	Nat.Sci. 160	Profess. 114	Soc.Sci. 43
1. High Visibility	5.39 (5)	5.76 (5)	5.56 (5)	5.05 (4)
2. Produces Students	4.04 (3)	4.38 (3)	3.92 (3)	4.53 (3)
3. Productive Scholar	3.73 (2)	3.03 (2)	3.68 (2)	2.81 (1)
4. Achieves Goals	2.58 (1)	2.43 (1)	2.36 (1)	2.95 (2)
5. On Federal Committees	9.89 (12)	9.23 (11)	9.61 (12)	8.72 (11)
6. Fund Raiser	7.97 (8)	7.19 (7)	8.05 (8)	7.79 (7)
7. Good Teacher	4.08 (4)	5.09 (4)	5.09 (4)	5.19 (5)
8. Nonacademic Experience	9.36 (11)	8.60 (10)	8.61 (11)	8.35 (10)
9. University Service	7.04 (6)	8.47 (9)	8.17 (9)	8.19 (8)
10. Management Training	8.07 (10)	8.27 (8)	7.28 (7)	8.28 (9)
11. Funding Knowledge	7.22 (7)	5.87 (6)	6.88 (6)	6.63 (6)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	8.00 (9)	9.66 (12)	8.58 (10)	9.53 (12)

TABLE 19

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES
 BY BROAD DISCIPLINE GROUPS FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Broad Discipline N =	Arts+Hum 74	Nat.Sci. 160	Profess. 114	Soc.Sci. 43
1. In Faculty Government	8.11 (10)	8.88 (10)	9.28 (11)	9.07 (11)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	6.84 (8)	6.03 (7)	5.82 (5)	7.49 (7)
3. Assessment of Faculty	5.91 (5)	5.82 (6)	6.44 (7)	6.26 (6)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.04 (2)	4.92 (3)	4.49 (2)	4.49 (4)
5. Low Turnover	8.39 (11)	9.31 (12)	8.47 (10)	7.88 (9)
6. Attracts Faculty	4.70 (4)	5.12 (5)	4.94 (3)	4.21 (2)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.04 (1)	3.57 (1)	3.35 (1)	4.28 (3)
8. Stimulates Research	6.41 (6)	4.96 (4)	6.25 (6)	4.93 (5)
9. Good Negotiator	4.28 (3)	4.57 (2)	5.40 (4)	4.14 (1)
10. Raises Funds	10.32 (12)	9.26 (11)	9.46 (12)	9.58 (12)
11. Curriculum Development	6.78 (7)	8.00 (9)	6.57 (8)	8.05 (10)
12. Represents Department	7.82 (9)	7.56 (8)	7.40 (9)	7.63 (8)

TABLE 20

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
 BY BROAD DISCIPLINE GROUPS FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Broad Discipline: N =	Arts+Hum. 74	Nat.Sci. 160	Profess. 114	Soc.Sci. 43
1. Identified with Specialty	8.45 (12)	8.60 (12)	8.51 (12)	8.16 (11)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	4.66 (1)	5.77 (4)	6.12 (5)	5.26 (2)
3. Delegates Decision Making	6.19 (6.5)	6.22 (5)	6.03 (4)	6.23 (6)
4. Makes Strong Impression	7.99 (11)	7.64 (10)	7.50 (10)	8.77 (12)
5. First Among Equals	6.66 (8)	7.74 (11)	7.87 (11)	6.84 (9)
6. Interested in Students	5.16 (3)	5.28 (2)	4.79 (1)	5.93 (3)
7. Motivated to Achieve	7.84 (10)	6.34 (6)	6.95 (9)	6.81 (8)
8. Decision Maker	6.19 (6.5)	5.74 (3)	5.45 (3)	6.44 (7)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	5.77 (5)	6.55 (7)	6.85 (8)	4.91 (1)
10. Long Range Goals	6.97 (9)	6.72 (9)	6.69 (7)	7.02 (10)
11. Decisive Action	4.99 (2)	4.39 (1)	4.83 (2)	6.19 (5)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	5.66 (4)	6.56 (8)	6.33 (6)	6.02 (4)

TABLE 21

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
 BY AGE LEVEL FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Age Level: N =	21-30yrs 35	31-40yrs 120	41-50yrs 141	51-60yrs 67	61-70yrs 28
1. High Visibility	6.40 (7)	5.89 (5)	5.15 (5)	5.07 (5)	6.21 (5)
2. Produces Students	5.06 (4)	4.19 (3)	4.30 (3)	3.90 (3)	3.32 (2)
3. Productive Scholar	3.23 (2)	3.24 (2)	3.34 (2)	3.34 (2)	3.75 (3)
4. Achieves Goals	2.40 (1)	2.77 (1)	2.20 (1)	2.55 (1)	2.79 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	9.00 (11)	9.38 (12)	9.46 (12)	9.43 (12)	9.71 (12)
6. Fund Raiser	5.31 (5)	7.38 (7)	7.96 (7)	8.46 (9)	8.32 (10)
7. Good Teacher	6.31 (6)	4.72 (4)	4.84 (4)	4.96 (4)	4.18 (4)
8. Nonacademic Experience	8.57 (9)	8.67 (10)	8.93 (11)	8.52 (10)	8.57 (11)
9. University Service	8.77 (10)	8.56 (9)	7.97 (8)	7.66 (7)	6.75 (6)
10. Management Training	7.71 (8)	7.93 (8)	8.16 (9)	7.79 (8)	7.57 (8)
11. Funding Knowledge	4.74 (3)	5.99 (6)	6.83 (6)	7.24 (6)	7.46 (7)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	10.49 (12)	9.16 (11)	8.89 (10)	8.85 (11)	7.64 (9)

TABLE 22

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES
BY LEVEL FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Age Level: N =	21-30yrs 35	31-40yrs 120	41-50yrs 141	51-60yrs 67	61-70yrs 28
1. In Faculty Government	9.69 (12)	9.09 (11)	8.70 (10)	8.79 (11)	7.96 (9)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	6.94 (7)	6.47 (7)	6.09 (6)	6.13 (5)	5.96 (7)
3. Assessment of Faculty	6.09 (6)	5.97 (6)	6.11 (7)	6.40 (7)	5.39 (4)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.80 (5)	4.39 (2)	4.63 (2.5)	5.03 (4)	3.79 (2)
5. Low Turnover	8.20 (9)	9.04 (10)	9.04 (11)	8.07 (10)	8.14 (10)
6. Attracts Faculty	4.77 (4)	4.71 (4)	5.37 (4)	4.40 (2)	4.54 (3)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.97 (1)	3.57 (1)	3.73 (1)	2.88 (1)	2.71 (1)
8. Stimulates Research	4.60 (3)	5.60 (5)	5.52 (5)	6.21 (6)	5.89 (6)
9. Good Negotiator	4.09 (2)	4.65 (3)	4.63 (2.5)	4.88 (3)	5.75 (5)
10. Raises Funds	8.31 (10)	9.29 (12)	9.70 (12)	10.22 (12)	9.89 (12)
11. Curriculum Development	8.43 (11)	7.67 (9)	7.05 (8)	7.10 (8)	6.82 (8)
12. Represents Department	8.11 (8)	7.39 (8)	7.34 (9)	7.66 (9)	8.64 (11)

TABLE 23

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
 BY AGE LEVEL FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Age Level:	21-30yrs	31-40yrs	41-50yrs	51-60yrs	61-70yrs
N =	35	120	141	67	28
1. Identified with Specialty	8.86 (12)	8.65 (12)	8.58 (12)	8.28 (11)	7.46 (11)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	5.34 (3)	6.35 (5)	5.62 (4)	4.96 (2)	4.25 (2)
3. Delegates Decision Making	5.31 (2)	6.46 (6.5)	6.16 (6)	6.01 (5)	6.32 (4)
4. Makes Strong Impression	6.69 (7)	6.96 (9)	8.45 (11)	8.33 (12)	8.11 (12)
5. First Among Equals	6.97 (9)	7.22 (11)	7.62 (10)	8.13 (10)	6.86 (9)
6. Interested in Students	5.80 (4)	5.13 (2)	5.23 (2)	5.39 (3)	4.00 (1)
7. Motivated to Achieve	6.06 (5)	6.46 (6.5)	7.18 (9)	7.06 (9)	7.43 (10)
8. Decision Maker	6.63 (6)	5.54 (3)	5.48 (3)	6.24 (7)	6.68 (7)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	6.71 (8)	6.25 (4)	6.35 (8)	6.03 (6)	6.50 (6)
10. Long Range Goals	7.40 (10)	7.18 (10)	6.29 (7)	6.88 (8)	6.71 (8)
11. Decisive Action	4.51 (1)	4.74 (1)	4.89 (1)	4.82 (1)	5.32 (3)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	7.60 (11)	6.48 (8)	5.91 (5)	5.87 (4)	6.36 (5)

TABLE 24

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF AVERAGE.

Years of Experience: N =	0-5yrs 93	6-10yrs 72	11-15yrs 66	16-20yrs 58	21-25yrs 52	26-30yrs 22	31-35yrs 12	36+yrs 16
1. High Visibility	6.35 (6)	5.63 (5)	5.18 (5)	4.74 (4.5)	5.44 (5)	5.73 (5)	5.58 (5)	5.13 (5)
2. Produces Students	4.75 (3)	4.51 (3)	4.18 (3)	4.05 (3)	3.71 (3)	3.45 (2)	3.33 (2)	3.38 (3)
3. Productive Scholar	3.25 (2)	3.42 (2)	3.14 (2)	3.24 (2)	3.44 (2)	4.00 (3)	3.58 (4)	3.06 (2)
4. Achieves Goals	2.24 (1)	2.82 (1)	2.86 (1)	2.24 (1)	2.29 (1)	2.23 (1)	2.92 (1)	2.69 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	9.15 (11)	9.06 (11.5)	9.08 (11)	9.97 (12)	10.12 (12)	9.00 (11)	10.42 (12)	9.38 (12)
6. Fund Raiser	6.56 (7)	7.69 (7)	7.65 (7)	7.93 (9)	8.46 (9)	7.77 (8)	9.58 (11)	8.69 (10)
7. Good Teacher	5.53 (4)	4.90 (4)	4.98 (4)	4.74 (4.5)	4.42 (4)	5.14 (4)	3.42 (3)	4.00 (4)
8. Nonacademic Experience	8.34 (9)	8.39 (10)	8.26 (9)	9.57 (11)	9.50 (11)	8.23 (9)	9.42 (10)	8.88 (11)
9. University Service	8.83 (10)	8.15 (9)	8.61 (10)	7.59 (7)	6.94 (7)	8.82 (10)	6.25 (6)	7.13 (6)
10. Management Training	7.78 (8)	8.06 (8)	8.06 (8)	7.60 (8)	8.81 (10)	6.64 (6)	8.25 (9)	7.88 (9)
11. Funding Knowledge	5.54 (5)	6.29 (6)	6.58 (6)	7.21 (6)	6.75 (6)	7.32 (7)	7.50 (7)	7.50 (8)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	9.68 (12)	9.04 (11.5)	9.27 (12)	8.86 (10)	8.19 (8)	9.68 (12)	7.75 (8)	7.31 (7)

TABLE 25

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years of Experience: N =	0-5yrs 93	6-10yrs 72	11-15yrs 66	16-20yrs 58	21-25yrs 52	26-30yrs 22	31-35yrs 12	36+yrs 16
1. In Faculty Government	9.14 (12)	9.47 (11)	8.68 (10)	8.10 (10)	9.17 (11)	8.73 (11)	8.67 (11)	7.56 (9)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	6.76 (7)	6.42 (7)	6.62 (7)	5.24 (4)	5.81 (6)	6.09 (6)	6.92 (7)	6.56 (7)
3. Assessment of Faculty	6.13 (6)	5.54 (5)	6.50 (6)	6.17 (7)	6.31 (7)	5.32 (4)	7.75 (9)	4.81 (4)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.71 (3)	4.44 (2)	4.42 (3)	4.62 (3)	4.58 (3)	4.50 (3)	5.58 (4)	4.31 (3)
5. Low Turnover	8.99 (11)	8.72 (10)	9.03 (12)	9.33 (11)	8.19 (10)	7.64 (8)	8.08 (10)	7.69 (10)
6. Attracts Faculty	4.82 (4)	5.06 (4)	4.88 (4)	6.07 (6)	4.42 (2)	3.82 (2)	3.58 (2)	4.25 (2)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.75 (1)	3.50 (1)	3.48 (1)	3.84 (1)	3.04 (1)	3.45 (1)	2.33 (1)	2.88 (1)
8. Stimulates Research	5.00 (5)	6.29 (6)	4.97 (5)	5.98 (5)	5.79 (5)	6.27 (7)	5.83 (5)	5.63 (6)
9. Good Negotiator	4.43 (2)	4.67 (3)	4.58 (3)	4.41 (2)	5.02 (4)	6.05 (5)	4.75 (3)	5.31 (5)
10. Raises Funds	8.84 (10)	9.49 (12)	9.00 (11)	9.95 (12)	10.52 (12)	10.00 (12)	11.00 (12)	10.06 (12)
11. Curriculum Development	7.83 (9)	7.39 (8)	7.06 (8)	6.72 (8)	7.54 (9)	8.05 (10)	6.33 (6)	7.25 (8)
12. Represents Department	7.66 (8)	7.54 (9)	7.73 (9)	7.17 (9)	7.48 (8)	7.82 (9)	7.17 (8)	8.31 (11)

TABLE 26

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN FOR PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years of Experience: N =	0-5yrs 93	6-10yrs 72	11-15yrs 66	16-20yrs 58	21-25yrs 52	26-30yrs 22	31-35yrs 12	36+yrs 16
1. Identified with Specialty	8.65 (12)	8.42 (12)	8.86 (12)	7.84 (10)	9.10 (12)	9.27 (12)	7.75 (10)	6.38 (5.3)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	5.99 (5)	6.38 (6)	5.52 (2)	4.66 (1)	5.25 (3)	5.82 (3)	6.83 (7.5)	3.75 (1)
3. Delegates Decision Making	5.74 (3.5)	6.54 (7)	6.30 (7)	6.45 (6)	5.63 (6)	6.68 (9)	5.58 (3.5)	6.69 (9)
4. Makes Strong Impression	6.98 (8)	7.61 (10)	7.74 (11)	8.36 (12)	8.42 (10.5)	7.95 (11)	8.92 (12)	8.31 (12)
5. First Among Equals	7.10 (10)	7.99 (11)	6.79 (9)	8.12 (11)	8.42 (10.5)	6.64 (8)	6.83 (7.5)	6.38 (5.3)
6. Interested in Students	5.39 (2)	4.89 (2)	5.55 (3)	5.62 (4)	5.21 (2)	4.68 (1)	3.33 (1)	4.31 (2)
7. Motivated to Achieve	6.45 (6)	6.17 (5)	6.85 (10)	7.66 (9)	7.12 (9)	7.45 (10)	7.92 (11)	6.94 (10)
8. Decision Maker	5.74 (3.5)	5.94 (3)	6.08 (5)	5.26 (3)	5.35 (4)	5.95 (4)	5.75 (5)	8.00 (11)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	6.65 (7)	6.15 (4)	5.82 (4)	6.83 (8)	5.69 (7)	6.09 (5.5)	7.67 (9)	6.50 (8)
10. Long Range Goals	7.20 (11)	7.01 (9)	6.48 (8)	6.67 (7)	6.79 (8)	6.09 (5.5)	6.50 (6)	6.38 (5.3)
11. Decisive Action	4.35 (1)	4.88 (1)	4.92 (1)	4.90 (2)	5.08 (1)	5.23 (2)	5.33 (2)	5.00 (3)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	7.02 (9)	6.69 (8)	6.11 (6)	5.69 (5)	5.48 (5)	6.14 (7)	5.58 (3.5)	5.88 (4)

TABLE 27

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES BY YEARS AT THE INSTITUTION FOR THE COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years at Institution: N =	0-5yrs 205	6-10yrs 54	11-15yrs 44	16-20yrs 38	21-25yrs 28	26-30yrs 8	31-35yrs 10	36+yrs 4
1. High Visibility	5.78 (5)	5.19 (4)	5.20 (5)	5.66 (5)	5.61 (5)	5.63 (5)	4.00 (4)	5.25 (5)
2. Produces Students	4.33 (3)	4.48 (3)	4.32 (3)	3.45 (3)	3.79 (2)	3.50 (3)	3.70 (3)	4.75 (2.5)
3. Productive Scholar	3.25 (2)	3.50 (2)	3.45 (2)	2.95 (2)	3.86 (3)	2.75 (2)	3.20 (1)	5.00 (4)
4. Achieves Goals	2.46 (1)	2.61 (1)	2.84 (1)	2.24 (1)	2.21 (1)	2.13 (1)	3.60 (2)	1.25 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	9.37 (12)	8.89 (11.5)	8.59 (10.5)	10.45 (12)	10.18 (12)	9.63 (12)	9.40 (10)	11.75 (12)
6. Fund Raiser	7.48 (7)	7.70 (7)	7.61 (7)	7.84 (8)	8.36 (10.5)	9.25 (11)	7.70 (7.5)	6.75 (7.5)
7. Good Teacher	4.88 (4)	5.48 (5)	5.18 (4)	4.47 (4)	4.29 (4)	4.00 (4)	4.30 (5)	7.25 (9)
8. Nonacademic Experience	8.53 (10)	8.89 (11.5)	8.59 (10.5)	9.39 (11)	8.29 (9)	9.13 (10)	10.30 (12)	9.50 (11)
9. University Service	8.50 (9)	7.91 (8)	8.14 (8.5)	7.32 (6)	6.86 (6)	9.00 (9)	6.40 (6)	6.50 (6)
10. Management Training	7.85 (8)	8.17 (9)	8.14 (8.5)	8.00 (9)	7.64 (8)	7.13 (6)	9.60 (11)	6.75 (7.5)
11. Funding Knowledge	6.23 (6)	6.30 (6)	6.36 (6)	7.42 (7)	7.25 (7)	7.88 (7)	7.70 (7.5)	4.75 (2.5)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	9.33 (11)	8.72 (10)	8.98 (12)	8.82 (10)	8.36 (10.5)	8.00 (8)	8.10 (9)	8.50 (10)

TABLE 28

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES BY YEARS AT THE INSTITUTION FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE

Years at Institution: N =	0-5yrs 205	6-10yrs 54	11-15yrs 44	16-20yrs 38	21-25yrs 28	26-30yrs 8	31-35yrs 10	36+yrs 4
1. In Faculty Government	8.90 (10)	9.06 (11)	8.59 (10.5)	9.18 (11)	8.11 (10)	10.00 (11)	8.30 (9.5)	9.50 (10)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	6.27 (7)	6.85 (7.5)	6.66 (7)	5.24 (4)	5.36 (5)	8.50 (10)	7.20 (7)	4.50 (5)
3. Assessment of Faculty	6.06 (6)	6.19 (6)	6.20 (6)	5.34 (5)	6.68 (8)	7.50 (7)	5.70 (6)	3.75 (1.3)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.64 (2)	4.83 (3)	4.41 (3)	4.39 (2)	4.14 (2)	4.38 (3.5)	5.20 (4)	3.75 (1.3)
5. Low Turnover	8.98 (11)	8.85 (10)	8.59 (10.5)	7.66 (8)	8.64 (11)	7.88 (9)	9.20 (11)	7.50 (8)
6. Attracts Faculty	4.79 (4)	5.09 (4)	5.86 (5)	4.87 (3)	4.68 (3)	2.38 (1)	3.90 (2)	5.75 (6)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.49 (1)	3.63 (1)	4.14 (1)	2.89 (1)	3.00 (1)	2.75 (2)	3.70 (1)	3.75 (1.3)
8. Stimulates Research	5.51 (5)	5.80 (5)	5.11 (4)	6.29 (7)	5.96 (6)	5.13 (5)	5.30 (5)	6.25 (7)
9. Good Negotiator	4.68 (3)	4.46 (2)	4.50 (2)	5.53 (6)	4.93 (4)	4.38 (3.5)	4.30 (3)	4.25 (4)
0. Raises Funds	9.47 (12)	9.35 (12)	8.77 (12)	10.55 (12)	10.14 (12)	10.50 (12)	9.50 (12)	9.75 (11)
1. Curriculum Development	7.10 (8)	7.61 (9)	7.55 (9)	7.74 (9)	7.57 (9)	6.88 (6)	8.30 (9.5)	8.75 (9)
2. Represents Department	7.81 (9)	6.85 (7.5)	7.18 (8)	8.16 (10)	6.61 (7)	7.75 (8)	7.40 (8)	10.50 (12)

TABLE 29

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS BY YEARS AT THE INSTITUTION FOR COMBINED DATA.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years at Institution N =	0-5yrs 205	6-10yrs 54	11-15yrs 44	16-20yrs 38	21-25yrs 28	26-30yrs 8	31-35yrs 10	36+yrs 4
1. Identified with Specialty	8.57 (12)	8.81 (12)	8.64 (12)	8.45 (11)	8.25 (11)	6.00 (5.5)	7.40 (9.5)	8.75 (10.5)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	5.97 (3)	5.41 (3)	5.14 (2)	4.84 (1)	5.46 (6)	6.00 (5.5)	4.80 (2)	4.75 (2)
3. Delegates Decision Making	5.98 (4)	6.33 (7)	6.77 (7)	6.05 (6)	5.18 (4)	8.25 (10)	7.60 (12)	6.50 (8)
4. Makes Strong Impression	7.39 (11)	8.50 (11)	7.82 (11)	8.47 (12)	7.93 (10)	9.00 (12)	7.50 (11)	9.25 (12)
5. First Among Equals	7.11 (10)	8.20 (10)	7.39 (9)	7.50 (10)	9.04 (12)	8.00 (9)	6.40 (5)	7.50 (9)
6. Interested in Students	5.20 (2)	5.19 (2)	5.95 (5)	4.87 (2)	4.89 (3)	4.13 (2)	4.50 (1)	5.00 (3)
7. Motivated to Achieve	6.68 (8)	6.20 (6)	7.75 (10)	6.92 (9)	7.25 (9)	8.88 (11)	7.40 (9.5)	5.75 (5.5)
8. Decision Maker	6.06 (5)	5.54 (4)	5.32 (4)	5.92 (4)	4.68 (1)	6.25 (7)	5.80 (4)	8.75 (10.5)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	6.52 (6)	6.04 (5)	6.02 (6)	6.58 (7)	5.39 (5)	5.75 (4)	7.10 (7.5)	5.50 (4)
10. Long Range Goals	6.85 (9)	6.39 (9)	7.02 (8)	6.74 (8)	7.21 (8)	6.38 (8)	7.10 (7.5)	4.50 (1)
11. Decisive Action	4.75 (1)	4.87 (1)	4.61 (1)	5.34 (3)	4.82 (2)	3.88 (1)	5.60 (3)	6.00 (7)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	6.62 (7)	6.35 (8)	5.30 (3)	5.95 (5)	5.54 (7)	5.50 (3)	6.80 (6)	5.75 (5.5)

TABLE 30

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
 BY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Publications: N =	None 70	1 - 3 55	4 - 7 59	8 - 11 42	12+ 164
1. High Visibility	6.47 (5)	6.35 (5)	5.12 (5)	6.02 (5)	4.95 (4)
2. Produces Students	4.17 (3)	3.80 (3)	4.15 (3)	4.69 (3)	4.18 (3)
3. Productive Scholar	3.91 (2)	2.95 (2)	3.24 (2)	3.69 (2)	3.16 (2)
4. Achieves Goals	2.31 (1)	2.67 (1)	2.54 (1)	2.83 (1)	2.41 (1)
5. On Federal Committees	10.06 (12)	9.51 (12)	9.39 (12)	9.55 (12)	9.08 (11)
6. Fund Raiser	7.51 (9)	8.60 (10)	7.76 (7)	7.40 (7.5)	7.41 (7)
7. Good Teacher	4.33 (4)	4.25 (4)	4.83 (4)	5.07 (4)	5.35 (5)
8. Nonacademic Experience	8.60 (11)	9.09 (11)	8.61 (10)	8.14 (10)	8.82 (10)
9. University Service	7.50 (8)	7.75 (8)	8.05 (8)	7.79 (9)	8.55 (9)
10. Management Training	7.36 (7)	7.44 (7)	8.49 (9)	7.40 (7.5)	8.30 (8)
11. Funding Knowledge	6.77 (6)	7.33 (6)	6.64 (6)	6.29 (6)	6.13 (6)
12. Nonacademic Achievement	8.33 (10)	8.24 (9)	9.37 (11)	9.12 (11)	9.43 (12)

TABLE 31

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES
 BY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Publications: N =	None 70	1 - 3 55	4 - 7 59	8 - 11 42	12+ 164
1. In Faculty Government	8.70 (11)	8.05 (10)	9.19 (11)	8.90 (11)	9.10 (10)
2. Communicates Administration Expectations	6.34 (6)	6.07 (4)	6.36 (7)	6.05 (6)	6.39 (7)
3. Assessment of Faculty	5.73 (5)	6.20 (6)	6.19 (6)	6.64 (7)	5.94 (6)
4. Administration of Tasks	4.57 (3)	4.44 (2)	4.07 (2)	3.88 (2)	4.96 (5)
5. Low Turnover	8.04 (10)	8.51 (11)	8.32 (10)	8.79 (10)	9.22 (12)
6. Attracts Faculty	4.44 (2)	6.15 (5)	5.10 (4)	5.81 (5)	4.35 (2)
7. Develops Good Teaching	3.07 (1)	3.07 (1)	3.66 (1)	3.17 (1)	3.82 (1)
8. Stimulates Research	6.97 (7.5)	6.62 (7)	5.37 (5)	5.60 (4)	4.78 (4)
9. Good Negotiator	4.69 (4)	4.85 (3)	4.86 (3)	5.10 (3)	4.52 (3)
10. Raises Funds	10.07 (12)	10.20 (12)	9.85 (12)	9.07 (12)	9.14 (11)
11. Curriculum Development	6.97 (7.5)	6.91 (8)	6.81 (8)	7.48 (9)	7.85 (9)
12. Represents Department	7.91 (9)	7.02 (9)	7.24 (9)	7.40 (8)	7.78 (8)

TABLE 32

AVERAGE VALUES GIVEN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
 BY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS FOR COMBINED DATA.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Publications: N =	None 70	1 - 3 55	4 - 7 59	8 - 11 42	12+ 164
1. Identified with Specialty	8.63 (12)	8.73 (12)	8.71 (12)	8.71 (12)	8.27 (11)
2. Sensitive to Department Needs	5.29 (2)	5.36 (3)	6.36 (6)	5.43 (4)	5.60 (2)
3. Delegates Decision Making	5.97 (4)	5.84 (5)	5.69 (3)	6.38 (7)	6.45 (8)
4. Makes Strong Impression	7.67 (11)	8.35 (11)	7.29 (10)	7.74 (10)	7.88 (10)
5. First Among Equals	6.83 (8)	6.55 (8)	6.78 (9)	7.14 (8)	8.37 (12)
6. Interested in Students	4.64 (1)	4.55 (1)	4.93 (2)	5.21 (2)	5.73 (3)
7. Motivated to Achieve	7.24 (10)	7.38 (10)	7.53 (11)	8.14 (11)	5.92 (5)
8. Decision Maker	5.99 (5)	5.78 (4)	5.95 (4)	5.48 (5)	5.77 (4)
9. Good Conflict Resolution	6.17 (6)	5.96 (6)	6.59 (8)	6.21 (6)	6.41 (7)
10. Long Range Goals	7.19 (9)	7.05 (9)	6.49 (7)	7.24 (9)	6.57 (9)
11. Decisive Action	5.60 (3)	4.95 (2)	4.44 (1)	4.64 (1)	4.64 (1)
12. Concerned with Helping Faculty	6.34 (7)	6.33 (7)	6.27 (5)	5.38 (3)	6.40 (6)

APPENDIX B

Sample Questionnaire
Deans' Effectiveness Rating Form
Cover Letters

Faculty Rank _____

Department _____

Age _____

Total years teaching
experience _____

Number of years at
this university _____

Number of published
articles _____

What percentage of your time do you
spend in the following activities:

Administration _____

Public Relations _____

Research _____

Teaching _____

Other _____

100%

I N S T R U C T I O N S

Listed below are three sets of characteristics and behaviors that could be used to describe an effective department chairman. For each set, rank the importance of the individual characteristics according to how you feel it describes a good department chairman. Place the number "1" beside the most important, "2" beside the next important, and so forth through "12" for the least important. Rank each set separately. A space has been provided for you to mention additional characteristics if you wish. After completing form, please remove staple, detach form from cover, refold so the return address is visible, staple, and place in campus mail.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Rank from 1-12

- ___1 High visibility in professional organizations.
- ___2. Noted for producing outstanding students.
- ___3 Strong reputation as a creative and productive scholar in his field
- ___4 Established reputation for planning and achieving program goals.
- ___5. Membership on federal government agency committees.
- ___6. Reputation established as a successful fund raiser
- ___7. Known as a good teacher
- ___8 Work experience in a government agency, in business, or in a private foundation.
- ___9. Prior membership on university service committees, such as student life, etc.
- ___10. Trained in professional management.
- ___11. Knowledge in dealing with funding agencies outside the university.
- ___12. Visible achievements in community leadership outside the university.

Other _____

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Rank from 1-12

- ___1 Participates and is influential in faculty government at the university level
- ___2. Understands and communicates to the department faculty expectations of the university administration
- ___3. Develops sound procedures for assessing faculty performance
- ___4. Shows effective and equitable organizations of faculty responsibilities such as committee assignments, teaching loads, etc.
- ___5. Maintains a low turnover rate in his faculty.
- ___6. Attracts and recruits promising faculty.
- ___7. Promotes the development of a good teaching faculty.
- ___8. Succeeds in stimulating faculty research activity and growth of research productivity in his department.
- ___9. Negotiates successfully with university on such matters as department budget, faculty tenure, and promotions, etc
- ___10. Raises funds from sources outside the university.
- ___11. Guides curriculum development skillfully to a point of completion.
- ___12. Represents the department well in the total university community.

Other _____

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Rank from 1-12

- ___1. Highly identified with his academic field of specialization.
- ___2. Extremely sensitive to the department's needs in the broader context of the total university.
- ___3. Willing to delegate decision making to individual faculty and department committees.
- ___4. Capable of making a strong and positive impression on people.
- ___5. Identifies himself as one of the faculty, first among equals.
- ___6. Interested in the needs of the students.
- ___7 Highly motivated to achieve as a departmental chairman and educational leader.
- ___8 Tends to make decisive decisions and use faculty as advisors.
- ___9. Personally effective at resolving and preventing conflicts in the department faculty.
- ___10. Oriented towards long range goals of the department more than immediate needs.
- ___11 Capable of decisive thinking and action.
- ___12. Concerned with helping each faculty member to find his place in the program.

Other _____

SAMPLE EFFECTIVENESS RATING FORM

Rater: _____

College to be rated: College of Arts and Sciences

Please evaluate the department chairmen under your immediate direction in terms of their overall effectiveness in performing their responsibilities.

On the first line, enter the name of the chairman whom you consider to be the most effective. List the remaining chairmen in the order of most to least effective.

LIST THE NAMES OF CHAIRMEN IN
ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS

MOST EFFECTIVE

1. Best _____
2. Next Best _____
3. Next _____
4. Next _____
5. Next _____
6. Next _____
7. Next _____
8. Next _____
9. Next _____
10. Next _____
11. Next _____
12. Next _____
13. Next _____
14. Next _____
15. Next _____
16. Next _____
17. Next _____
18. Next _____
19. Next _____
20. Next _____
21. Next _____

LEAST EFFECTIVE

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

FORT COLLINS, COLORADO 80521

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

May 15, 1969

TO: Selected Faculty Members
FROM: J. Stanley Ahmann
SUBJECT: Participation in Research Study

Colorado State University is participating in a research study which needs your support and cooperation. This project is being conducted on a regional basis, and the results will be evaluated by an independent research staff.

Would you please complete this short questionnaire and return it in the campus mail by June 1, 1969. Your participation in this study will contribute to the increased effectiveness of this University. Thank you for your assistance.



APPENDIX C

Detailed Results for Colorado State University

TABLE 33

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY CSU ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY RANK.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Administrative and Faculty Rank: N =	Dean 6	Chairman 42	Prof. 52	Asc Prof. 47	Ast.Prof. 49	Instr. 27
Professional Activities.						
1	4.33 (4)	4.48 (4)	5.44 (5)	6.23 (5)	6.57 (5)	6.74 (7)
2	6.00 (6)	4.19 (3)	3.98 (3)	4.02 (2)	4.41 (3)	4.11 (3)
3	3.33 (2)	3.48 (2)	2.92 (2)	4.32 (3)	3.47 (2)	3.89 (2)
4	2.33 (1)	2.33 (1)	2.27 (1)	2.45 (1)	2.67 (1)	2.15 (1)
5	9.33 (10)	9.69 (12)	9.19 (12)	9.15 (12)	9.76 (12)	10.44 (12)
6	7.50 (8)	8.21 (8)	7.48 (7)	8.11 (9)	6.92 (7)	7.74 (8)
7	6.33 (7)	5.14 (5)	5.04 (4)	4.43 (4)	4.80 (4)	4.26 (4)
8	9.00 (9)	8.31 (9)	9.10 (11)	8.32 (10)	8.31 (10)	8.74 (10.5)
9	5.50 (5)	8.74 (10)	7.98 (8)	7.74 (8)	8.22 (9)	8.15 (9)
10	10.67 (12)	7.31 (7)	8.56 (9)	7.32 (7)	6.94 (8)	6.37 (5)
11	4.00 (3)	6.50 (6)	6.79 (6)	6.96 (6)	6.80 (6)	6.70 (6)
12	9.67 (11)	9.48 (11)	9.02 (10)	9.06 (11)	9.14 (7)	8.74 (10.5)
Administrative Responsibilities:						
1	8.00 (10)	9.48 (12)	7.96 (10)	8.43 (10)	8.45 (10)	8.04 (9)
2	4.00 (2)	6.55 (7)	6.08 (5)	5.83 (6)	6.37 (6)	6.11 (6)
3	6.67 (7)	5.90 (6)	6.13 (6)	5.38 (3)	6.04 (5)	5.89 (5)
4	6.00 (5.5)	4.71 (4)	5.37 (3)	4.32 (2)	4.33 (3)	4.07 (2)
5	10.00 (11.5)	8.81 (11)	8.96 (11)	8.87 (11)	8.90 (11)	9.30 (11)
6	1.83 (1)	3.74 (2)	5.40 (4)	5.70 (5)	5.59 (4)	6.15 (7)
7	5.33 (4)	3.40 (1)	3.65 (1)	2.98 (1)	3.71 (1)	2.63 (1)
8	4.83 (3)	4.29 (3)	6.33 (7)	6.53 (7)	7.67 (9)	6.67 (8)
9	6.00 (5.5)	5.00 (5)	4.37 (2)	5.53 (4)	4.14 (2)	4.48 (3)
10	10.00 (11.5)	9.62 (8)	9.75 (12)	9.91 (12)	9.39 (12)	10.41 (12)
11	7.83 (9)	6.81 (9)	7.60 (9)	7.02 (8)	7.61 (8)	5.70 (4)
12	7.50 (8)	8.02 (10)	6.52 (8)	7.34 (9)	6.78 (7)	8.19 (10)
Personal Characteristics:						
1	7.50 (10)	8.88 (12)	8.63 (12)	9.36 (12)	8.69 (12)	8.33 (12)
2	5.50 (3)	5.67 (4)	5.23 (2)	6.00 (6)	5.22 (3)	5.41 (3)
3	9.33 (11)	6.26 (8)	6.81 (7)	5.83 (4)	5.88 (4)	5.48 (4)
4	6.83 (9)	7.93 (10)	8.10 (11)	7.98 (11)	7.69 (11)	7.33 (8.5)
5	10.00 (12)	8.12 (11)	7.79 (10)	5.96 (5)	6.14 (5)	7.33 (8.5)
6	6.17 (8)	5.07 (2)	5.52 (3)	4.85 (2)	5.18 (2)	4.07 (1)
7	5.67 (4.5)	5.90 (5)	6.83 (8)	7.02 (9)	6.92 (9)	8.00 (11)
8	5.17 (2)	6.12 (6)	5.60 (4)	5.79 (3)	6.16 (6)	6.07 (5)
9	4.17 (1)	6.60 (9)	5.87 (6)	7.06 (10)	7.00 (10)	6.48 (6)
10	6.00 (6.5)	6.21 (7)	7.08 (9)	6.98 (8)	6.80 (8)	7.52 (10)
11	5.67 (4.5)	4.36 (1)	4.69 (1)	4.70 (1)	4.69 (1)	5.33 (2)
12	6.00 (6.5)	5.33 (3)	5.85 (5)	6.96 (7)	6.53 (7)	7.04 (7)

TABLE 34

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY CSU COLLEGES.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

College Codes: N =	Eng. 21	Home Ec. 16	Vet.Med. 23	Agri. 22	Nat.Sci. 40	Hum.+Soc. 86	Forestry 15
Professional Activities:							
1	6.00 (5.5)	5.31 (5)	6.00 (6)	6.18 (5)	5.95 (5)	5.74 (5)	5.13 (3)
2	3.86 (3)	4.50 (3)	3.26 (3)	4.32 (3)	4.40 (3)	4.14 (3)	5.33 (4)
3	3.19 (2)	2.94 (2)	3.00 (2)	3.27 (2)	2.88 (2)	3.99 (2)	5.53 (5)
4	2.71 (1)	2.00 (1)	2.39 (1)	2.41 (1)	2.85 (1)	2.26 (1)	1.93 (1)
5	8.43 (10)	10.19 (12)	8.70 (10)	9.91 (12)	9.27 (11)	10.01 (12)	9.40 (12)
6	7.14 (7)	8.88 (9.5)	7.96 (7)	6.95 (7)	7.50 (8)	8.06 (9)	5.80 (6)
7	5.38 (4)	5.13 (4)	5.13 (4)	4.68 (4)	4.50 (4)	4.28 (4)	7.33 (8)
8	7.90 (9)	9.13 (11)	8.91 (11)	8.55 (10)	8.60 (9)	8.64 (10.5)	7.87 (9)
9	9.67 (12)	6.81 (6)	8.22 (9)	7.68 (8)	8.75 (10)	7.53 (8)	8.93 (10)
10	7.95 (8)	6.88 (7)	8.30 (8)	8.41 (9)	7.13 (7)	7.33 (6)	6.93 (7)
11	6.00 (5.5)	7.38 (8)	5.83 (5)	6.32 (6)	6.65 (6)	7.40 (7)	4.80 (2)
12	9.43 (11)	8.88 (9.5)	10.30 (12)	9.00 (11)	9.55 (12)	8.64 (10.5)	9.00 (11)
Administrative Responsibilities:							
1	8.29 (9)	9.25 (11)	8.83 (11)	8.05 (11)	8.30 (10)	8.43 (10)	8.53 (11)
2	6.14 (7)	5.69 (6)	6.09 (8)	5.00 (2.5)	6.10 (7)	6.36 (6)	7.00 (9)
3	5.43 (5)	7.13 (8)	5.52 (5)	6.05 (7)	5.85 (5)	5.83 (5)	6.13 (6)
4	5.29 (4)	4.63 (2)	4.13 (2)	5.77 (6)	4.67 (3)	4.24 (2)	5.27 (3)
5	9.19 (12)	8.94 (10)	8.96 (11)	9.86 (12)	8.85 (11)	8.56 (11)	10.07 (12)
6	4.24 (1)	5.50 (5)	5.43 (4)	5.59 (5)	5.45 (4)	4.98 (4)	5.73 (4)
7	4.38 (2)	2.69 (1)	3.65 (1)	4.14 (1)	3.50 (1)	3.00 (1)	3.33 (1)
8	4.43 (3)	7.06 (7)	5.57 (6)	5.00 (2.5)	6.00 (6)	7.28 (9)	6.07 (5)
9	6.00 (6)	4.69 (3)	4.35 (3)	5.18 (4)	4.22 (2)	4.84 (3)	3.80 (2)
10	8.86 (11)	9.88 (12)	10.00 (12)	9.09 (11)	10.20 (12)	10.37 (12)	6.93 (7.5)
11	7.62 (8)	4.94 (4)	8.00 (10)	7.73 (9)	7.77 (9)	6.69 (7)	7.07 (10)
12	8.43 (10)	7.63 (9)	7.30 (9)	6.73 (8)	7.07 (8)	7.17 (8)	6.93 (7.5)
Personal Characteristics:							
1	7.24 (10)	8.63 (12)	9.00 (12)	8.50 (11.5)	8.80 (12)	9.17 (12)	8.87 (12)
2	7.33 (9)	5.38 (3.5)	6.00 (8)	6.41 (5)	4.47 (1)	5.26 (3)	5.13 (4)
3	7.14 (8)	5.38 (3.5)	5.74 (6.5)	7.73 (9)	6.35 (5)	6.03 (6)	4.80 (2)
4	6.86 (6.5)	7.56 (9.5)	8.26 (11)	6.91 (6)	8.05 (6)	8.02 (11)	8.40 (11)
5	7.86 (12)	7.13 (8)	7.35 (10)	8.50 (11.5)	6.38 (7)	6.71 (8)	7.87 (9)
6	5.19 (3)	3.75 (1)	5.39 (4)	5.55 (4)	5.55 (3)	4.90 (1)	4.73 (1)
7	5.29 (4)	8.31 (11)	5.74 (6.5)	4.73 (2)	7.20 (11)	7.74 (10)	5.87 (6)
8	5.14 (2)	5.88 (5)	4.48 (1)	5.14 (3)	6.72 (9)	6.40 (7)	5.33 (5)
9	6.86 (6.5)	6.88 (7)	5.48 (5)	7.77 (10)	6.85 (10)	5.92 (5)	8.20 (10)
10	6.76 (5)	6.50 (6)	7.13 (9)	6.95 (7)	6.25 (4)	7.00 (9)	7.60 (8)
11	4.62 (1)	5.06 (2)	4.78 (2)	2.95 (1)	5.07 (2)	4.95 (2)	4.93 (3)
12	7.71 (11)	7.56 (9.5)	5.30 (3)	7.36 (8)	6.57 (8)	5.55 (4)	6.27 (7)

TABLE 35

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY CSU BROAD DISCIPLINE GROUPS.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Broad Discipline Groups: N =	Arts-Hum. 43	Nat.Sci. 88	Profess. 72	Soc.Sci. 20
Professional Activities:				
1	5.65 (5)	6.01 (5)	5.67 (5)	5.70 (5)
2	4.51 (4)	4.26 (3)	3.85 (2)	4.45 (3)
3	4.23 (3)	3.17 (2)	3.90 (3)	2.70 (2)
4	2.16 (1)	2.47 (1)	2.46 (1)	2.35 (1)
5	10.30 (12)	9.18 (11)	9.64 (12)	9.30 (11)
6	7.98 (10)	7.28 (7)	7.99 (8)	7.45 (7)
7	3.86 (2)	4.99 (4)	5.21 (4)	4.70 (4)
8	9.35 (11)	8.57 (10)	8.38 (10)	7.55 (8)
9	6.91 (6)	8.48 (9)	8.15 (9)	8.60 (9)
10	7.63 (8)	7.68 (8)	6.82 (6)	8.85 (10)
11	7.60 (7)	6.11 (6)	6.88 (7)	6.55 (6)
12	7.86 (9)	9.64 (12)	9.06 (11)	9.85 (12)
Administrative Responsibilities:				
1	8.00 (10)	8.26 (10)	8.82 (11)	9.05 (11)
2	5.86 (6)	5.92 (7)	5.90 (5)	8.40 (10)
3	5.77 (5)	5.81 (6)	6.11 (6)	5.80 (6)
4	3.95 (2)	5.08 (3)	4.43 (2)	5.10 (4.5)
5	8.74 (11)	9.51 (11)	8.68 (10)	8.10 (9)
6	5.16 (4)	5.56 (5)	5.14 (3)	3.80 (1)
7	2.86 (1)	3.56 (1)	3.39 (1)	3.90 (2)
8	7.53 (9)	5.47 (4)	6.86 (8)	5.10 (4.5)
9	4.37 (3)	4.59 (2)	5.29 (4)	4.20 (3)
10	10.70 (12)	9.53 (12)	9.38 (12)	10.20 (12)
11	6.56 (7)	7.64 (9)	6.65 (7)	7.60 (8)
12	7.42 (8)	7.14 (8)	7.46 (9)	6.75 (7)
Personal Characteristics:				
1	9.37 (12)	8.60 (12)	8.64 (12)	8.80 (12)
2	4.60 (1)	5.57 (3)	5.94 (4)	5.55 (4)
3	6.19 (7)	6.20 (5.5)	6.03 (5)	6.85 (8)
4	7.88 (10)	7.84 (11)	7.54 (11)	8.65 (11)
5	6.86 (8)	7.27 (10)	7.50 (10)	5.50 (3)
6	5.40 (4)	5.16 (2)	4.69 (1)	5.25 (1.5)
7	8.09 (11)	6.20 (5.5)	6.96 (8)	6.35 (6)
8	5.93 (6)	5.85 (4)	5.61 (3)	7.15 (10)
9	5.42 (5)	6.83 (9)	7.19 (9)	5.25 (1.5)
10	6.95 (9)	6.76 (8)	6.85 (7)	7.10 (9)
11	4.79 (2)	4.28 (1)	4.72 (2)	6.65 (7)
12	5.28 (3)	6.67 (7)	6.49 (6)	6.00 (5)

TABLE 36

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY AGE GROUPS FOR CSU SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Age: N =	21-30yrs 19	31-40yrs 66	41-50yrs 87	51-60yrs 39	61-70yrs 12
Professional Activities:					
1	6.53 (7)	6.21 (5)	5.32 (5)	5.21 (4)	7.83 (9)
2	4.37 (3)	4.23 (3)	4.24 (3)	4.21 (3)	3.33 (2)
3	3.26 (2)	3.45 (2)	3.61 (2)	3.72 (2)	3.92 (9)
4	3.00 (1)	2.53 (1)	1.91 (1)	2.72 (1)	3.17 (1)
5	9.32 (10)	9.67 (12)	9.74 (12)	9.05 (11)	9.67 (12)
6	5.58 (6)	7.23 (7)	7.93 (8)	8.28 (10)	9.33 (11)
7	5.53 (5)	4.70 (4)	4.71 (4)	5.23 (5)	3.75 (3)
8	8.37 (9)	8.68 (10)	8.91 (11)	8.21 (9)	6.92 (5)
9	9.37 (11)	8.36 (9)	8.01 (9)	7.28 (7)	7.58 (8)
10	6.74 (8)	7.59 (8)	7.91 (7)	6.87 (6)	7.25 (6)
11	5.32 (4)	6.24 (6)	6.83 (6)	7.56 (8)	7.42 (7)
12	10.63 (12)	9.23 (11)	8.80 (10)	9.33 (12)	7.83 (10)
Administrative Responsibilities:					
1	8.95 (11.5)	8.58 (10)	8.47 (10)	8.23 (11)	7.75 (9)
2	6.89 (7)	6.11 (6)	5.97 (5)	6.38 (6)	5.33 (5)
3	5.95 (6)	5.71 (5)	6.05 (6)	6.15 (5)	4.92 (3)
4	4.84 (4)	4.23 (2)	4.72 (3)	5.36 (4)	3.92 (2)
5	8.58 (10)	9.45 (11)	9.14 (11)	8.08 (10)	8.58 (10)
6	4.79 (3)	5.02 (4)	5.74 (4)	4.49 (2)	5.08 (4)
7	3.89 (1)	3.30 (1)	3.72 (1)	2.97 (1)	2.17 (1)
8	5.58 (5)	6.18 (7)	6.13 (7)	7.18 (8)	6.17 (6)
9	4.11 (2)	4.80 (3)	4.52 (2)	4.77 (3)	6.92 (8)
10	8.95 (11.5)	9.47 (12)	9.92 (12)	10.03 (12)	10.75 (12)
11	7.84 (9)	7.65 (8)	6.82 (8.5)	6.69 (7)	6.42 (7)
12	7.63 (8)	7.35 (9)	6.82 (8.5)	7.49 (9)	8.67 (11)
Personal Characteristics:					
1	8.63 (12)	8.79 (12)	8.82 (12)	8.92 (12)	8.25 (11)
2	5.26 (3)	5.71 (3)	5.84 (5)	5.13 (2.5)	3.50 (1.5)
3	5.47 (4)	6.53 (7)	6.25 (7)	5.90 (5)	6.17 (4.5)
4	6.47 (7)	7.17 (10)	8.47 (11)	8.21 (11)	7.67 (9)
5	6.00 (5)	6.95 (9)	7.39 (10)	7.56 (10)	6.17 (4.5)
6	4.84 (1)	5.02 (1)	5.33 (2)	5.13 (2.5)	3.50 (1.5)
7	6.05 (6)	6.11 (4)	7.32 (9)	7.03 (8)	7.75 (10)
8	7.21 (8)	5.47 (5)	5.72 (3)	6.08 (7)	7.00 (7)
9	7.95 (11)	6.39 (6)	6.25 (7)	6.05 (6)	8.67 (12)
10	7.58 (10)	7.18 (11)	6.25 (7)	7.15 (9)	7.33 (8)
11	5.11 (2)	5.03 (2)	4.25 (1)	5.03 (1)	5.08 (3)
12	7.42 (9)	6.73 (8)	5.82 (4)	5.82 (4)	6.92 (6)

TABLE 37

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY AGE FOR CSU SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years of Experience: N =	0-5yrs 49	6-10yrs 43	11-15yrs 42	16-20yrs 37	21-25yrs 28	26-30yrs 13	31-35yrs 7	36+yrs 4
Professional Activities.								
1	6.55 (6)	5.95 (5)	5.60 (5)	5.14 (5)	5.29 (5)	6.00 (6)	5.43 (5)	7.00 (7)
2	4.37 (3)	4.65 (3)	4.48 (3)	3.89 (3)	3.82 (2)	3.69 (2)	3.00 (1.5)	3.25 (3.5)
3	3.43 (2)	3.60 (2)	3.52 (2)	3.24 (2)	4.07 (3)	4.23 (3)	3.57 (3.5)	2.75 (2)
4	2.18 (1)	2.65 (1)	2.36 (1)	2.30 (1)	2.11 (1)	2.46 (1)	3.57 (3.5)	3.25 (3.5)
5	9.37 (11)	9.21 (11)	9.69 (12)	9.92 (12)	9.89 (12)	8.62 (11)	10.86 (12)	9.25 (10)
6	6.71 (7)	7.58 (8)	7.67 (7)	7.65 (8.5)	8.14 (9)	8.15 (9)	10.00 (10.5)	11.00 (12)
7	5.24 (4)	4.84 (4)	4.86 (4)	4.65 (4)	4.68 (4)	5.46 (4)	3.00 (1.5)	2.50 (1)
8	8.24 (9)	8.44 (10)	8.02 (9)	9.54 (11)	9.39 (11)	7.69 (7)	9.00 (9)	6.75 (6)
9	8.71 (10)	8.19 (9)	8.52 (10)	7.65 (8.5)	7.07 (7)	8.54 (10)	6.00 (6)	7.75 (8)
10	7.31 (8)	7.51 (7)	7.83 (8)	7.35 (6)	8.50 (10)	5.69 (5)	6.14 (7)	8.75 (9)
11	6.02 (5)	6.21 (6)	6.55 (6)	7.41 (7)	6.64 (6)	7.92 (8)	7.43 (8)	9.75 (11)
12	9.86 (12)	9.30 (12)	8.95 (11)	8.92 (10)	8.14 (8)	9.54 (12)	10.00 (10.5)	6.00 (5)
Administrative Responsibilities:								
1	8.59 (10)	8.84 (10)	8.48 (10)	8.24 (10)	8.32 (11)	7.77 (11)	8.86 (11)	7.25 (8)
2	6.90 (7)	5.84 (6)	6.29 (7)	5.22 (4)	5.79 (5)	6.62 (5)	6.29 (6)	7.00 (6.5)
3	5.84 (6)	5.51 (5)	5.98 (6)	6.19 (6)	6.04 (6)	5.85 (4)	6.57 (7)	5.25 (4)
4	4.47 (2)	4.58 (3)	4.48 (2)	5.11 (3)	5.29 (4)	3.46 (1)	5.29 (4)	3.75 (2)
5	9.24 (11)	9.49 (12)	9.48 (12)	9.27 (11)	7.54 (10)	7.08 (7)	8.29 (9.5)	9.25 (11)
6	5.00 (4)	5.37 (4)	5.48 (4)	5.84 (5)	4.86 (2)	3.69 (3)	4.57 (3)	4.75 (3)
7	3.63 (1)	3.44 (1)	3.10 (1)	3.95 (1)	3.18 (1)	3.62 (2)	2.00 (1)	1.50 (1)
8	5.67 (5)	6.79 (7)	5.60 (5)	6.41 (7)	7.07 (8)	7.62 (9.5)	5.71 (5)	5.50 (5)
9	4.71 (3)	4.09 (2)	4.64 (3)	4.51 (2)	5.00 (3)	6.77 (6)	4.29 (2)	7.50 (9)
10	9.31 (12)	9.47 (11)	9.19 (11)	9.97 (12)	10.79 (12)	10.31 (12)	11.14 (12)	11.50 (12)
11	7.31 (8)	7.77 (9)	6.60 (8)	6.46 (8)	7.46 (9)	7.15 (8)	6.71 (8)	7.00 (6.5)
12	7.43 (9)	7.70 (8)	7.24 (9)	6.62 (9)	6.68 (7)	7.62 (9.5)	8.29 (9.5)	7.75 (10)
Personal Characteristics:								
1	8.57 (12)	8.74 (12)	9.62 (12)	7.86 (11)	8.89 (12)	9.85 (12)	9.43 (12)	6.00 (5)
2	5.61 (4)	6.30 (5)	5.71 (5)	4.49 (1)	5.21 (2)	6.23 (7)	4.71 (2)	3.75 (3)
3	5.82 (5)	6.74 (7)	6.14 (7)	6.46 (6)	5.71 (5)	5.85 (4.5)	7.00 (10)	6.50 (7)
4	7.29 (10.5)	7.72 (11)	7.71 (11)	8.35 (12)	8.00 (10)	8.15 (11)	8.57 (11)	8.25 (9)
5	6.41 (6)	7.37 (9)	6.71 (9)	7.81 (10)	8.21 (11)	7.31 (9)	5.29 (3)	5.25 (4)
6	4.92 (2)	5.00 (1)	5.26 (2)	5.78 (5)	5.43 (3)	4.31 (1)	2.57 (1)	3.00 (1)
7	6.69 (7)	5.49 (3)	6.95 (10)	7.70 (9)	7.07 (9)	8.00 (10)	6.71 (7.5)	8.00 (8)
8	5.51 (3)	5.81 (4)	6.52 (8)	5.76 (4)	5.61 (4)	5.46 (3)	6.29 (5.5)	9.50 (12)
9	7.04 (8)	6.58 (6)	5.69 (4)	6.68 (7)	5.82 (6)	6.31 (8)	8.86 (9)	9.00 (10.5)
10	7.22 (9)	7.47 (10)	5.98 (6)	6.84 (8)	6.68 (8)	6.15 (6)	6.71 (7.5)	9.00 (10.5)
11	4.31 (1)	5.26 (2)	4.48 (1)	4.86 (2)	4.79 (1)	4.54 (2)	6.29 (5.5)	3.50 (2)
12	7.29 (10.5)	6.84 (8)	5.67 (3)	5.41 (3)	6.14 (7)	5.85 (4.5)	5.57 (4)	6.25 (6)

TABLE 38

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AT CSU.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years at Institution: N =	0-5yrs 132	6-10yrs 31	11-15yrs 22	16-20yrs 20	21-25yrs 11	26-30yrs 3	31-35yrs 4
Professional Activities:							
1	5.77 (5)	5.58 (4)	5.59 (5)	6.50 (5)	6.82 (5)	4.33 (4.5)	4.75 (4)
2	4.15 (3)	5.00 (3)	4.68 (4)	3.05 (2.5)	3.45 (2)	3.00 (3)	5.25 (6)
3	3.46 (2)	3.97 (2)	4.27 (2)	3.05 (2.5)	4.09 (3)	1.33 (1)	3.00 (1)
4	2.41 (1)	2.16 (1)	2.18 (1)	2.40 (1)	2.73 (1)	2.67 (2)	3.75 (3)
5	9.49 (12)	9.03 (12)	9.32 (12)	10.50 (12)	10.18 (12)	9.33 (10)	10.75 (11)
6	7.62 (8)	7.32 (7)	7.18 (7)	7.85 (8)	8.45 (11)	11.00 (12)	8.50 (9)
7	4.80 (4)	5.65 (5)	4.50 (3)	4.35 (4)	4.73 (4)	4.33 (4.5)	3.50 (2)
8	8.52 (9)	8.65 (10)	8.77 (10)	8.85 (10)	7.64 (9)	6.67 (6)	11.00 (12)
9	8.42 (10)	7.87 (9)	7.95 (9)	7.35 (7)	7.18 (7)	8.33 (7.5)	5.00 (5)
10	7.61 (7)	7.39 (8)	7.59 (8)	7.00 (6)	6.91 (6)	9.67 (11)	6.75 (8)
11	6.49 (6)	6.42 (6)	6.45 (6)	7.90 (9)	7.45 (8)	9.00 (9)	6.50 (7)
12	9.26 (11)	8.97 (11)	8.95 (11)	9.20 (11)	8.36 (10)	8.33 (7.5)	9.25 (10)
Administrative Responsibilities:							
1	8.52 (10)	8.32 (10)	8.59 (10)	9.25 (11)	6.00 (7)	10.00 (11)	8.50 (9)
2	6.07 (6)	7.26 (8)	5.95 (5)	4.90 (4)	5.73 (5)	9.67 (10)	4.75 (3)
3	5.73 (5)	6.74 (7)	5.73 (4)	5.40 (5)	6.36 (8)	6.67 (6)	6.50 (7)
4	4.73 (2)	4.65 (3)	4.45 (3)	4.05 (2)	5.00 (3)	5.00 (5)	5.25 (8)
5	9.33 (11)	9.13 (11)	8.86 (12)	6.55 (7)	8.82 (11)	8.00 (8)	9.75 (12)
6	5.05 (4)	4.97 (4)	6.91 (7)	4.75 (3)	5.91 (6)	1.33 (1)	5.25 (5)
7	3.39 (1)	3.39 (1)	3.82 (1)	3.00 (1)	4.00 (1)	1.67 (2)	3.00 (1)
8	6.14 (7)	6.16 (5)	6.18 (6)	7.30 (8)	7.73 (9)	4.00 (4)	5.25 (5)
9	4.78 (3)	4.48 (2)	4.05 (2)	6.00 (6)	4.82 (2)	3.67 (3)	3.50 (2)
10	9.67 (12)	9.55 (12)	8.73 (11)	11.20 (12)	10.73 (12)	11.33 (12)	9.50 (10.5)
11	6.74 (8)	7.87 (9)	7.23 (9)	7.75 (10)	7.82 (10)	7.33 (7)	7.25 (8)
12	7.48 (9)	6.65 (6)	6.95 (8)	7.55 (9)	5.09 (4)	9.33 (9)	9.50 (10.5)
Personal Characteristics:							
1	8.67 (12)	9.10 (12)	9.73 (12)	9.05 (12)	7.18 (8.5)	4.33 (3)	11.25 (12)
2	5.80 (3)	5.23 (3)	5.59 (5)	4.65 (2)	4.73 (1)	6.67 (6)	2.75 (1)
3	6.08 (4)	6.13 (6)	7.00 (7)	5.70 (4)	6.09 (5.5)	7.00 (7)	8.75 (10.5)
4	7.50 (11)	8.48 (11)	7.77 (11)	8.75 (11)	7.27 (10)	10.33 (12)	8.75 (10.5)
5	6.76 (10)	8.03 (10)	7.41 (9)	7.05 (9)	8.64 (12)	7.33 (8)	5.75 (5.5)
6	5.13 (2)	5.19 (2)	5.55 (4)	4.50 (1)	4.82 (2)	4.00 (2)	3.50 (2)
7	6.75 (8)	6.06 (5)	7.73 (10)	7.30 (10)	7.18 (8.5)	8.33 (11)	5.75 (5.5)
8	6.12 (5)	5.29 (4)	4.77 (2)	6.45 (7)	6.27 (7)	8.00 (9.5)	4.50 (3)
9	6.58 (6)	6.35 (7)	6.41 (6)	6.65 (8)	6.09 (5.5)	5.67 (5)	8.25 (9)
10	6.77 (9)	6.77 (9)	7.18 (8)	6.20 (6)	8.27 (11)	8.00 (9.5)	7.00 (8)
11	4.73 (1)	4.94 (1)	3.45 (1)	5.30 (3)	5.55 (3)	3.33 (1)	6.50 (7)
12	6.65 (7)	6.42 (8)	4.86 (3)	5.80 (5)	5.91 (4)	5.00 (4)	5.25 (4)

TABLE 39

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS FOR CSU SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Publications: N =	None 44	1 - 3 32	4 - 7 33	8 - 11 20	12+ 93
Professional Activities:					
1	6.50 (5)	6.41 (5)	6.00 (5)	6.55 (6)	5.06 (4)
2	4.11 (3.5)	4.25 (4)	4.18 (3)	4.50 (3)	4.06 (3)
3	3.95 (2)	3.31 (2)	3.76 (2)	3.85 (2)	3.38 (2)
4	2.32 (1)	2.75 (1)	1.85 (1)	2.80 (1)	2.42 (1)
5	10.25 (12)	9.44 (12)	9.73 (12)	10.05 (12)	9.12 (11)
6	8.16 (10)	8.09 (8)	7.76 (7)	7.60 (9)	7.23 (7)
7	4.11 (3.5)	4.19 (3)	4.58 (4)	5.10 (4)	5.38 (5)
8	8.59 (9)	8.28 (10)	8.45 (10)	7.80 (10)	8.83 (10)
9	7.55 (8)	8.25 (9)	8.00 (8)	7.35 (8)	8.49 (9)
10	6.77 (6)	7.03 (6)	8.06 (9)	7.10 (7)	7.87 (8)
11	7.09 (7)	7.66 (7)	6.67 (6)	6.25 (5)	6.29 (6)
12	8.61 (11)	8.34 (11)	9.33 (11)	9.05 (11)	9.60 (12)
Administrative Responsibilities:					
1	8.23 (10.5)	7.38 (9)	8.76 (11)	9.05 (11)	8.72 (10)
2	5.84 (5)	6.09 (6)	6.45 (7)	6.20 (6)	6.19 (7)
3	5.91 (6)	5.84 (4)	5.61 (5)	6.05 (5)	5.92 (6)
4	4.09 (2)	5.06 (3)	3.55 (2)	4.00 (2)	5.26 (5)
5	8.14 (9)	9.34 (11)	8.73 (10)	8.50 (10)	9.39 (12)
6	5.07 (4)	6.72 (8)	5.36 (4)	5.05 (4)	4.71 (3)
7	3.20 (1)	2.91 (1)	3.52 (1)	2.55 (1)	3.82 (1)
8	7.57 (8)	7.41 (10)	6.73 (8)	6.70 (7)	5.06 (4)
9	4.59 (3)	4.88 (2)	4.82 (3)	5.00 (3)	4.68 (2)
10	10.59 (12)	10.28 (12)	9.76 (12)	9.45 (12)	9.28 (11)
11	7.00 (7)	6.50 (7)	6.21 (6)	7.75 (9)	7.56 (9)
12	8.23 (10.5)	5.97 (5)	6.76 (9)	7.70 (8)	7.33 (8)
Personal Characteristics:					
1	8.89 (12)	8.88 (12)	8.97 (12)	9.55 (12)	8.55 (12)
2	4.82 (2)	5.66 (4)	5.48 (3)	5.50 (3)	5.76 (5)
3	5.41 (3)	5.78 (6)	5.61 (4)	6.25 (8)	6.90 (9)
4	7.86 (11)	7.94 (11)	7.64 (10)	7.80 (10)	7.89 (10)
5	6.52 (8)	5.75 (5)	6.91 (9)	5.65 (5)	8.18 (11)
6	4.75 (1)	4.34 (1)	4.97 (2)	5.20 (1)	5.47 (2)
7	8.27 (11)	7.19 (10)	7.79 (11)	7.20 (9)	5.56 (3)
8	6.00 (5)	5.53 (3)	6.33 (6)	6.20 (7)	5.74 (11)
9	6.27 (6)	6.75 (9)	6.42 (8)	5.70 (6)	6.82 (8)
10	7.48 (9)	6.66 (7)	6.36 (7)	7.95 (11)	6.62 (7)
11	5.75 (4)	4.81 (2)	4.24 (1)	5.55 (4)	4.22 (1)
12	6.50 (7)	6.69 (8)	5.67 (5)	5.45 (2)	6.39 (6)

APPENDIX D

Detailed Results for Kansas State University

TABLE 40

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY KSU ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY RANK.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Administrative and Faculty Rank. N =	Dean 6	Chairman 32	Prof. 40	Asc.Prof. 32	Ast.Prof. 38	Instr. 20
Professional Activities:						
1	4.17 (4)	5.06 (5)	4.50 (4)	5.09 (4)	5.50 (4)	6.90 (6)
2	3.17 (3)	3.00 (3)	4.30 (3)	4.53 (3)	4.82 (3)	4.55 (4)
3	1.33 (1)	2.75 (2)	3.20 (2)	2.81 (2)	3.16 (2)	3.60 (2)
4	3.00 (2)	2.53 (1)	2.82 (1)	2.47 (1)	2.50 (1)	2.80 (1)
5	8.50 (7)	8.88 (11)	9.32 (11.5)	9.09 (11)	8.92 (11)	10.50 (12)
6	9.50 (10)	8.47 (9)	7.82 (8)	7.22 (7)	6.92 (7)	7.55 (8)
7	4.67 (5)	4.50 (4)	5.32 (5)	5.22 (5)	5.58 (5)	4.05 (3)
8	9.50 (10)	8.75 (10)	9.32 (11.5)	9.06 (10)	8.45 (8)	8.95 (11)
9	9.50 (10)	8.00 (7)	7.77 (7)	8.09 (8)	8.55 (10)	7.50 (7)
10	9.83 (12)	8.97 (12)	8.13 (9)	8.78 (9)	8.50 (9)	7.95 (10)
11	5.50 (6)	7.22 (6)	6.25 (6)	6.19 (6)	5.74 (6)	6.05 (5)
12	9.33 (8)	8.34 (8)	9.17 (10)	9.16 (12)	9.37 (12)	7.60 (9)
Administrative Responsibilities:						
1	10.67 (12)	9.50 (11)	8.88 (10)	9.47 (12)	9.76 (12)	9.25 (4)
2	6.17 (7)	7.22 (8)	5.57 (6)	6.94 (7)	6.39 (6)	6.70 (7)
3	7.00 (8)	6.84 (6)	5.63 (7)	6.47 (6)	6.50 (7)	5.80 (6)
4	5.33 (4)	4.97 (5)	4.22 (1)	4.56 (3)	4.05 (1.5)	4.65 (2)
5	7.83 (9)	8.72 (10)	9.27 (12)	7.91 (8)	7.76 (9)	8.50 (10)
6	3.67 (3)	2.97 (2)	5.15 (5)	4.66 (4.5)	4.89 (4)	4.80 (3)
7	2.50 (1)	2.81 (1)	4.35 (2)	3.47 (1)	4.05 (1.5)	3.00 (1)
8	2.83 (2)	3.69 (3)	5.05 (4)	4.66 (4.5)	5.16 (5)	5.45 (5)
9	5.83 (5)	4.84 (4)	4.88 (3)	3.75 (2)	4.58 (3)	5.30 (4)
10	8.83 (10)	9.59 (12)	8.97 (11)	9.28 (11)	9.26 (11)	9.50 (12)
11	6.00 (6)	7.06 (7)	7.90 (8)	8.44 (10)	7.95 (10)	7.10 (8)
12	9.83 (11)	7.88 (9)	8.00 (9)	8.19 (9)	7.63 (8)	7.95 (9)
Personal Characteristics.						
1	7.33 (10)	7.81 (11)	7.65 (10)	8.72 (11)	7.89 (10)	9.25 (12)
2	6.33 (6)	5.53 (4)	5.07 (1)	6.09 (7)	6.13 (5)	6.00 (4)
3	6.67 (8)	4.63 (1)	6.77 (8)	5.59 (3)	6.42 (6)	7.20 (10)
4	8.50 (12)	8.38 (12)	7.82 (12)	8.16 (10)	6.66 (9)	7.75 (11)
5	8.17 (11)	7.84 (10)	7.72 (11)	8.81 (12)	8.13 (12)	6.85 (8)
6	5.17 (1)	5.16 (2)	5.80 (4)	5.78 (5)	5.45 (3)	3.95 (1)
7	5.50 (3.5)	7.63 (9)	7.15 (9)	6.84 (9)	6.68 (8)	6.10 (6)
8	6.50 (7)	5.63 (5)	5.40 (3)	5.53 (2)	5.42 (2)	6.95 (9)
9	5.50 (3.5)	5.84 (6)	6.55 (7)	5.75 (4)	6.00 (4)	5.80 (3)
10	7.17 (9)	6.56 (8)	5.92 (5)	6.13 (8)	8.11 (11)	6.70 (7)
11	5.83 (5)	5.41 (3)	5.30 (2)	4.47 (1)	3.89 (1)	6.05 (5)
12	5.33 (2)	5.94 (7)	6.52 (6)	5.84 (6)	7.11 (9)	5.40 (2)

TABLE 41

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY KSU COLLEGES.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

College Codes: N =	Eng. 24	Home Ec. 14	Vet.Med. 11	Agri. 29	Arts+Sci. 88	Forestry 1
Professional Activities:						
1	5.17 (4)	5.00 (4)	6.09 (5)	5.62 (5)	5.08 (5)	2.00 (2)
2	4.21 (3)	4.36 (3)	4.00 (3)	4.00 (3)	4.31 (3)	4.00 (4)
3	3.42 (2)	2.43 (1)	2.73 (1)	3.00 (2)	3.05 (2)	3.00 (3)
4	2.33 (1)	2.50 (2)	2.82 (2)	2.14 (1)	2.89 (1)	1.00 (1)
5	9.63 (12)	8.14 (8)	8.82 (9)	9.76 (11)	9.10 (11)	12.00 (12)
6	8.08 (9)	9.14 (11)	7.09 (8)	7.00 (7)	7.59 (7)	6.00 (6)
7	5.33 (5)	5.36 (5)	4.18 (4)	5.34 (4)	4.90 (4)	5.00 (5)
8	7.75 (8)	9.86 (12)	10.00 (12)	8.28 (9)	9.15 (12)	9.00 (9)
9	8.83 (11)	8.21 (9)	9.00 (10.5)	8.14 (8)	7.69 (8)	8.00 (8)
10	7.71 (7)	8.86 (10)	9.00 (10.5)	8.86 (10)	8.53 (9)	11.00 (11)
11	6.50 (6)	6.64 (6)	6.55 (6)	6.21 (6)	6.10 (6)	7.00 (7)
12	8.54 (10)	7.36 (7)	6.91 (7)	10.03 (12)	9.07 (10)	10.00 (10)
Administrative Responsibilities:						
1	9.88 (12)	10.71 (12)	9.27 (10.5)	9.90 (12)	8.89 (11)	12.00 (12)
2	5.75 (5)	5.00 (4)	5.09 (5)	5.59 (6)	7.41 (7)	3.00 (3)
3	6.38 (7)	8.00 (9)	6.36 (7)	6.21 (7)	5.98 (6)	7.00 (7)
4	4.38 (2)	3.64 (1)	4.27 (2)	5.00 (5)	4.51 (4)	1.00 (1)
5	9.25 (10)	8.14 (10)	8.18 (8)	9.10 (11)	8.06 (10)	10.00 (10)
6	4.42 (3)	5.50 (6)	4.55 (3.5)	4.86 (4)	4.26 (2)	4.00 (4)
7	3.25 (1)	3.71 (2)	2.64 (1)	3.41 (2)	3.82 (1)	5.00 (5)
8	5.25 (4)	4.93 (3)	4.55 (3.5)	3.31 (1)	5.02 (5)	6.00 (6)
9	5.79 (6)	5.57 (7)	5.91 (6)	4.14 (3)	4.30 (3)	2.00 (2)
10	9.38 (11)	9.79 (11)	9.36 (12)	8.97 (10)	9.25 (12)	9.00 (9)
11	6.92 (9)	5.43 (5)	8.55 (9)	8.72 (9)	7.85 (8)	8.00 (8)
12	6.88 (8)	7.57 (8)	9.27 (10.5)	8.48 (8)	7.97 (9)	11.00 (11)
Personal Characteristics:						
1	8.54 (12)	6.64 (9)	8.09 (12)	9.00 (11)	7.86 (11)	12.00 (12)
2	7.08 (9)	4.93 (1)	6.18 (5)	4.90 (2)	5.72 (4)	3.00 (3)
3	6.46 (6)	5.71 (4)	4.91 (1)	7.14 (10)	5.86 (5)	4.00 (4)
4	6.08 (5)	9.29 (12)	7.64 (11)	6.93 (9)	8.25 (12)	11.00 (11)
5	8.21 (11)	9.07 (11)	7.18 (9)	9.17 (12)	7.48 (10)	9.00 (9)
6	4.54 (1)	5.86 (6)	5.64 (4)	6.10 (5)	5.22 (2)	6.00 (6)
7	6.83 (8)	8.07 (10)	6.36 (6)	6.28 (6)	6.99 (9)	5.00 (5)
8	5.17 (3)	5.50 (2)	5.00 (2)	5.07 (3)	6.23 (6)	1.00 (1)
9	7.29 (10)	6.00 (8)	6.64 (7)	5.62 (4)	5.70 (3)	7.00 (7)
10	6.63 (7)	5.93 (7)	7.45 (10)	6.79 (8)	6.70 (8)	10.00 (10)
11	4.88 (2)	5.21 (3)	5.27 (3)	4.59 (1)	5.08 (1)	2.00 (2)
12	5.79 (4)	5.79 (5)	6.82 (8)	6.41 (7)	6.26 (7)	8.00 (8)

TABLE 42

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY KSU BROAD DISCIPLINE GROUPS.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Broad Discipline Groups: N =	Arts-Hum. 31	Nat.Sci. 72	Profess. 42	Soc.Sci. 23
Professional Activities:				
1	5.03 (5)	5.44 (5)	5.38 (5)	4.48 (3)
2	3.39 (3)	4.51 (3)	4.05 (3)	4.61 (4)
3	3.03 (1)	2.86 (2)	3.31 (2)	2.91 (1)
4	3.16 (2)	2.39 (1)	2.19 (1)	3.48 (2)
5	9.32 (11)	9.29 (11)	9.55 (12)	8.22 (10)
6	7.97 (8)	7.08 (7)	8.17 (9)	8.09 (9)
7	4.39 (4)	5.21 (4)	4.88 (4)	5.61 (5)
8	9.39 (12)	8.64 (9)	9.02 (11)	9.04 (11)
9	7.23 (7)	8.47 (8)	8.19 (10)	7.83 (8)
10	8.68 (10)	8.99 (10)	8.07 (8)	7.78 (7)
11	6.68 (6)	5.57 (6)	6.88 (6)	6.70 (6)
12	8.19 (9)	9.69 (12)	7.76 (7)	9.26 (12)
Administrative Responsibilities:				
1	8.26 (10)	9.64 (12)	10.07 (12)	9.09 (12)
2	8.19 (9)	6.17 (7)	5.67 (6)	6.70 (7)
3	6.10 (6)	5.83 (6)	7.00 (8)	6.65 (6)
4	4.16 (3.5)	4.72 (5)	4.60 (2.5)	3.96 (1)
5	7.90 (8)	9.06 (11)	8.12 (10)	7.70 (8)
6	4.06 (2)	4.58 (4)	4.60 (2.5)	4.57 (3)
7	3.29 (1)	3.58 (1)	3.29 (1)	4.61 (4)
8	4.84 (5)	4.33 (2)	5.21 (4)	4.78 (5)
9	4.16 (3.5)	4.54 (3)	5.60 (5)	4.09 (2)
10	9.81 (12)	8.92 (10)	9.62 (11)	9.04 (11)
11	7.10 (7)	8.44 (9)	6.43 (7)	8.43 (10)
12	8.39 (11)	8.08 (8)	7.31 (9)	8.39 (9)
Personal Characteristics:				
1	7.16 (10)	8.60 (12)	8.29 (11)	7.61 (10)
2	4.74 (1)	6.03 (4)	6.43 (7.5)	5.00 (2)
3	6.19 (4.5)	6.25 (6)	6.02 (4)	5.70 (3)
4	8.13 (12)	7.40 (10)	7.43 (10)	8.87 (12)
5	6.39 (7)	8.31 (11)	8.50 (12)	8.00 (11)
6	4.84 (2)	5.43 (2)	4.95 (1)	6.52 (7)
7	7.48 (11)	6.51 (8)	6.93 (9)	7.22 (9)
8	6.55 (8)	5.60 (3)	5.17 (3)	5.83 (5)
9	6.26 (6)	6.21 (5)	6.26 (6)	4.61 (1)
10	7.00 (9)	6.68 (9)	6.43 (7.5)	6.96 (8)
11	5.26 (3)	4.51 (1)	5.02 (2)	5.78 (4)
12	6.19 (4.5)	6.42 (7)	6.07 (5)	6.04 (6)

TABLE 43

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY AGE GROUPS FOR KSU SAMPLE.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Age: N =	21-30yrs 16	31-40yrs 54	41-50yrs 54	51-60yrs 28	61-70yrs 16
Professional Activities:					
1	6.25 (6)	5.50 (5)	4.87 (4)	4.89 (5)	5.00 (5)
2	5.88 (5)	4.15 (3)	4.41 (3)	3.46 (3)	3.31 (2)
3	3.19 (2)	2.98 (1)	2.91 (2)	2.82 (2)	3.63 (3)
4	1.69 (1)	3.07 (2)	2.67 (1)	2.32 (1)	2.50 (1)
5	8.63 (9)	9.04 (11)	9.02 (11.5)	9.96 (12)	9.75 (11)
6	5.00 (4)	7.56 (7)	8.02 (8)	8.71 (9)	7.56 (9)
7	7.25 (7)	4.76 (4)	5.04 (5)	4.57 (4)	4.50 (4)
8	8.81 (10)	8.65 (9)	8.96 (10)	8.96 (10)	9.81 (12)
9	8.06 (8)	8.80 (10)	7.91 (7)	8.18 (7.5)	6.13 (6)
10	8.88 (11)	8.35 (8)	8.56 (9)	9.07 (11)	7.81 (10)
11	4.06 (3)	5.69 (6)	6.83 (6)	6.79 (6)	7.50 (7.5)
12	10.31 (12)	9.07 (12)	9.02 (11.5)	8.18 (7.5)	7.50 (7.5)
Administrative Responsibilities:					
1	10.56 (12)	9.72 (12)	9.07 (11)	9.57 (11)	8.13 (10)
2	7.00 (7)	6.93 (7)	6.28 (7)	5.79 (6)	6.44 (7)
3	6.25 (6)	6.30 (6)	6.20 (6)	6.75 (7)	5.75 (6)
4	4.75 (4.5)	4.59 (4)	4.48 (2)	4.57 (3)	3.69 (2)
5	7.75 (9)	8.54 (10)	8.87 (10)	8.07 (10)	7.81 (9)
6	4.75 (4.5)	4.33 (2)	4.78 (4)	4.29 (2)	4.13 (3)
7	4.06 (2.5)	3.89 (1)	3.74 (1)	2.75 (1)	3.13 (1)
8	3.44 (1)	4.89 (5)	4.54 (3)	4.86 (4)	5.69 (5)
9	4.06 (2.5)	4.46 (3)	4.81 (5)	5.04 (5)	4.88 (4)
10	7.56 (8)	9.07 (11)	9.35 (12)	10.50 (12)	9.25 (12)
11	9.13 (11)	7.70 (9)	7.43 (8)	7.68 (8)	7.13 (8)
12	8.69 (10)	7.44 (8)	8.19 (9)	7.89 (9)	8.63 (11)
Personal Characteristics:					
1	9.13 (12)	8.48 (12)	8.20 (11)	7.39 (10)	6.88 (9)
2	5.44 (4)	7.13 (9)	5.28 (3)	4.71 (2)	4.81 (2)
3	5.13 (2)	6.37 (6)	6.00 (5)	6.18 (6)	6.44 (7.5)
4	6.94 (7.5)	6.70 (7)	8.43 (12)	8.50 (11)	8.44 (12)
5	8.13 (11)	7.54 (11)	8.00 (10)	8.93 (12)	7.38 (11)
6	6.94 (7.5)	5.26 (2)	5.06 (1)	5.75 (3)	4.38 (1)
7	6.06 (6)	6.89 (8)	6.94 (9)	7.11 (9)	7.19 (10)
8	5.94 (5)	5.63 (3)	5.07 (2)	6.46 (7)	6.44 (7.5)
9	5.25 (3)	6.07 (4)	6.52 (8)	6.00 (5)	4.88 (3)
10	7.19 (9)	7.19 (10)	6.35 (7)	6.50 (8)	6.25 (6)
11	3.81 (1)	4.39 (1)	5.91 (4)	4.54 (1)	5.50 (4)
12	7.81 (10)	6.19 (5)	6.07 (6)	5.93 (4)	5.94 (5)

TABLE 44

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY AGE FOR KSU SAMPLE.
 NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years of Experience: N =	0-5yrs 44	6-10yrs 29	11-15yrs 24	16-20yrs 21	21-25yrs 24	26-30yrs 9	31-35yrs 5	36+yrs 12
Professional Activities:								
1	6.14 (6)	5.14 (5)	4.46 (4)	4.05 (3)	5.63 (5)	5.33 (5)	5.80 (6)	4.50 (4.5)
2	5.18 (4)	4.31 (3)	3.67 (2)	4.33 (4)	3.58 (3)	3.11 (2)	3.80 (3)	3.42 (3)
3	3.05 (2)	3.14 (2)	2.46 (1)	3.24 (2)	2.71 (2)	3.67 (3)	3.60 (2)	3.17 (2)
4	2.30 (1)	3.07 (1)	3.75 (3)	2.14 (1)	2.50 (1)	1.89 (1)	2.00 (1)	2.50 (1)
5	8.91 (10)	8.83 (11)	8.00 (8)	10.05 (12)	10.37 (12)	9.56 (11)	9.80 (10)	9.42 (11)
6	6.39 (7)	7.86 (7)	7.63 (7)	8.43 (9)	8.83 (9)	7.22 (7)	9.00 (9)	7.92 (10)
7	5.84 (5)	5.00 (4)	5.21 (5)	4.90 (5)	4.13 (4)	4.67 (4)	4.00 (4)	4.50 (4.5)
8	8.45 (9)	8.31 (9)	8.67 (10)	9.62 (11)	9.63 (11)	9.00 (9)	10.00 (11)	9.58 (12)
9	8.95 (11)	8.10 (8)	8.75 (11)	7.48 (7)	6.79 (6)	9.22 (10)	6.60 (7)	6.92 (7)
10	8.32 (8)	8.86 (12)	8.46 (9)	8.05 (8)	9.17 (10)	8.00 (8)	11.20 (12)	7.58 (8)
11	5.00 (3)	6.41 (6)	6.63 (6)	6.86 (6)	6.88 (7)	6.44 (6)	7.60 (8)	6.75 (6)
12	9.49 (12)	8.66 (10)	9.83 (12)	8.76 (10)	8.25 (8)	9.89 (12)	4.60 (5)	7.75 (9)
Administrative Responsibilities:								
1	9.75 (12)	10.41 (12)	9.04 (12)	7.86 (9)	10.17 (11)	10.11 (12)	8.40 (10)	7.67 (10)
2	6.61 (7)	7.28 (8)	7.21 (6)	5.29 (5)	5.83 (6)	5.33 (6)	7.80 (8.5)	6.42 (7)
3	6.45 (6)	5.59 (6)	7.42 (7)	6.14 (6)	6.63 (7)	4.56 (4)	9.40 (11)	4.67 (5)
4	4.98 (5)	4.24 (2)	4.33 (4)	3.76 (2)	3.75 (2)	6.00 (7)	6.00 (6.5)	4.50 (3)
5	8.70 (11)	7.59 (10)	8.25 (9)	9.43 (11)	8.96 (10)	8.44 (9)	7.80 (8.5)	7.17 (8)
6	4.61 (4)	4.59 (3)	3.83 (1)	6.48 (7)	3.92 (3)	4.00 (2)	2.20 (1)	4.08 (2)
7	3.89 (1)	3.59 (1)	4.17 (3)	3.67 (1)	2.88 (1)	3.22 (1)	2.80 (2)	3.33 (1)
8	4.25 (3)	5.55 (5)	3.88 (2)	5.24 (4)	4.29 (4)	4.33 (3)	6.00 (6.5)	5.67 (6)
9	4.11 (2)	5.52 (4)	4.46 (5)	4.24 (3)	5.04 (5)	5.00 (5)	5.40 (3)	4.58 (4)
10	8.32 (9)	9.52 (11)	8.67 (11)	9.90 (12)	10.21 (12)	9.56 (11)	10.80 (12)	9.58 (12)
11	8.41 (10)	6.83 (7)	7.88 (8)	7.19 (8)	7.63 (8)	9.33 (10)	5.80 (5)	7.33 (9)
12	7.91 (8)	7.31 (9)	8.58 (10)	8.14 (10)	8.42 (9)	8.11 (8)	5.60 (4)	8.50 (11)
Personal Characteristics:								
1	8.73 (12)	7.93 (11)	7.54 (11)	7.81 (10)	9.33 (12)	8.44 (12)	5.40 (5)	6.50 (9)
2	6.41 (7)	6.48 (7.5)	5.17 (1)	4.95 (2.5)	5.29 (4)	5.22 (1.5)	9.80 (12)	3.75 (1)
3	5.66 (2)	6.24 (5)	6.58 (6)	6.43 (7)	5.54 (6.5)	7.89 (11)	3.60 (1)	6.75 (9.5)
4	6.64 (8)	7.45 (10)	7.79 (12)	8.38 (11)	8.92 (11)	7.67 (10)	9.40 (10)	8.33 (12)
5	7.86 (11)	8.90 (12)	6.92 (9)	8.67 (12)	8.67 (10)	5.67 (3)	9.00 (9)	6.75 (9.5)
6	5.91 (3)	4.72 (2)	6.04 (4.5)	5.33 (4)	4.96 (2)	5.22 (1.5)	4.40 (3)	4.75 (2)
7	6.18 (5)	7.17 (9)	6.67 (7)	7.57 (9)	7.17 (9)	6.67 (8.5)	9.60 (11)	6.58 (8)
8	6.00 (4)	6.14 (4)	5.29 (2)	4.38 (1)	5.04 (3)	6.67 (8.5)	5.00 (4)	7.50 (11)
9	6.20 (6)	5.52 (3)	6.04 (4.5)	7.10 (8)	5.54 (6.5)	5.78 (4)	6.00 (7)	5.67 (5)
10	7.18 (10)	6.34 (6)	7.38 (10)	6.38 (6)	6.92 (8)	6.00 (5)	6.20 (8)	5.50 (3.5)
11	4.41 (1)	4.31 (1)	5.71 (3)	4.95 (2.5)	5.42 (5)	6.22 (6)	4.00 (2)	5.50 (3.5)
12	6.73 (9)	6.48 (7.5)	6.88 (8)	6.19 (5)	4.71 (1)	6.56 (7)	5.60 (6)	5.75 (6)

TABLE 45

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AT KSU.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Years at Institution: N =	0-5yrs 73	6-10yrs 23	11-15yrs 22	16-20yrs 18	21-25yrs 17	26-30yrs 5	31-35yrs 6	36+yrs 4
Professional Activities:								
1	5.79 (6)	4.65 (4)	4.82 (4)	4.72 (5)	4.82 (5)	6.40 (6)	3.50 (3.5)	5.25 (5)
2	4.66 (3)	3.78 (3)	3.95 (3)	3.89 (3)	4.00 (3.5)	3.80 (3.5)	2.67 (1)	4.75 (2.5)
3	2.88 (2)	2.87 (1)	2.64 (1)	2.83 (2)	3.71 (2)	3.60 (2)	3.33 (2)	5.00 (4)
4	2.56 (1)	3.22 (2)	3.50 (2)	2.06 (1)	1.88 (1)	1.80 (1)	3.50 (3.5)	1.25 (1)
5	9.15 (11)	8.70 (10)	7.86 (7)	10.39 (12)	10.18 (12)	9.80 (11)	8.50 (9.5)	11.75 (12)
6	7.22 (7)	8.22 (8)	8.05 (8)	7.83 (8)	8.29 (9)	8.20 (8)	7.17 (6)	6.75 (7.5)
7	5.03 (4)	5.26 (5)	5.86 (5)	4.61 (4)	4.00 (3.5)	3.80 (3.5)	4.83 (5)	7.25 (9)
8	8.56 (9)	9.22 (11.5)	8.41 (10)	10.00 (11)	8.71 (11)	10.60 (12)	9.83 (11)	9.50 (11)
9	8.64 (10)	7.96 (7)	8.32 (9)	7.28 (7)	6.65 (6)	9.40 (10)	7.33 (7.5)	6.50 (6)
10	8.29 (8)	9.22 (11.5)	8.68 (11)	9.11 (10)	8.12 (8)	5.60 (5)	11.50 (12)	6.75 (7.5)
11	5.77 (5)	6.13 (6)	6.27 (6)	6.89 (6)	7.12 (7)	7.20 (7)	8.50 (9.5)	4.75 (2.5)
12	9.45 (12)	8.39 (9)	9.00 (12)	8.39 (9)	8.35 (10)	7.80 (8)	7.33 (7.5)	8.50 (10)
Administrative Responsibilities:								
1	9.59 (12)	10.04 (12)	8.59 (11)	9.11 (11)	9.47 (11)	10.00 (11.5)	8.17 (8)	9.50 (10)
2	6.64 (6)	6.30 (7)	7.36 (7)	5.61 (7)	5.12 (6)	7.80 (8.5)	8.83 (9.5)	4.50 (5)
3	6.66 (7)	5.43 (6)	6.68 (6)	5.28 (6)	6.88 (7)	8.00 (10)	5.17 (4.5)	3.75 (2)
4	4.48 (4)	5.09 (3)	4.36 (2)	4.78 (2)	3.59 (2)	4.00 (3)	5.17 (4.5)	3.75 (2)
5	8.36 (9)	8.48 (10)	8.32 (10)	8.89 (10)	8.53 (10)	7.80 (8.5)	8.83 (9.5)	7.50 (8)
6	4.32 (2)	5.26 (4)	4.82 (4)	5.00 (3.5)	3.88 (3)	3.00 (1)	3.00 (1)	5.75 (6)
7	3.67 (1)	3.96 (1)	4.45 (3)	2.78 (1)	2.35 (1)	3.40 (2)	4.17 (2)	3.75 (2)
8	4.37 (3)	5.30 (5)	4.05 (1)	5.17 (5)	4.82 (4)	5.80 (5)	5.33 (6)	6.25 (7)
9	4.51 (5)	4.43 (2)	4.95 (5)	5.00 (3.5)	5.00 (5)	4.80 (4)	4.83 (3)	4.25 (4)
10	9.12 (11)	9.09 (11)	8.82 (12)	9.83 (12)	9.76 (12)	10.00 (11.5)	9.50 (12)	9.75 (11)
11	7.74 (8)	7.26 (9)	7.86 (9)	7.72 (8)	7.41 (8)	6.60 (6)	9.00 (11)	8.75 (9)
12	8.42 (10)	7.13 (8)	7.41 (8)	8.83 (9)	7.59 (9)	6.80 (7)	6.00 (7)	10.50 (12)
Personal Characteristics:								
1	8.40 (12)	8.43 (10.5)	7.55 (10)	7.78 (10)	8.94 (11)	7.00 (8)	4.83 (1)	8.75 (10.5)
2	6.26 (5)	5.65 (4)	4.68 (1)	5.06 (1)	5.94 (7)	5.60 (5)	6.17 (4)	4.75 (2)
3	5.81 (3)	6.61 (9)	6.55 (7)	6.44 (6)	4.59 (3)	9.00 (11)	6.83 (8.5)	6.50 (8)
4	7.19 (10)	8.52 (12)	7.86 (12)	8.17 (12)	8.35 (10)	8.20 (9)	6.67 (6.5)	9.25 (12)
5	7.75 (11)	8.43 (10.5)	7.36 (9)	8.00 (11)	9.29 (12)	8.40 (10)	6.83 (8.5)	7.50 (9)
6	5.33 (2)	5.17 (2)	6.36 (6)	5.28 (2)	4.94 (4.5)	4.20 (1.5)	5.17 (3)	5.00 (3)
7	6.56 (7.5)	6.39 (8)	7.77 (11)	6.50 (7.5)	7.29 (9)	9.20 (12)	8.50 (12)	5.75 (5.5)
8	5.95 (4)	5.87 (5.5)	5.86 (5)	5.33 (3)	3.65 (1)	5.20 (3)	6.67 (6.5)	8.75 (10.5)
9	6.40 (6)	5.61 (3)	5.64 (2)	6.50 (7.5)	4.94 (4.5)	5.80 (6.5)	6.33 (5)	5.50 (4)
10	7.00 (9)	5.87 (5.5)	6.86 (8)	7.33 (9)	6.53 (8)	5.40 (4)	7.17 (10)	4.50 (1)
11	4.78 (1)	4.78 (1)	5.77 (4)	5.39 (4)	4.35 (2)	4.20 (1.5)	5.00 (2)	6.00 (7)
12	6.56 (7.5)	6.26 (7)	5.73 (3)	6.11 (5)	5.29 (6)	5.80 (6.5)	7.83 (11)	5.75 (5.5)

TABLE 46

AVERAGE VALUES FOR THREE SUBSCALES BY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS FOR KSU SAMPLE.
NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES INDICATE RANK OF THE AVERAGE.

Publications: N =	None .26	1 - 3 23	4 - 7 26	8 - 11 22	12+ 71
Professional Activities:					
1	6.42 (6.5)	6.26 (5)	4.00 (3)	5.55 (5)	4.79 (4)
2	4.27 (3)	3.17 (3)	4.12 (4)	4.86 (3)	4.34 (3)
3	3.85 (2)	2.43 (1)	2.58 (1)	3.55 (2)	2.89 (2)
4	2.31 (1)	2.57 (2)	3.42 (2)	2.86 (1)	2.41 (1)
5	9.73 (12)	9.61 (11)	8.96 (10)	9.09 (11)	9.03 (11)
6	6.42 (6.5)	9.30 (10)	7.77 (7)	7.23 (7)	7.66 (7)
7	4.69 (4)	4.35 (4)	5.15 (5)	5.05 (4)	5.32 (5)
8	8.62 (11)	10.22 (12)	8.81 (9)	8.45 (10)	8.82 (9)
9	7.42 (8)	7.04 (7)	8.12 (8)	8.18 (9)	8.62 (8)
10	8.35 (10)	8.00 (8)	9.04 (11)	7.68 (8)	8.86 (10)
11	6.23 (5)	6.87 (6)	6.62 (6)	6.32 (6)	5.92 (6)
12	7.85 (9)	8.09 (9)	9.42 (12)	9.18 (12)	9.21 (12)
Administrative Responsibilities:					
1	9.50 (12)	9.00 (11)	9.73 (11)	8.77 (11)	9.61 (12)
2	7.19 (8)	6.04 (6)	6.23 (6)	5.91 (5)	6.65 (7)
3	5.42 (5)	6.70 (7)	6.92 (7)	7.18 (8)	5.96 (6)
4	5.38 (4)	3.57 (2)	4.73 (3)	3.77 (2)	4.58 (5)
5	7.88 (10)	7.35 (8)	7.81 (9)	9.05 (12)	9.00 (11)
6	3.38 (2)	5.35 (4)	4.77 (4)	6.50 (6)	3.89 (2)
7	2.85 (1)	3.30 (1)	3.85 (2)	3.73 (1)	3.83 (1)
8	5.96 (6)	5.52 (5)	3.65 (1)	4.59 (3)	4.41 (4)
9	4.85 (3)	4.83 (3)	4.92 (5)	5.18 (4)	4.31 (3)
10	9.19 (11)	10.09 (12)	9.96 (12)	8.73 (10)	8.96 (10)
11	6.92 (7)	7.48 (9)	7.58 (8)	7.23 (9)	8.23 (8)
12	7.38 (9)	8.48 (10)	7.85 (10)	7.14 (7)	8.37 (9)
Personal Characteristics:					
1	8.19 (12)	8.52 (11)	8.38 (12)	7.95 (10)	7.92 (11)
2	6.08 (6.5)	4.96 (3)	7.46 (11)	5.36 (5)	5.38 (2)
3	6.92 (9)	5.91 (6)	5.81 (4)	6.50 (6)	5.86 (4)
4	7.35 (10.5)	8.91 (12)	6.85 (8)	7.68 (9)	7.86 (10)
5	7.35 (10.5)	7.65 (9.5)	6.62 (5)	8.50 (11)	8.61 (12)
6	4.46 (1)	4.83 (1)	4.88 (2)	5.23 (3)	6.06 (6)
7	5.50 (3)	7.65 (9.5)	7.19 (10)	9.00 (12)	6.39 (7)
8	5.96 (4)	6.13 (7)	5.46 (3)	4.82 (2)	5.82 (3)
9	6.00 (5)	4.87 (2)	6.81 (7)	6.68 (8)	5.89 (5)
10	6.69 (8)	7.61 (8)	6.65 (6)	6.59 (7)	6.49 (9)
11	5.35 (2)	5.13 (4)	4.69 (1)	3.82 (1)	5.20 (1)
12	6.08 (6.5)	5.83 (5)	7.04 (9)	5.32 (4)	6.42 (8)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Articles and Books

- Anderson, K. J. The ambivalent department. Educational Record, 49, 1968, 206-213.
- Angiolillo, Paul F. Reflections of a department head. Improving College and University Teaching, 13, 1965, 8-11.
- Bevan, J. M. The deanship. Liberal Education, 53, 1967, 344-356.
- Bowler, N. W. Who should be in charge of the department-- Head or chairman? The Journal of Higher Education, 33, 1962, 315-318.
- Browning, E. The ideal department chairman. The National Education Quarterly, 30, 1962, 42-47.
- Caplow, T. and McGee, R. J. The Academic Marketplace. John Wiley and Sons: New York, 1961.
- Churchman, C. W. Challenge to Reason, New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1968.
- Churchman, C. W. Task setting and goal achievement in technoscientific missions. Issues in Public Science Policy and Administration: A Symposium, University of New Mexico, 1969.
- Churchman, C. W. The Systems Approach, New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.
- Crandall, L. G. The College department chairman. The National Business Education Quarterly, 29, 1961, 33-38, 54-55.
- Creek, H. L. Head of the department. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 36, 1950, 81-96.
- Dearing, B. G. The relation of the dean to the faculty. The Journal of General Education, 15, 1964, 191-201.
- Dressel, P. L. and J. E. Dietrich. Departmental review and self-study. The Journal of Higher Education, 38, 1967, 25-37.
- Euwema, Ben. The organization of the department. The Educational Record, 34, 1953, 38-43.
- Gross, E. and Grambsch, P. V. University Goals and Academic Power. American Council on Education, 1968.

- Hanzeli, V. The educational leadership of the academic dean. The Journal of Higher Education, 37, 1966, 421-428.
- Heimler, C. H. The college departmental chairman. The Educational Record, 48, 1967, 158-163.
- Hemphill, J. K. Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 385-401.
- Hill, W. W. and French, W. L. Perceptions of the power of department chairmen by professors. Administrative Science Quarterly, 11, No. 4, 1967, 548-574.
- Hoag, K. The department head: A dialogue. The Journal of Teacher Education, 13, 1962, 65-68.
- Horn, F. H. Dean and the president. Liberal Education, 50, 1964, 463-475.
- Hotchkiss, C. W. Handbook for the Administration of Academic Departments, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, 1967, 41 pp.
- Jasinski, H. What is expected of a college department chairman. The National Business Education Quarterly, 29, 1961, 39-43, 55-56.
- Korfmacher, W. C. Central administration and the department. Improving College and University Teaching, 15, 1967, 196-199.
- Lippincott, B. E. and C. H. McLaughlin. Personnel administration in a department of political science. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 44, 1958, 641-647.
- Lunsford, T. F. Authority and ideology in the administered university. American Behavioral Scientist, June, 1968.
- MacLeod, R. D. Confessions of an ex-chairman. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 40, 1954, 424-431.
- McKeachie, W. J. The organization of a large department of psychology. American Psychologist, 24, 1968, 659-661.
- Morrow, G. R. The University of Pennsylvania: faculty participation in the government of the University. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 49, 1963, 114-122.
- Murray, R. K. On departmental development: A theory. The Journal of General Education, 16, 1964, 227-236.

- Palamountain, J. C. Power structures in the university. Antioch Review, 26, 1966, 299-306.
- Parsons, T. and G. M. Platt. Considerations of the American academic system. Minerva, 6, 1968, 497-523.
- Patton, R. D. The department chairman. The Journal of Higher Education, 32, 1961, 459-461.
- Pollard, E. C. How to remain in the laboratory though head of a department. Science, 145, 1964, 1018-1-21.
- Porter, K. H. Department head or chairman? American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 47, 1961, 339-342.
- Richardson, H. D. Faculty work load study and analysis. College and University, 43, 1967, 108-114.
- Rosenblum, S., R. B. Glenn, J. E. Laggini, R. L. Mitchell and G. E. Smith. The academic administrator. College and University, 7, 1968, 35-42.
- Siegel, S. Non-Parametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Taylor, W. S. Reply to Professor Porter: Pro Chairmanship. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 48, 1962, 75-76.
- Wispe, L. G. The bigger the better: Productivity, size, and turnover in a sample of psychology departments. American Psychologist, 24, 1969.

Papers, Reports, etc.

- Ahmann, J. S. Synopsis of remarks concerning the emerging role of the department chairman. Colorado State University, April 11, 1969.
- Booth, D. Notes to Prospective Chairmen of Academic Departments. Invited talk for the Institute on The Role of Academic Department or Division Chairmen in Institutions of Higher Education, St. Louis University, November 11-13, 1968.
- Brown, D. G. Faculty recruiting. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Monograph No. 2.

Fellman, D. The Departmental Chairmen. A paper presented at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

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

McKeachie, W. J. Memo to New Department Chairmen. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Monograph No. 1.

Monson, C. H., Jr. The University of Utah's New Department Chairmen Training Program. A talk presented at a meeting for University Administrators, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, December 18, 1968.

Parsons, T. and G. M. Platt. The American Academic Profession. A report given to the National Science Foundation, Grant GS513, March, 1968.

Schroeder, G. B. Leadership Behavior of Department Chairmen. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory.

A report on Survey of the Role and Responsibilities of Department Heads--College of Liberal Arts, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Penn., August, 1964. Hamilton, Booz, and Allen.

Dissertations

Aldmon, H. F. Critical Behavior Requirements of Heads of Departments. Unpublished doctoral thesis, The University of Tennessee, 1959, Pp. 202.

Doyle, E. A. The status and functions of the departmental chairman. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1953. Pp. 138.

Gunter, C. The Role of Departmental Chairmen in the Governance of State Universities. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Washington State University, 1964.

Leffland, K. W. The College Administrator and Faculty: A Study of Administrative Functions and Roles. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1958. Pp. 215.

McKenna, D. L. A Study of Power and Inter-Personal Relationships in the Administration of Higher Education. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1958. Pp. 215.

Shuart, J. M. Some Value-Orientations of Academic Department Chairmen: A Study of Comparative Values. Unpublished doctoral thesis. New York University, 1964.