University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2003

Leadership Behaviors and Communication Satisfaction: Community Colleges in Micronesia

Julie M. Ulloa-Heath EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Ulloa-Heath, Julie M. EdD, "Leadership Behaviors and Communication Satisfaction: Community Colleges in Micronesia" (2003). *Dissertations*. 723.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/723>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION:
COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN MICRONESIA

by

Julie M. Ulloa-Heath

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the Requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

2003

Dissertation Committee

Johanna Hunsaker, Ph. D., Chair
Susan Zgliczynski, Ph. D., Member
William Piland, Ph. D., Member

©Copyright by Julie M. Ulloa-Heath, 2003.

All Rights Reserved.

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to examine the satisfaction of Micronesian community college faculty with communication and their perception of their department chair's leadership style. Specifically, this study examined (a) the relationship of communication satisfaction with leadership and demographic data; (b) the relationship between the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) subset and the scales of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ); (c) the difference between institutions in terms of satisfaction with communication or perception of leadership style; and (d) suggestions for improving communication.

Significant relationship was found between the overall communication satisfaction with leadership quality and ethnicity. The data revealed that the scales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the scales of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire were significantly correlated. The analysis of variance revealed differences in communication satisfaction between colleges. However, the perceptions of transformational leadership style were similar in all the colleges. Suggestions to improve communication were: the need for an open communication, to improve personal feedback, and to improve relationship with the supervisor.

DEDICATION

To my children: Isa Marie, Nicole, Justin, and Jordan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The accomplishment of a doctoral degree has not come easily without the help and support of my committee members. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my Committee Chair, Dr. Johanna Hunsaker, and the members of my committee, Dr. Susan Zgliczynski, and Dr. William Piland, for their guidance through the process of this study.

I would like to acknowledge my parents, Jose A. Ulloa and Maxima T. Manglona, for instilling the importance of education and for encouraging me throughout my life to pursue my dreams. “Na’i animu” (na’i – to give; animu – mettle, effort), my parents would tell me. Those words were my source of hope and inspiration that I embrace during times of despair in my doctoral journey. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to my husband, Clarence, and to my children. Thank you for your patience and understanding for all those times when I was unable to be there in order for me to continue my studies.

Thank you to my family, friends, and fellow cohort for the support and encouragement that made the journey less stressful and quite pleasant.

Thank you to Northern Marianas College, College of Micronesia, College of the Marshall Islands, Palau Community College, and Guam Community Colleges for allowing me to conduct the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Background of the Study	5
Research Questions	9
Research Hypothesis	9
Research Significance	10
Definition of Terms	10
Assumptions and Limitations	11
Summary	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Leadership	14
Theories of Leadership	16
Trait Theories	16
Behavioral Theories	17
Ohio State Leadership Studies	18
University of Michigan Studies	18
Managerial Grid	19
Theory X and Y	20

CHAPTER	PAGE
II. (Continued)	
Contingency Theories	20
Fiedler's Contingency Theory	21
Hersey and Blanchard Situational Theory	22
Path-Goal Theory	23
Transformational and Transactional Leadership	24
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	26
Research using MLQ	28
Leadership in Community Colleges	30
Communication	34
Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire	35
Summary	50
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	51
Research Design	51
Population	53
Instrumentation	54
Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire	55
CSQ Reliability and Validity	56
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	56
MLQ Reliability and Validity	58
Demographic Questionnaire	58
Human Subjects	58

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. (Continued)	
Data Collection	59
Data Analysis	60
Response Rate	62
Summary	62
IV. RESULTS	64
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	65
Description of the Sample	66
Testing of Hypotheses	69
Research Question One	69
Research Question Two	82
Research Question Three	84
Research Question Four	88
Summary	89
V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS	91
Summary of the Study	91
Discussion of the Results	95
Limitations	100
Implications and Recommendations	101
Policy and Practice	102
Instrumentation	105
Recommendation for Further Studies	106

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. (Continued)	
Conclusion	106
REFERENCES	108
APPENDICES.....	120

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Faculty Distribution	54
2. Personal Characteristics of Respondents	67
3. Summary of Work-related Characteristics of Respondents	68
4. Mean Scores for Age and Years in the Department	69
5. Regression Analysis for Predicting Overall Communication Satisfaction	71
6. Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Perspective	73
7. Regression Analysis for Predicting Personal Feedback.....	75
8. Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Integration.....	76
9. Regression Analysis for Predicting Relationship with Supervisor.....	77
10. Regression Analysis for Predicting Communication Climate.....	78
11. Regression Analysis for Predicting Horizontal Communication.....	79
12. Regression Analysis for Predicting Media Quality	81
13. Bivariate Correlation Analysis Between Communication Satisfaction Subscales and Multifactor Leadership Subscales	83
14. Analysis of Variance of the Overall Communication Satisfaction	85
15. Sheffe Summary Statistics on the Overall Communication Satisfaction by Colleges	86
16. Analysis of Variance of Leadership Style	87

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	PAGE
A. Approval from Presidents.....	120
B. Letter to Faculty.....	123
C. Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire.....	124
D. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	126
E. Demographic Questionnaire.....	128
F. Suggestions from Faculty.	129
FIGURE	
Map of Micronesia.....	133

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Effective communication is key to organizational excellence. Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997) claimed that an effective leader does not just manage people but is more importantly a manager of meaning. The authors believed that the actions and symbols of leadership frame and mobilize meaning. “Leaders articulate and define what has previously remained implicit or unsaid; then they invent images, metaphors, and models that provide a focus for new attention. By doing so, they consolidate or challenge prevailing wisdom” (p. 37). Leaders manage meaning through understanding, participation, and ownership. Getting the message across is vital to creating meaning.

Pace and Faules (1989) stated that leadership and communication are intimately intertwined. Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997) also said that communication is inseparable from leadership. Hoy and Miskel (1996, 2001) noted that understanding communication is important to educational leaders, who must use communication to create understanding within the organization. Bolman and Deal (1992) indicated that leadership has often been proposed as the solution to most organizational problems.

One of the challenges facing today’s educational leaders is establishing a community of well-informed employees. Contemporary theories of leadership emphasize communication as an essential component of an organization’s success. As Barge (1992)

noted, “for leadership to be effective, communication must help organizational members reduce ambiguity” (p.13).

According to Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997), leadership is the “pivotal force” (p.3) behind the creation and survival of institutions and is vital “to help organizations develop a new vision” (p.3). Bennis and Nanus emphasized the need for a new type of leader, who must practice transformational leadership: “One who commits people to action, who converts leaders into agents of change” (p.3).

Statement of the Problem

Today’s community colleges are facing a multitude of social and economic challenges. The visiting teams of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges witnessed and reported stresses and strains that reduced the ability of responsible college leaders (trustees, administrators or faculty) to set sound directions for their campus. As a result, in November 1998, the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) sounded the alarm that without stronger leadership at all levels in community colleges within the Western Region (California, Hawaii, Guam and the Pacific Islands), the ability for colleges to educate students could be endangered (CCLDI, 2000).

College presidents cannot rely on their authority alone; they must be willing to communicate and share authority (Lewis, 1989). “Upper-level administration is expected to declare the vision and mission of the college, but without the coordination and cooperation between upper-level administrators and chairs who are aligned with students and faculty, the vision and mission of the college would not be grounded or

representative” (Gillett-Karam, 1999, p. 5). Effective communication is essential, the key to the life and excellence of an organization (Pace, 1989). “Quality of communication, perceptions of relationships and satisfaction with organizational life have emerged as central concerns in organizational research” (Goldhaber et al., 1987, p. 80).

There are many administrative configurations in community colleges. Generally, a community college is a hierarchy—the faculty reports to the department chairs, who report to the deans, who report to the vice-president, who reports to the president, who reports to the board of control (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The college chairperson is often considered the key administrator in charge of the day-to-day college affairs and functions as a conduit between student, faculty, and administration. Without the department chair’s leadership, the college loses its cohesiveness, alignment, and representation (Gillett-Karam, 1999). Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997) asserted that organizations short on leadership have less chance for survival. Satisfaction is primarily an affective component of the communicative interaction and is itself an important outcome (Grant & King, 1994). Therefore, this researcher sought to investigate the relationship between faculty perception of department chair leadership styles and faculty satisfaction with communication in community colleges in Micronesia.

Micronesia, Greek for *small islands*, is one of the three major divisions of the Pacific Islands. They are located in the Western Pacific, east of the Philippines, and for the most part north of the equator. Micronesia contains approximately 2,000 tiny tropical islands scattered over more than three million square miles of the Pacific, an ocean area larger than the continental United States. The islands are comprised of eight distinct and unique island groups. Each group has its own culture, language, history, and astonishing

tropical attractions. The groups are Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, Pohnpei, Yap, Chuuk, and Kosrae (see Figure 1). The last four groups of islands are combined in the Federated States of Micronesia (Levy, 2000).

In the early 1500s, Spanish explorers discovered and colonized the people who had settled Micronesia in ancient times. By the 1800s, Germany had taken over Micronesia. The Japanese occupied Micronesia in 1914, and the Americans seized it in 1947. The United States created the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which includes the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Marshall Islands (Levy, 2000).

The people of Micronesia are a heterogeneous mixture of distinct cultures and traditions. The existence of numerous indigenous languages (Yapese, Ulithian, Woleaian, Chuukese, Pohnpeian, Kosraean, Nukuoro, Kapingamarangi, Marshallese, Palauan, Chamorro, and Carolinian) illustrates the cultural diversity. Most Micronesians speak English and a native language. European, Japanese, and American influences are evident throughout the islands. According to Hezel (1992),

Acculturation in the islands has been a drama played out for the past 200 years, with the greatest changes occurring in the last 20 years . . . They now enjoy a material standard of living higher than at any time in the past, but this has altered their traditional cultural forms beyond all possibility of recovery. Having committed themselves to a semi-Western lifestyle, they face the problem of ensuring that it will continue (p. 11).

Background of the Study

Despite much of the research on leadership, it is still “a highly valued phenomenon that is very complex” (Northouse, 1997, p. 10). One of the keys to a successful college is leadership (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The success in meeting the challenges facing community colleges depends on the quality of college’s leadership (Wharton, 1990). Hoy and Miskel (2001) reported that understanding communication in schools is even more important than previously thought to meet the increasing volume of information. “Communication is acknowledged by academics and managers as fundamentally important in the operation of all organizations” (Downs, Dewine, & Grenbaum, 1994).

Valle (1999) argued that public organizations today need leaders capable of coping with continual environmental change. The primary goal of leaders in public organizations is to create and communicate organizational vision. Therefore, public service requires new leadership. Valle stated that in the past, the main function of a public organizational leader was training employees to deal with anticipated problems by focusing on specific policies, procedures, and rules; in this way, employees were guided toward the organization’s objectives. Organization effectiveness was measured by adherence to standards, rules, and procedures. Rewards were granted to those who followed the rules. This type of leadership is often referred to as transactional leadership, which is appropriate for a mechanistic organization that operates in a routine manner. Such an organization is considered stable and predictable.

However, public services are not mechanistic organizations. The problems they face are not routine, so transactional leadership does not provide the necessary guidance to create comprehensive plans of action in a rapidly changing environment. Today's community college environments are rapidly changing to meet the needs of the students and a global and technological society (Phillippe, 2000). Community colleges continue to face difficult times as the colleges have grown larger and more complex. Productivity and accountability have been raised repeatedly (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Phillippe, 2000; Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, & VanHorn-Grassmeyer, 1994). Organizations must be able to change as rapidly as their environment (Bass, 1990).

According to Cohen and Brawer (1996), leadership is the answer in effecting student learning, sustaining staff morale, presenting a positive public image, managing growth, raising funds, and answering every challenge promptly and efficiently. Clearly, in order for community colleges to survive and meet the challenges of a continuously changing environment, "leadership is the key to the survival of the fittest in an organization" (Valle, 1999 p. 2). Cohen and Brawer (1996) believed that "successful colleges are blessed with the proper leaders: people who know how to guide their colleagues, stimulating each to put forth maximum effort toward attaining the proper goals" (p. 132). These views describe a transformational leader who builds on commitment to the organization's objectives and empowers followers to achieve these objectives (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Researchers today discuss leadership in terms of collaboration, interaction, and the relationship between leader and follower. According to Rost (1993), the essence of leadership is not in the leader but in the relationship with followers. Rost rethought the

traditional definition of leadership and shifted from the industrial to what he called the post-industrial conception of leadership. His premise is that leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect mutual purposes. Change must reflect the wishes of both the leader and the followers (Rost, 1991).

According to Putti and Tong (1992), leadership is a process of the leader's influence on his or her followers for the attainment of goals. If subordinates are not happy with a style of leadership, the accomplishment of organizational objectives can be jeopardized. Therefore, identifying the styles of leadership that can secure subordinate satisfaction with supervision is important.

Pace and Faules (1994) believed that leadership style has to do primarily with the communicative behaviors used to help others to achieve desired outcomes: "style is what indicates the behavior (talking, acting) to be used in helping in particular way" (p. 197). Leadership style "is what a person says (language) and what a person does (actions) that others are helped to achieve desired outcomes" (p. 187).

Much research on leadership in higher education primarily focuses on college presidents, vice-presidents, and deans (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Seagren et.al., 1993). Little attention was given to the leadership role of department chairs. Seagren, Creswell and Wheeler (1993), believed that "department chairs are key leaders in any successful higher education institution, and without such leadership by chairs, no institution can be continuously successful" (p. 17).

The primary purposes of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) are to assure quality and to promote the ongoing pursuit of excellence. To assure quality, the ACCJC establishes accreditation standards, which stipulate the need for communication and leadership. Kramer (1995) reported that superior-subordinate communication has frequently been shown to have an important impact on various organizational outcomes. Studying faculty's perception in communication and leadership behaviors is a way to measure quality in the institution. Sawbridge (2001) stated, "leadership is an organizational quality that runs through all roles" (p. 12).

One of the most difficult aspects of leadership is the creation of understanding throughout an organization that involves continual change. Change generates fear of uncertainty. The role of leaders is to deal with uncertainty systematically by effective communications (Hooper & Potter, 2000). Is there a relationship between communication satisfaction and leadership style? This is the central issue addressed by this study.

This study used two instruments to measure the community college faculty's perceptions with communication satisfaction and leadership style. Communication satisfaction was measured using Downs and Hazen's (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ). The perception in leadership style was measured using Bass and Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

Research Questions

This study examined the satisfaction of the faculty of Micronesian community with college communication and their perception of their department chair's leadership style. Four questions guide the study:

1. Can a combination of demographic variables and perception of leadership styles of department chairs, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), predict communication satisfaction in community college faculty?
2. Is there a relationship between the subset of scales of the MLQ and the scales of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ)?
3. Is there no difference between institutions in terms of satisfaction with communication or perception of leadership style?
4. What suggestions can be made for improving communication, and do they differ by college?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in the study:

1. There is no relationship between the criterion variable of communication satisfaction and a combination of demographic variables and a leadership style;
2. There is no relationship between the dimensions of communication satisfaction and the dimensions of leadership style;
3. There is no difference in communication satisfaction between the community colleges, and there is no difference in perception of leadership, and

4. There will be similar reporting of issues of dissatisfaction and factors of satisfaction at the colleges.

Research Significance

Understanding how leadership style is perceived will provide valuable insight regarding whether these perceptions are in accord with perception of satisfaction in communication. The findings of this study would serve as a reference for those who are or would be department chairs in a community college. In addition, this study would have considerable potential for broadening our understanding of leadership in college department chairs and faculty communication satisfaction. An institution may be interested in the study to address the improvement of leadership and communication issues and ways in which it may be improved. As mentioned previously, there are no studies that investigate communication satisfaction and leadership style in a community college setting situated in Micronesia. Therefore, the findings in this study would set the framework for future investigation in communication satisfaction and community college leadership.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:

Communication: A kind of psychological and social process by which an individual or a group transmits concepts, ideas, attitudes, or facts to another person or group (Huang, 1980).

Communication Satisfaction: The overall degree of satisfaction that one feels from one's total communication environment (Downs & Hazen, 1977; Redding, 1978).

Leadership: An influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect mutual purposes (Rost, 1991).

Leadership Style: Behavior of the leader--what leaders do and how they act (Northouse, 1997).

Transactional Leadership: Those who transactionally lead, view the leader-follower relationship as a process of exchange. They tend to gain compliance by offering rewards for performance and compliance or by threatening punishment for non-performance and non-compliance.

Transformational Leadership: Transformational leaders are visionary and inspirational in approach. They tend to build ownership by involving the group in the decision making process.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions are made in this study:

1. Instructional faculty were able to evaluate the leadership style of their department chair.
2. Instructional faculty were able to evaluate their satisfaction with communication.
3. All subjects responded accurately and truthfully.

This study was completed with the following limitations in mind:

1. The data collected for this research is limited to contributions from instructional faculty of community colleges in Micronesia. Therefore, the results might not be representative of instructional faculty as a whole.
2. The participants might have responded to the MLQ and CSQ as they thought they should instead of answering truthfully. One of the cultural characteristics of indigenous people in Micronesian islands is that of withholding negative opinions about others.
3. In late April 2001, the researcher traveled to the Marshall Islands, Pohnpei, Guam, Palau, and Saipan to distribute surveys. It was the last week of classes for some of the colleges. Because of the hectic time during which the surveys were distributed, the accuracy of the survey might have been impacted by the study's time frame.
4. The researcher was an employee in one of the community colleges therefore; subjects in that institution may conceal their true opinion.

Summary

Colleges need to respond to a changing environment that demands service exceeding financial capabilities, technological change, competition for students, programs and funding (CCLDI, 2000). Leadership is pertinent in the survival of the colleges. Communication is an important aspect in leadership. Given the importance of leadership and communication in an organization, it is appropriate to learn more about them through an investigation of their relationship to each other. This study investigated the relationship of communication satisfaction and leadership style within the community college setting.

The next chapter reviews relevant literature on leadership, communication, and community colleges. Chapter 3 describes the method used for testing the hypothesis. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the results and implications of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Community colleges would continue to face great challenges. As in any unstable time, organizations look for leadership competencies – setting direction for the organization and communicating the vision (Hooper & Potter 2000). This study examined the satisfaction of Micronesian community college faculty with communication and their perception of their department chair's leadership style. Thus, this literature review focuses on leadership, theories of leadership, leadership styles, communication, and the community college.

Leadership

Interest in leadership and leaders has been for centuries. Bass (1990) indicates that the study of leadership and leadership effectiveness can be found in Greek and Latin classics, in the Hebrew Bible and Christian Scriptures, in the writings of ancient Chinese philosophers, and in early Icelandic legends. Despite the fact that numerous studies have been conducted on leadership, researchers and theorists have not reached a consistent definition of the term. Stogdill (1974) pointed out that each researcher arrived at his or her own definition: "there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it" (p.7). Bass (1990) concurred.

Bennis and Nanus (1997) asserted that more than 850 definitions of leadership exist and literally thousands of empirical studies of leaders have been conducted, but no clear and unequivocal understanding of the concept exists. Multiple interpretation continues instead. For example, Chemers (1997) defined leadership as “a process of social influences in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task” (p. 1), while Rost (1993) defined leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their shared purposes” (p. 102).

The nature of leadership is complex (Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Chemers, 1997; Daft, 1999; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Northouse, 1997; and Pace & Faules, 1994). Bennis and Nanus (1997) compared defining leadership with describing love: “Like love, leadership continued to be something everybody knew exists but nobody could define” (p.5). According to Yukl (1998), more than 5,000 articles have been published on leadership, and hundreds more are added each year. Yukl complained of

the sheer volume of publications, the disparity of approaches, the proliferation of confusing terms, the narrow focus of most researchers, the high percentage of irrelevant or trivial studies, the preference for simplistic explanations, and the lack of research designed to integrate different aspects of leadership and develop a general theory. As the old adage goes, it is difficult to see the forest for the trees. (p. 494)

Theories of Leadership

Theory is nevertheless important in understanding leadership. Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1996) explained that theory provides a framework for conceptualizing how critical variables interact. Theory guides the understanding of the phenomena. The authors contended that theories of leadership involve testable ideas. “In general, only leadership theories add to the body of knowledge concerning the science of leadership and help in the development of universal laws of leadership” (p. 108).

Four dominant theories of leadership have been advanced in the 20th century. To a great extent, each has been an extension of and response to the criticisms of the previously dominant paradigm (Chemers, 1997, Hellriegel & Slocum, 1996, Northouse, 1997). The dominant theoretical approaches described here are presented in chronological order.

Trait Theories

From the early 1900s until the late 1940s, trait investigations were the dominant research strategy (Chemers, 1997). According to Bass (1990), trait theories of leadership were the first serious attempts to study the phenomenon. Trait theories developed out of the concept of the *great man*. According to the great man theory, leaders are born with natural leadership qualities that common people cannot possess (Daft, 1999; Northouse 1997). Trait theory researchers thus focused on the traits of successful leaders. They believed that leaders have certain traits—physical, social, and personal—in common. Trait theorists speculated about certain key traits yet did not judge whether these traits were inherent to individuals or whether they could be developed through training and

education. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1995) reported that trait theories did not make assumptions that leadership is acquired through heredity. They asserted that the characteristics of leaders are simply different from non-leaders. In contrast, Luthans (1991) indicated that leadership traits could be acquired through learning and experience and that they are not completely inherent.

The traits examined by various researchers included physical, personality, and social characteristics and personal abilities and skills. “One of the problems surrounding personality traits is that researchers used different labels to describe similar patterns of behavior. This inconsistency in labeling made it difficult to determine personality trait-leadership relationships” (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1996, p.193). Inability to find a single trait or combination of traits that completely explains leadership abilities led researchers to focus on the behaviors of particular leaders.

Behavioral Theories

Criticizing the conflicting results in the trait theories, researchers focused on behavioral theory. Unlike trait theory, where the focus is on the leader’s personality, behavioral theory concentrates on the leader’s behavior: what leaders do and how they act (Pierce & Newstrom, 1995). Behavioral theorists differentiated leaders from non-leaders by examining effective leadership behaviors and assuming that the best styles of leadership could be learned. The main goal of the various behavioral theories was to recommend how leaders should behave. This approach was dominant in the 1950s and 1960s.

Ohio State Leadership Studies

In the late 1940s, researchers at Ohio State University studied the behavior of individuals leading a group. According to Chemers (1997), this was the most comprehensive contemporary research on leadership behavior. They developed the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which measures the behavior of a leader. The instrument was given to hundreds of individuals in educational, military, and industrial settings. The results revealed that certain clusters of behaviors were typical of leaders. Two general behaviors emerged from the result of the questionnaire-- *consideration* and *initiating structure* (Northouse, 1997).

Consideration describes the extent to which a leader is sensitive to subordinates and includes friendship, mutual trust and respect, warmth, and participation in decision making. In contrast, initiating structure describes the extent to which a leader is task-oriented and directs followers toward task accomplishment (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

University of Michigan Studies

Around the same time that the LBDQ was being developed, researchers at the University of Michigan were exploring leadership behaviors using interviews with subordinates of industrial supervisors. Their research identified two types of leadership behaviors: *production-oriented* and *employee-oriented*. The production-oriented leader emphasizes the technical and production aspects of a job, whereas the employee-oriented leader concentrates on strong human relations, showing concern for the problems and feelings of subordinates, and building good rapport with subordinates (Chemers, 1997; Daft, 1999; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Northouse, 1997).

The leadership behaviors identified by Ohio State University and the University of Michigan have similarities. The *consideration* leadership behavior and the *employee-oriented* leadership behavior both focused on the human needs of their subordinates. The leader respects the subordinates' ideas, feelings, and seeks input from subordinates. The *initiating structure* leadership behavior and the *production-oriented* leadership behavior both focused on task and work activities toward goal achievement (Daft, 2002).

The Managerial Grid

In 1964, Blake and Mouton (cf. Northouse, 1997) designed the Managerial Grid which was built on studies conducted at Ohio State and the University of Michigan. The Leadership Grid explained how leaders help organizations obtain their goals through two factors: concern for production and concern for people. According to Blake and Mouton, concern for production refers to whatever the organization is seeking to accomplish. Examples are policy decisions, workload, sales volume, and production development. Concern for people refers to how a leader relates to the workers. Examples are building commitment, trust, and providing good working conditions. The Leadership Grid delineates five major leadership styles: (a) *Authority-Compliance Management* places heavy emphasis on task and job requirements and less emphasis on people, (b) *Country Club Management* has a low concern for task accomplishment combined with a high concern for interpersonal relationships, (c) *Impoverished Management* is unconcerned with either the task or interpersonal relationships, (d) *Middle-of-the-Road Management* are compromisers, have an intermediate concern for the task, and an intermediate concern for the people, and (e) *Team Management* strongly emphasizes both tasks and interpersonal relationships (Daft, 1999; Northouse, 1997).

Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor (1966) defined Theory X and Theory Y as different ways that leaders view employees. According to Theory X, money, disciplinary techniques, punishments, and threats motivate employees. Managers practice a directive leadership style and lead by telling their subordinates what is expected and instructing them how to perform their task. In contrast, Theory Y assumes employees are intrinsically motivated by their work. Those employees are viewed as hard workers, cooperative, and having positive attitudes. Managers practice participative leadership styles. They act by consulting, seeking opinions, and encouraging employees to take part in planning and decision making. The study of behaviors could not identify certain behaviors that are generally associated with leadership success. "Often the degree to which leaders need to exhibit task- or people-oriented behaviors depends on the situation" (Hughes, Ginnett, & Cruphy, 1996, p.221).

Contingency Theories

Like the trait theories, behavioral theories were criticized for failing to identify a universal set of leadership behaviors that would consistently result in effective leadership (Northouse, 1997). This led researchers to focus on leadership in situations.

"Contingency theories are based on the premise that the performance of a group or organization depends not only on the leader but also on the situation" (Chemers & Ayman, 1993, p. 2). Hughes, Ginnett, and Cruphy (1996) argued that:

Leaders can and should change their behaviors as situational and follower characteristics change . . . a correct match between situational and follower characteristics and leaders' behaviors is assumed to have a positive effect on

group or organizational outcomes. Thus, these theories maintain that leadership effectiveness is maximized when leaders correctly make their behaviors contingent on certain situational and follower characteristics. (p. 488)

Northouse (1997) stated that contingency theory is concerned with styles and situations that provide the framework for effectively matching the leader and the situation.

Fiedler's Contingency Theory

Fred E. Fiedler was recognized for beginning the contingency theory movement (Chemers, 1997; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Northouse, 1997). Fiedler (1988) argued that successful leadership depends on the leader's ability to match leadership style to the situation; leadership style is most effective when it is used in the right situation. To understand the performance of leaders, one must comprehend the situation in which they lead. (Northouse, 1997). Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1996) compared the situational leadership theory (SLT) and contingency theory:

SLT emphasizes flexibility in leader behaviors, whereas the contingency model maintains that leaders are much more consistent (and consequently less flexible) in their behavior. Situational leadership theory maintains that leaders who correctly base their behaviors on follower maturity will be more effective, whereas the contingency model suggests that leader effectiveness is primarily determined by selecting the right kind of leader for certain situations or changing the situation to fit the particular leader's style. Another way to say this is that leadership effectiveness depends on both the leader's style and the favorableness of the leadership situation. Some leaders are better than others in some situations but less effective in others. To understand contingency theory, therefore, we need

to look first at the critical characteristics of the leader and then at the critical aspects of the situation (p. 500-501).

After assessing leadership styles, the situations in which leaders work, and whether or not they were effective, Fiedler (1988) developed the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPC) to measure leadership styles. Leaders who score high on the LPC are described as relationship-motivated. Leaders who score low on the LPC are described as task-motivated. The situation in which leaders work is determined by three factors: (a) *leader-member relations*--the extent to which the leader is accepted and respected, (b) *task structure*—how clearly a task's requirements are spelled out, and (c) *position power*—how much authority a leader has over subordinates. Effectiveness is determined by the degree to which the task is accomplished (Fiedler, 1972; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Northouse, 1997).

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Theory

In the late 1960s, Hersey and Blanchard refined the leadership model (considerate and initiating structure) developed at Ohio State University. They created the concept of situational leadership, which identifies four leadership styles (Daft, 1999; Hersey, 1988; Pace & Faules, 1994). Style 1, Telling, is a directive style (high task, low relationship). The leader defines the roles of followers and tells them what, how, and where to do various tasks. Style 2, Selling, provides direction but seeks input from followers (high task, high relationship). The leader and the followers share in decision making in Style 3, Participating (high relationship, low task), and the leader lets followers take responsibility for their work in Style 4, Delegating (low relationship, low task). Any one of the four styles can be effective in a given situation.

According to Hersey (1988), the key variable affecting leadership success lies in the concept of follower readiness--the ability and willingness to accomplish a task. "The leader's challenge is to identify follower readiness and then match it with the appropriate leadership style" (Hersey, 1988, p. 112). This theory suggests that leadership effectiveness is dependent on the given situation and the level of maturity of the followers. The underlying assumption of this theory is that different situations require different types of leadership. Hencley (1973) noted that "the situation approach maintains that leadership is determined not so much by the characters of the individuals as by the requirements of the social situation" (p.38). Therefore, to be an effective leader it is required that an individual adjust his/her leadership style to different situations (Northouse, 1997).

Path-Goal Theory

House (1971) initially developed the path-goal theory, which was refined by House and Mitchell (1974). The premise of this theory is the leader's ability to influence subordinates' perception of their work goals, personal goals, and paths to goal attainment. This theory suggests that "the motivational functions of the leader consist of increasing the number and kinds of personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and making paths to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying the paths, reducing road blocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route" (House & Mitchell, 1974, p. 102). The theory consists of three sets of contingencies-- leader style, followers, and the situation.

The challenge for the leader is to use a style that is most appropriate to a particular situation and the follower's needs. There are four styles of leadership:

directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement-oriented leadership. Leaders can exhibit any or all of these four styles contingent upon characteristics of subordinates and the task. A leader must choose a leadership style that best fits the subordinates and the work they are doing. For example, for work that is structured and unsatisfying, the theory suggests that the leader should be supportive. If subordinates are required to perform ambiguous tasks, the theory recommends that a leader use the achievement-oriented style, which helps subordinates feel that their efforts would result in effective performance (House & Miitchell, 1974; Northouse, 1997).

Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Burns (1978) attempted to link leadership and followership. Leadership has generally been conceptualized as a transactional or cost-benefit exchange process. A transactional leader motivates subordinates by exchanging rewards for services rendered. The concern of such leaders is to clarify subordinates' goals and to arrange rewards as incentives for goal attainment (Singer & Singer, 1990). Burns (1978) also introduced the concept of transformational leadership. He described transformational leadership as a process by which "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation" (p.20). According to Burns, transformational leaders bring out the best in "their followers and move them to pursue higher and more universal needs and purposes" (p. 20). He differentiated transformational from transactional leadership, describing the latter involving leaders who motivate followers by appealing to their self-interest.

Burns considered managers transactors and leaders transformers. Likewise, Bennis and Nanus (1985) differentiated between managers and leaders: "managers are

people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing” (p.21) and “management controls, arranges, does things right; leadership unleashes energy, sets the vision so we do the right thing” (p.65).

Bass (1985) generally agreed with the work of Burns but asserted that leaders should resort to strong emotions to motivate followers, regardless of the ultimate consequences for the followers. The transactional is associated with management and the transformational with vision. Bass (1990) formally differentiated transactional and transformational leadership. He described transactional leaders as emphasizing the transaction or exchange between leaders, colleagues, and followers. The transaction is based on specific leader expectations. The transactional leader communicates what followers will receive or avoid receiving if expectations are or are not met.

Bass (1985) pointed out that the two concepts, transactional and transformational leadership, are generally not independent of each other. A study of military officers and industrial managers (Waldman, Bass, & Einstein, 1985) indicated that although the effects of transformational leadership were generally much stronger than those of transactional leadership, leaders who possess both transactional and transformational characteristics were much more successful than those who had only one leadership style. Transformational leaders motivate subordinates to perform "beyond expectations." Such results are accomplished by heightening subordinates' awareness of the value of designated goals, by inducing them to transcend self-interest in favor of the organization, and by raising subordinates' motivational level. Such performance cannot be achieved through transactional leadership alone (Singer & Singer, 1990).

Lowe and Galen (1996) differentiated a transformational leader as one who articulates a vision of the future. Other researchers have described transformational leadership as focusing on a common purpose, addressing intrinsic rewards, and developing commitment with and in the followers (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1989, 1990).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

According to Gronn (1996), traditional research methodologies (e.g., questionnaires) remain theorists' major modes of inquiry. Instrumental approaches continue to dominate mainstream leadership studies, such as transformational leadership. Gronn noted that it is not clear whether the MLQ measures leaders' behavior, attributes, or effects. Although he acknowledged that Bass (1995) validated that MLQ measures all three, Gronn said that the surveys are able to measure the effects of leadership and that "there is no way of knowing whether those effects are fleeting or more enduring" (Gronn, 1996).

The consistency of questions being raised by many authors using the MLQ on whether the components of transformational leadership should be considered independent and whether the contingent reward leadership should be viewed as a separate factor led Avolio and Bass (1999) to re-examine the components of transformational and transactional leadership. They examined Bass's (1985) original six-factor model, which consists of the following:

1. *Charisma/ Inspirational* provides followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing, is a role model for ethical conduct, and builds identification with the leader and his or her articulated vision.

2. *Intellectual Stimulation* gets followers to question the tried and true ways of solving problems and encourages them to question the methods they use to improve upon them.

3. *Individualized Consideration* focuses on understanding the needs of each follower and works continuously to get them to develop to their full potential.

4. *Contingent Reward* clarifies what is expected from followers and what they will receive if they meet expected levels of performance.

5. *Active Management-by-Exception* focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems in order to maintain current performance levels.

6. *Passive-Avoidant Leadership* tends to react only after problems have become serious. It then takes corrective action and often avoids making any decisions at all.

The MLQ was sent out to a large, broad, and diverse population. Samples were taken from managers in U.S. business firms, nursing schools, government research agencies, U.S. Army junior officers, undergraduates, fire departments, political organizations, and not-for-profit agencies. A total of 3,786 people responded to the study. A confirmatory factor analysis was employed to test the psychometric properties of the instrument, and various multi-methods were used to examine the construct validity of the survey instrument. The study found a high degree of consistency in reliability, intercorrelations, and factor loadings. In sum, the study provided some evidence to

support the validity of the instrument and that researchers and practitioners should continue using the instrument while using other methodologies to examine leadership. The authors indicated that “by using multiple methods, it may be possible to get a better handle on discriminating among respective leadership factors. Not only is this important for research purposes, but it also may provide a basis for more precise training, assessment and evaluation” (Avalio & Bass, 1999).

Research using the MLQ

Putti and Tong (1992) investigated the civil service leadership style in an Asian country and examined the impact of leadership style on employee satisfaction by using correlational analysis. They believed that if subordinates are not happy with the style of leadership they receive, then the accomplishment of organizational goals can be jeopardized.

The sample for the study was taken from three different groups of public servants: nurses, police, and engineers. The literature review generally focuses on the civil service system, leadership, and employee satisfaction. Data on leadership styles and satisfaction were gathered and analyzed using the Pearson correlation, ANOVA, and MANOVA.

The results indicate differences in leadership styles in the three groups; the nurses and the police are identical to each other and different from the engineers. The findings of the study reveal positive and significant correlations between leadership styles and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. However, the type of leadership style that tends to have a better impact on subordinate satisfaction varies in the group. The findings also point out that the dominant leadership style in a particular job classification was not necessarily the leadership style that provided satisfaction to the subordinates.

Singer and Singer (1990) examined the leadership styles of the New Zealand police and employees from three Taiwan companies using the MLQ. The authors hypothesized that mechanistic organizations such as the police force would foster transactional leadership. Leadership in the Taiwanese companies was expected to be transactional due to the dominance of Confucian and Taoist tradition. The results of the study indicate that transformational leadership style was preferred in both samples. However, the Taiwanese employees had a greater liking for transactional leaders.

Lowe and Galen (1996) tested for the overall effectiveness of leader behavior and the moderators of the relationship between leader behaviors and effectiveness by using the recta-analytic techniques. The study conducted a meta-analytic review of the literature using the MLQ developed by Bass and Avolio (1985) and measured three styles of leadership--transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The objective was to test for overall effects and moderators of the relationship between leader behaviors and effectiveness using meta-analysis.

The authors looked at past published and unpublished research that used the MLQ. They listed all of the dependent variables that were measured to acknowledge that the MLQ had been used to measure the relationship between leader behavior and several outcomes. The differences in mean frequency rating as measured by the MLQ was used to test leader behavior and its effectiveness.

The results supported the notion that the transformational leader is associated with work unit effectiveness and that there was a high association between transformational scales and effectiveness as compared to transactional scales and effectiveness. The relationship between transactional scales and effectiveness was unclear.

Leadership in Community Colleges

According to Robles (1998), “community colleges are under increasing pressure to respond quickly to changes that can have significant impact on their mission if not their survival” (p. 14). The issues of community colleges vary and are complex. Some of the issues are access, governance, funding, accountability, curriculum, and technology. Becoming a leader in a college takes a long time as faculty members move up the ranks. “Most leaders in this culture are older and more experienced; younger, less experienced and typically more diverse faculty have a more difficult time accessing leadership positions” (p.7). Lucas (1994) emphasized the calls for leaders at every level, capable of creating a vision, communicating that vision to others, and stimulating people. “Such leadership is crucial not only in senior administrators but also in department chairs” (p.5).

Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989) stated that excellent leadership is needed to tackle critical challenges facing community colleges. In their Shared Vision study, they connected transformational leadership in the community colleges. They defined transformational leadership in the community college as “the ability to influence, shape, and embed values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors consistent with increased commitment to the unique mission of the community college” (p.34). The authors believed that “the challenge and responsibility of community college leadership is to create a vision for excellence within the context of institutional problems and characteristics” (p.11). Community colleges need transformational leadership to meet changing times.

Community colleges date back to the early years of the twentieth century, when they were commonly known as junior colleges. During the 1950s and 1960s the term *community college* was used for publicly supported institutions. By the 1970s the term

was applied to both publicly supported institutions and independent two-year colleges such as lower-division branches of private universities and church-supported two-year colleges. Cohen and Bawer (1996) defined a community college as “any institution accredited to award the Associates in Arts or the Associate in Science as its highest degree” (p. 5). In their early development, junior colleges offered primarily academic education, but “community colleges are now complex institutions taking on a broad array of educational, social, and economic functions” (Bailey & Averianova, 1998, p. 1). They strive to meet everyone’s educational needs and access to all (Cohen & Bawer, 1996).

Community colleges are hierarchical organizations. Presidents make decisions with a small group of administrators, and decisions are communicated informally through a peer network. However, as colleges grow in size and complexity, the governance changes to a pyramidal structure. Power flows from the president at the top of the organization through layers of staff--vice presidents, deans, directors, department heads, and faculty. “The interests of students, faculty, administrators and trustees were different, each holding unique goal sets and serving distinct constituencies” (Alfred, 1994 p. 247). This was the beginning of conflict regarding the decision-making roles of faculty and administrators (Alfred, 1994).

Twombly and Amey (1994) reported that community colleges have earned the reputation of being hierarchical, highly bureaucratic organizations. However, many colleges are implementing participative forms of governance, which might be one of the greatest challenges facing community college leaders. The complexity of governance in community colleges “demand[s] a new breed of administrators . . . with far-reaching educational vision” (Alfred, 1994, p. 254). Tyrrel and Stine (1997) echoed the need for

leadership practices that strive for excellence by focusing on cooperative relationships and a shared vision with all the stakeholders. They reported that despite emphasis on shared governance, “many employees still felt that they were not meaningfully involved with issues affecting their jobs” (p. 268). Therefore, Tyrrel and Stine called for a unity-building leadership that is transformational in nature. This new leadership style requires problem-solving among team members, best possible decision-making, and pushing decisions downward for greater efficiency (Vogt & Murrell, 1990; cf. Myran & Howdysshell, 1994).

Robles (1998) examined leadership in community colleges and concluded that when it comes to decision-making, higher education has greater involvement with professional staff than other organizations do. For this reason, he believes that other public or private organizations find it difficult to understand and work with a collegial culture such as the community college. According to Robles (1998), colleges “tend to select leaders on the basis of personality traits such as charisma, character, wisdom and vision, all of which are difficult to define” (p.2). Becoming a leader in higher education generally takes a long time. Faculty members usually move up through the ranks. Therefore, most leaders tend to be older and more experienced.

Leaders are found throughout the college. According to Bolman and Deal (1991), “leadership is not simply a matter of what a leader does but of what occurs in the relationship between a leader and others . . . Leaders both shape and are shaped by their constituents” (p. 409).

Twombly and Amey (1994) reported that in participative governance, communication is particularly crucial in community colleges, since it comes from and

moves in all directions. Therefore, “the process of communicating becomes as important as the information being disseminated” (p. 271). Sergiovanni (1991) pointed out that leaders manage meaning in their college by knowing what is of value to members and by reinforcing those values, often through communication (cf. Twombly & Amey, 1994).

Bennett (1988) argued that department and division chairs are the most important leaders on campus, yet their role is difficult and ambiguous. Department chairs remain faculty but are viewed as full-time administrators. They represent the interests of both the faculty and the administrators. Robles (1998) expressed the concern that “department and division chairs probably are the most cognizant . . . but find themselves in a role that is neither fish nor fowl and therefore, their effectiveness can be limited” (p.15).

Coats (1996) studied the relationship between the interpersonal behavior of community college department chairs and their leadership effectiveness. The study was conducted in Mississippi with department chairs from 15 of the 17 community/junior colleges, public, and private schools. The faculty was given two instruments to collect data for this study. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze the data. The findings indicate that effective department chairs have a need to maintain and establish interaction with others and want to be included by others. Hence, effective chairpersons establish and maintain interactions with others.

Communication

Contemporary theories of leadership emphasize the importance of communication in achieving success. Bennis and Nanus (1985) corroborated this notion and accentuated the importance of open communication. They asserted that the effective leader must use

communication as a tool for creating understanding. Goldhaber (1990) defined communication as the process of creating and exchanging messages within a network of interdependent relationships. Daft (2002) defines open communication as sharing all types of information throughout the company.

Communication, through both formal and informal channels, is the lifeblood of any organization (Boone & Krutz, 1993). Communication is critical to everything that goes on in an organization and to its success. Barge (1994) pointed out that communication and leadership are linked and that “leadership is an interactional process that helps people in organizations manage their environment” (p.13). The role of communication is to create understanding. Barge noted, “for leadership to be effective, communication must help organizational members reduce ambiguity” (p.13).

Ambiguity breeds communication problems. According to REM Associates (1999),

Poor communication is not just a problem . . . it is a disease. We call it a disease because it matches the dictionary definition down to a tee: ‘an impairment of the normal state of the living organism that affects the performance of its vital functions’. That's exactly what poor communication is. It is a condition that stops the normal functioning of an organization. Instead of people interacting positively together to accomplish a return to a mutual investment in time, energy, and effort, their energies are dissipated or spent against each other in misunderstanding and mistrust; thus the performance of the vital function of the organization is impaired, if not seriously injured. (p.1)

Educational leaders must play a critical role in fostering and nurturing a climate characterized by open communication. This helps employees to feel a part of the organization. Open communication fosters workplace coherence. According to Boone and Kurtz (1993), research shows that open communications are desirable because they enhance human relationships and increase morale and productivity.

Effective communication is key to communication satisfaction. In an open communication climate, employees feel free to express their opinions, voice their complaints, and offer suggestions to their superiors. They talk freely among themselves about important policy decisions and their production, personnel, or marketing concerns. With effective communication, information passes without distortion upward, downward, and horizontally throughout the organization (Boone & Kurtz, 1993).

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

Goldhaber and Roger's (1979) Communication Audit Survey (CAS), Downs and Hazen's (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), and Roberts and O'Reiley's (1974) Organizational Communication Questionnaire (OCQ) are the three most widely used organization-wide communication instruments. Greenbaum (1986) conducted a comparative study of the three instruments and looked at which research projects have used the instruments, what communication dimensions were investigated, and why the researchers choose the particular instrument. The overall objectives of the instruments varied. The CAS was chosen to evaluate the organization's communication, whereas the CSQ focused on the relationships of communication and satisfaction along with communication-productivity relationship. The OCQ measured the communication variables in the organization and allowed respondents to summarize their own

communication behavior. Greenbaum (1986) revealed that the CSQ and OCQ were half the length of the CAS and that the CSQ was easier to score. Another major difference between the CSQ and the other instruments is that the former measures job satisfaction and productivity. Greenbaum concluded that there is no right instrument to measure communication and that the selection of instrument lies with the researcher.

Downs (1998) explored the dimensions of the CSQ, examining the role of professional communication in manufacturing organizations in Australia, Thailand, and Korea. Professional communication was viewed as the intentional communication aimed at achieving strategic goals within the organization. He identified the eight dimensions he and Hazen (1977) developed:

1. *Organizational Perspective*: satisfaction with broad information about the organization as a whole. This includes notification of changes, financial standing, and organizational goals and policies.
2. *Organizational Integration*: satisfaction with information about employee's immediate work environment-departmental plans, job requirements, and some personnel news.
3. *Communication Climate*: satisfaction with the communication environment on a personal and organizational level. This includes the extent to which communication in the organization motivates and stimulates employees to meet organization goals and makes them identify with the organization. It also includes estimates of whether people's attitudes toward communication are healthy in the organization.

4. *Media Quality*: satisfaction with the degree to which meetings are well organized, written communication is clear, and the amount of communication in the organization is about right.

5. *Communication with Top Management*: satisfaction with the extent to which senior management communicates with employees.

6. *Personal Feedback*: satisfaction with communication with the supervisor. Measures whether the supervisor is open to ideas, listens, and pays attention and whether guidance is offered in solving job-related problems.

7. *Horizontal and Informal Communication*: satisfaction with perceptions of the grapevine and the degree to which horizontal and informal communication is accurate and free-flowing.

8. *Relationship to Subordinates*: (only answered by managers/supervisors) satisfaction with communication with subordinates and their degree of helpfulness.

Samples used in the study were taken from manufacturing companies from Australia, Thailand and Korea. The CSQ was translated from English into Korean and Thai. The data were analyzed using the Pearson correlation. The value of the coefficients between all communication dimensions was found to have a high correlation between all communication dimensions, and the correlation was consistent across the three cultures.

The study indicates it is significant that Thai employees were found to be consistently more satisfied with communication than Australian and Korean employees. The Australian group was moderately satisfied with the relationship between supervisor and subordinates. Thai respondents were slightly satisfied with the relationship. Overall,

the responses of the Australian sample were more consistent than those of the other two groups.

Employees feel satisfied with communication when their needs for information pertaining to their tasks or roles on organizational activities are fulfilled (Putti et al. 1990; Crino & White, 1981). Open communication results in communication satisfaction, which ultimately rewards both the individual and the organization by providing an environment where people thrive and the organization becomes effective (Boone & Kurtz, 1993).

Gregson (1990) applied factor analysis to CPA firms. The analysis studied the relationships between job satisfaction, communication satisfaction, sex, firm size, tenure, and intent to turnover for accountants. The author measured communication satisfaction using a modified version of the CSQ by Downs and Hazen (1977). The job satisfaction was measured by using a modified version of the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Gregson showed that job satisfaction was directly related to “intent to turnover” and communication satisfaction was connected to job satisfaction. In addition, communication satisfaction was indirectly related to “intent to turnover.” Gregson indicated that CPA firms can influence job satisfaction and accountant intent to turnover by affecting communications satisfaction.

According to Gregson (1990), researchers seek to find variables related to job satisfaction so that ultimately job satisfaction can be altered. The accountant’s specialty, the accountant’s level, the size of the firm, the number of years the accountant has been employed by the firm, and the way accountants feel about their organization have been studied. Gregson addressed the relationship of communication to job satisfaction and

intent to turnover for accountants, indicating that an organization can increase job satisfaction and decrease turnover by adjusting their personnel policies related to communication according to the relationships found in this study.

Gregson (1990) demonstrated that communication has important implications for the job satisfaction and accountant turnover. A breakdown in communication between accountants and supervisors could have a potentially adverse effect on job satisfaction and dangerous consequences for an organization. While controlling for the effects of three demographic variables (sex, firm size, and tenure with firm), Gregson examined the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. She predicted that communication satisfaction is related to job satisfaction and that communication satisfaction and job satisfaction are related to intent to turnover.

The first regression equation that Gregson (1990) conducted set intent to turnover as the dependent variable and all other variables as independent variables. The next set of equations set total job satisfaction as the dependent variable and communication satisfaction and the demographics as the independent variables.

The study found that demographics of firm size and tenure were directly related to communication satisfaction. Gender was not directly or indirectly related to communication satisfaction. In every case where communication satisfaction increased, so did job satisfaction (Gregson, 1990).

Pearce and Segal (1998) studied the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction and between job performance and communication satisfaction in small businesses. According to them, much research since the 1970s has focused on how job performance relates to job satisfaction and less on how communication satisfaction

relates to job satisfaction. The lack in research of the latter area might be due to the lack of interest in cross-disciplinary research in organizational communication among human resources management and organizational behavior scholars (Pearce & Segal, 1998).

Organizational communication scholars continue to be interested in organizational communication satisfaction and job performance construct, but most of the work is anecdotal, quasi-experimental, or a review of existing literature, such as that of Downs & Hain (1982). Researchers have done some work on the organization communication/job satisfaction construct (Downs, 1977; Foehrenbach & Rosenberg, 1982; Goldhaber, Porter, Yates & Lesniak, 1978; Muchinsky, 1977; Pincus, 1986; Ruch & Goodman, 1983; Thiry, 1977; Walther, 1988). These studies indicate correlations specifically between organizational communication and job performance (Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Jain, 1973; Pincus, 1986). However, the relationship between organizational communication/job performance needs further empirical study (Pearce & Segal, 1998).

Gregson (1991) looked at employees from 350 small Virginia firms who were asked to report their perceptions of employee communication satisfaction using the Downs and Hazen (1977) questionnaire. There was only a 16% return rate, and the authors were unable to conduct a factor analysis, but they were able to calculate Cronbach's coefficient alpha for each dimension of communication satisfaction and measured and performed correlation and regression analyses. The study indicates that communication satisfaction was not significantly related to the age of the firm or the number of employees in the organization. Communication satisfaction and staff evaluation were strongly related. When communication satisfaction was low, managerial

evaluations of staff productivity, work quality, attendance, safety, conduct, and job longevity were low.

Gregson (1991) pointed out that although many researchers have shown a relationship between communication and job satisfaction, no prior research has determined whether respondents viewed communication separately from job satisfaction. If respondents recognized communication to be separate from job satisfaction, then the potential to influence job satisfaction by altering communication existed. Using the varimax orthogonal rotation, Gregson (1991) analyzed the data from her earlier work and found that there was little co-mingling of the job satisfaction and communication satisfaction items. Her studies confirm that communication satisfaction and job satisfaction are viewed as separate constructs and are properly perceived as separate multi-dimensional constructs for CPAs.

Putti and Aryee (1990) explored the relationship between communication relationship satisfaction (CRS) and organizational commitment. The interest in commitment was influenced by organizational effectiveness. Previous studies have linked organizational effectiveness with communication, age, and employee satisfaction with communication.

The objective of Putti and Arvee's (1990) study was to explore the impact of communication relationship satisfaction (CRS) on organizational commitment. CRS was defined as the "personal satisfaction inherent in successfully communicating to someone or successfully being communicated with" (Thayer, 1967, p. 64). Redding (1972) also defined CRS as "the overall degree of satisfaction an employee perceives in his total communication environment" (p. 479). In Putti and Arvee, *commitment* refers to the

process by which individuals come to identify with the values of the organization and to the fact that individuals desire maintaining membership with the organization.

Commitment is perceived as an effective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation that links the individual to the organization.

Putti and Arvee (1990) speculated that communication relationship satisfaction might improve the individual's sense of membership in the organization. This indicates significant relationships regarding organizational commitment. Member satisfaction with the amount of information available to them might enhance their commitment. This might be explained by the fact that satisfaction with information can encourage a sense of belonging and identification within the organization.

Despite the significant correlation between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment, the correlation nature of the analysis prevented any perception of causality. Putti and Arvee (1990) believed that should the findings of their study be confirmed through a multivariate analysis, it would have implications for management of employee commitment. Managers would have to realize the importance of communication in the commitment process and perhaps understand the factors that directly or indirectly affect organizational effectiveness, such as the impact of communication. An abundance of research has tried to determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Johlke, Duhan, and Howell (2000) examined direct and indirect influences of supervisory communication practices and subordinate job outcomes for salespeople. The particular supervisor behaviors the authors observed are informal communication, which is characterized by face-to-face, verbal contact, and bi-directional communication. The

authors concluded that frequent communication is positively related to job performance for salespeople. Frequent communication contact with the supervisor can contribute to job performance. The study suggests that informal communication is positively related to job satisfaction.

Crouch and Hellweg (1989) looked at the impact of performance feedback on subordinate communication satisfaction. They used only two CSQ dimensions (supervisory communication and personal feedback) in their analysis, since supervisory communication and the reception of personal feedback are relevant to vertical dyadic co-orientation. The authors analyzed the data using a one-tailed test because the sample size was small. The data analysis showed a level of non-correlation between perceived agreement concerning feedback and a subordinate's degree of communication satisfaction.

Crouch and Hellweg (1989) pointed out a number of limitations in the study: (a) the selection of the participants was not entirely random, (b) the demographic data were only collected in aggregate form, and (c) the perceived agreement instrument prevented an accurate assessment of perception.

Crino and White (1981) reported that the Downs and Hazen's (1977) CS instrument contains eight general factors of communication satisfaction: Personal Feedback, Corporate Perspective, Organizational Integration, Relationship With Supervisors, Communication Climate, Horizontal Communication, Media Quality, and Relationships With Subordinates. All of the factors had not been reported as having an alpha coefficient. Also, the dimensionality of the instrument had not been re-examined since the publication of the original development study in 1977. Therefore, Crino and

White (1981) conducted a study to define more clearly the psychometric properties of the instrument.

The subjects for Crino and White's 1981 study were first-line supervisors in five textile mills in the Southwest. The authors found that when using a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0, an eight-factor solution is most appropriate for the scale on satisfaction. The overall dimensionality was shown to be consistent with the original eight-factor dimensionality proposed by Downs and Hazen (1977). The varimax rotated matrix of the eight-factor solution shows that some items clustered, but overall, an eight-item solution was supported. The authors pointed out that the internal consistency for each subscale was unclear and recommended that the questionnaire on satisfaction in communication should continue to be refined.

Pettit, Goris, and Vaught (1997) reported the importance of communication in organizational functioning. According to the authors, management and researchers are interested in two organizational concepts: job performance and job satisfaction. Through literature review, they reported that the relationship between performance and satisfaction is highly variable. Pettit et al. cited a number of authors supporting this finding: Brayfield and Crockett (1995); Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1979); Vroom (1964); Fisher (1980); and Srivastva, et al., (1975). Pettit et al. (1997) discussed organizational communication as one of those situational variables that perhaps exerts an effect on the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. The authors explored the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction and the moderating influence of organizational communication on that relationship.

The data was analyzed using regression analysis. The results show that job performance has a direct relationship to job satisfaction. The findings resemble the results of previous studies, but data very weakly supports organizational communication as a moderator of the performance-satisfaction relationship. Organizational communication is a strong predictor of job satisfaction and weakly moderates the job performance/job satisfaction relationship.

Varona (1996) looked at three private Guatemalan organizations to examine the differences and similarities in employees' communication satisfaction and organizational commitment and the impact of tenure and position on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. The sample of the study was drawn from a private Catholic school, a private Catholic children's hospital, and a food factory. A total of 177 of the 400 employees completed the surveys.

The instruments used were the Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ) and the Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI). Downs (1990) developed the former, which is an extended form of the CSQ. The communication and the commitment instruments were analyzed using Cronbach alphas and varimax rotation to determine the internal reliability of the instruments and to assess the factor solution. The Pearson correlation was computed for the food factory employees to determine the relationship between the communication satisfaction factors and organizational commitment and tenure. The other two organizations (the school and hospital) were not analyzed with the Pearson correlation because communication satisfaction data and organizational commitment data were collected separately in these two organizations. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was computed to predict the effects of communication

satisfaction factors on commitment factor. A paired t-test was conducted to compare the level of communication satisfaction between supervisors and subordinates. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated to determine the significant differences between organizations on communication satisfaction and commitment. Tenure was compared to communication satisfaction and commitment; more committed and less committed were compared to communication satisfaction; and more satisfied with communication and less satisfied with communication were compared to commitment factors.

The study showed that a positive but moderate relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment existed. Overall communication satisfaction demonstrated some influence on organizational commitment. Organizational Integration and Horizontal Communication were the most frequent communication predictors of commitment in this study. The schoolteachers were significantly more satisfied with communication and more committed to their organization than the employees of the hospital and the food factory. Varona (1996) stated that although several earlier studies had investigated schoolteacher communication satisfaction, none had compared their findings to other types of organizations, such as those in nursing or manufacturing. This is the first study to compare an educational institution to these other types of organizations (p.133).

Significant differences were found on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment by tenure. The employees with the fewest and the most years of service were significantly more satisfied with communication satisfaction factors. Employees with more years of service were more committed, but schoolteachers with less than one year of employment were the most committed. According to Varono, "this

research suggests that cultural differences influence communication and commitment in the workplace. Therefore, the need for more cross-cultural research is an imperative” (p.138).

Lee and Chen (1996) studied nine petrochemical companies in Taiwan, examining the relationship between perceived leadership styles, employee communication satisfaction, and employee organizational commitment. The authors used the ANOVA to find differences between the dimensions of leadership styles for organizational variables, and differences between the dimensions of communication satisfaction and organizational commitment on demographic variables and organizational variables. The study showed no significant differences between them but found differences between the dimensions of communication satisfaction and the demographic variables. The results of the demographic variables tested by ANOVA demonstrated significant differences between (a) male and female employees in the eight dimensions in the communication satisfaction and the overall communication satisfactions, (b) married and unmarried employees in the satisfaction of media quality and organizational integration, (c) different ages in general organizational perspective, organizational integration, communication climate, and media quality, (d) different educational levels in personal feedback, organizational integration, and media quality, (e) different amounts of seniority in organizational integration, communication with superiors, communication climate, horizontal and informal communication, and media quality, (f) different positions in all dimensions of communication except horizontal and informal communication, and (g) departments in organizational integration and in horizontal and informal communication.

A Pearson correlation was used to analyze the dimensions of leadership styles and communication satisfaction, the dimensions of communication satisfaction and organizational commitment, and leadership styles and organizational commitment. The results reveal significant positive correlation between them.

A regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment. The latter was used for the dependent variable and leadership style dimension as independent variables. The results indicate a low correlation with leadership dimensions and organizational commitment.

Pincus and Rayfield (1986) examined the idea that employee perception of communication between top managers and employees influences certain organizational variables in different and predictive ways. The sample of their study consisted of 327 nurses at a large urban East Coast teaching hospital. Data was collected using the Downs and Hazen CSQ, a Job Description Index, and a job performance evaluation questionnaire. Overall communication satisfaction and its factors were compared. The Pearson correlation was used to test the magnitude and direction of the relationship between top management communication and the outcome measures. A canonical correlation analysis was employed to evaluate the relationship between the factors of communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance.

Professional hospital nurses reported dissatisfaction with their top management's communication efforts, and nurse perceptions of top management communication were significantly related to the overall job and communication satisfaction. The correlation analysis reveals that top management communication was highly correlated with job satisfaction but not with job performance. The Pearson correlation did not demonstrate

any significant relationship between top management communication and job performance. The canonical correlation analysis reveals that the overriding influence of perceptions of supervisor communication is positively related to employee communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

Parrish, Tucker, and Gulbro (1995) investigated the relationships between the factors of leadership styles using the MLQ, the internal communication, the CSQ, and customer satisfaction at a small bank in the southeastern United States. Employee perception of the bank leader was measured within three dimensions of leadership: transactional, transformation, and laissez-faire (non-leadership qualities). The manager and subordinates filled out the MLQ.

Data shows that the manager's self-reported scores were considerably higher than the average of the employee scores for the manager, so different perspectives of the manager's leadership exist. In addition, the manager thought that his employees would be fairly satisfied, but in fact, employees were less satisfied with their manager and rated him only slightly effective in his job. The employees were dissatisfied with several aspects of communication in the bank, and none of the employees were highly satisfied with their jobs. Correlation of the eight factors of the communication satisfaction and employee productivity was analyzed to determine the greatest impact on employee job satisfaction and productivity. Data revealed a strong correlation between both job satisfaction and productivity with the relationship with the supervisor. According to the authors, the findings imply that job satisfaction and productivity will increase as employees perceive a better relationship with their supervisor.

Summary

Leadership and communication are essential elements in the organization. Employees are key to an organization's success. Leaders must learn to communicate successfully in all dimensions of communication satisfaction (Lee & Chen, 1996). It is essential that leaders have an understanding of the factors that influence perceptions which can lead to changes in the work environment resulting in increased employee satisfaction and productivity (Arnold and Peterson, 1998). As Verano (1996) stated, "these findings show that the more satisfied employees are with communication, the more committed they are to the organization and vice versa" (p. 132).

The research discussed above illustrates important predictors of employee satisfaction with their job and with organizational communication. The literature also reveals various methods of interpreting job satisfaction and communication satisfaction. Generally, the literature provides evidence of the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, morale, productivity, and commitment.

The literature on communication satisfaction in higher education is minimal. There is no research investigating the relationship of leadership style and communication satisfaction in community colleges or higher education. By combining qualitative and quantitative methods, this study broadened previous efforts to understand leadership and communication. The next chapter describes the design of the study, and the statistical procedures that tested the hypotheses.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study examined the satisfaction of Micronesian community college faculty with college communication and their perception of their department chair's leadership style. The researcher sought to investigate the relationship between communication satisfaction, leadership style, and demographic data using survey instruments. Therefore, this chapter will describe the research design, population, instrumentation, data collection, and methods of analysis utilized to address the research questions.

Research Design

A non-experimental research design was employed for this study. Two survey instruments were used to collect data on community college faculty's communication satisfaction as well as their perceived department chair's leadership style:

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Additionally, demographic data was gathered.

Heiman (1992), emphasized that the purpose of research is to understand the laws of nature by describing relationships between variables. Since the central purpose of this study was to seek relationships between variables, the researcher conducted a

correlational study. “In correlational research we use a correlational statistic to summarize the relationship” (p.174).

The disadvantage of a correlational study is the tendency to conclude that a high correlation implies that one variable has a causal influence on the other variable (Heiman, 1992; Huck & Cormier, 1996; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Huck and Cormier warned “correlation $\neq$ cause” (p. 69). “The fact that there is a relationship between two variables does not mean that changes in one variable cause the changes in the other variable” (Heiman, 1992, p. 174). Tabachnick and Fidell, held the same view stating “in nonexperimental research, it is very difficult to attribute causality “ (p.3).

The following questions guided the study:

1. Can a combination of demographic variables and perception of leadership styles of department chairs as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), predict communication satisfaction in community college faculty?
2. Is there a relationship between the subset of scales of the MLQ and the scales of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ)?
3. Is there no difference between institutions in terms of satisfaction with communication or perception of leadership style?
4. What suggestions are made for improving communications, and do they differ by college?

Since the major purpose of analysis for this study was to assess relationships between variables, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), some form of correlation/regression or chi square is appropriate. Bivariate correlation, regression, and multiple regression were the statistical technique chosen to address research questions

one and two. In addition, on research question three, the researcher looked at the communication satisfaction mean scores of the five community colleges. Therefore, according to Huck and Cormier (1996), a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) allows the researcher to make a single inferential statement concerning the means of the study's population. The authors cautioned that:

“although all ANOVAs are alike in that they focus on means, they differ in three main respects: the number of independent variables, the number of dependent variables, and whether the samples are independent or correlated.a one-way ANOVA has *one* independent variable, it focuses on *one* dependent variable, and it involves samples that are *independent*” (p.298).

The findings of the data allowed the researcher to decide whether the sample obtained is or is not representative of the target population.

The CSQ has an open-ended question asking respondents to indicate what needs to be changed about communication to improve their satisfaction. Content analysis was utilized to address research question four. The researcher read through the entire list of responses to determine the main concern that were common to the respondents. Categories were identified.

Population

The intended population for this study was the full-time instructional faculty at Micronesia's five community colleges: Northern Marianas College (NMC), Guam Community College (GCC), College of Micronesia (COM), College of Marshall Islands (CMI), and Palau Community College (PCC). The study population excluded non-

instructional faculty. In total, there were approximately 210 full-time instructional faculty employed at all five colleges.

Table 1 identified the number of full-time instructional faculty by colleges.

Table 1

Faculty Distribution

College	Full-time Instructional Faculty
Northern Marianas College	36
Guam Community College	62
College of Micronesia	41
College of the Marshall Islands	35
Palau Community College	32

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in the study: the CSQ by Downs and Hazen (1977) that measures communication satisfaction and the MLQ 5X by Bass and Avolio (1995) that determines leadership style. Additionally, demographic data was gathered. Demographic data was collected to determine if demographics significantly effected communication satisfaction or if demographic response-bias existed.

The researcher obtained the CSQ in Rubin, Palmgreen, and Sypher (1994). According to the authors, academic researchers may use the CSQ without permission. Authorization to use the MLQ was obtained through Mind Garden. Mind Garden publishes a range of psychological instruments.

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

Downs and Hazen (1977) developed the CSQ, which measures an individual's satisfaction with various aspects of communication in his or her organization (Crino & White, 1981).

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire has eight dimensions: organizational perspective, organizational integration, communication climate, media quality, relation with supervisor, personal feedback, horizontal communication, and relationships with subordinates. The CSQ instrument has a total of 43 questions. There are 40 questions that measure the eight dimensions. Each dimension of communication has five items, which are averaged for a factor score. In addition, there are two questions that ask employees to indicate their level of job satisfaction and one open-ended question asking respondents to indicate what needs to change to improve their satisfaction with communication. For the purpose of this study, the dimension of relationship with subordinate was excluded (five questions). The two job satisfaction questions were also excluded. Therefore, a total of 36 questions were utilized for this study (35 questions for the seven communication dimensions and one open-ended question).

The 35 questions for the seven dimensions used a Likert-type scale ranging from *very satisfied* (1) to *very dissatisfied* (7) was employed for this study. Each factor (dimension) has five items, which are averaged for a factor score (Rubin, Palmgreen, & Sypher, 1994). Clampitt, (1988), suggested four approaches that can be used to analyze the CSQ data: categorized items into groups; rank order items, utilize factor scores; and make data bank comparisons.

The method that the researcher chose to arrive at conclusions is to calculate the factor scores for each of the seven communication satisfaction dimensions.

“Theoretically, utilizing the factor scores should prove revealing because each of the five items that make up an individual factor are measuring the “same thing” (Clampitt, 1988, p. 122).

Furthermore, the one open-ended question was utilized to seek what types of communication changes could be made to increase satisfaction with communication.

CSQ Reliability and Validity

The reliability of the CSQ was reported at .94 by Downs and Hazen (1977) after a two week interval test-retest. The CSQ has been widely used and found to have a high degree of validity and reliability across a number of organizations. It has been employed extensively in the U.S., Japan, Great Britain, Spain, Australia, Netherlands, Thailand, Korea, China, and Guatemala (Downs, 1998; Lee & Chen, 1996; Lee, 1989; Varona, 1996; Pu, 1988). The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) has been reported having a range of .76 to .97 (Crino & White, 1981; Crouch & Hellweg, 1989; Varona, 1996; Lee & Chen, 1996; Pincus & Rayfield, 1986; Rubin, Palmgreen & Sypher, 1994). Validity of the CSQ has been determined through factor analysis. Rubin, Palmgreen and Sypher (1994) reported “evidence of concurrent validity exists” (p.116).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Full time instructional faculty’s perception of their supervisor’s leadership style was tested using the MLQ 5X. Bass and Avolio (1997) developed the instrument to measure leadership style. It determines three styles of leadership: transformational,

transactional, and laissez-faire. In addition, this instrument measures perceived leadership effectiveness, willingness to exert effort, and satisfaction with the leader.

The instrument has 45 questions with a choice of 5 numerically coded Likert-type responses. The score values range from “0” (not at all) to “4” (frequently, if not always). According to Bass and Avolio (1995), a lower score indicates that the leader’s behaviors are perceived to be inconsistent with the description of the leadership factor(s). A higher score indicates that the leader’s behavior is perceived to be consistent with the leadership factor.

The MLQ 5X was scored by averaging scores for the items on the scale. Summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale obtained the scores. All of the leadership style scales have four questions. Extra Effort has three questions, Effectiveness has four questions, and Satisfaction has two questions.

Transformational leadership has five subscales: Idealized Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, and Idealized Attributes. Transactional Leadership has three subscales: Contingent Transactions, Management-by-Exception (Active), and Management-by-Exception (Passive). Laissez-Faire has one subscale, and Outcomes of Leadership has three subscales: Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction.

The researcher used the highest score between the leadership styles to determine the styles leadership. The subscales of the Outcomes of Leadership were aggregated and identified as leadership quality.

MLQ Reliability and Validity

Reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale range from .74 to .94 (Avolio & Bass, 1999). “The reliability within each data set generally indicated that the MLQ 5X was reliably measuring each of the leadership factors” (Bass & Avolio, 2000, p. 15). In addition, the authors examined the construct validity of the MLQ 5X using confirmatory factor analysis yielding significance on each construct.

Demographic Questionnaire

The purpose of the demographic data was twofold. First, it provided data to define the respondents that can address the response bias issue. That is, those that did not respond, does this introduce any bias to the results and implications derived from the study. Finally, the curiosity of the researcher was to explore whether relationships existed between demographic data and communication satisfaction.

The form gathered personal information about the subject (gender, age, ethnicity, education, and primary language) as well as work-related information (department, department size, years in the department, number of meetings, and gender of supervisor).

Human Subjects

Approval to proceed in this study was granted by the University of San Diego Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects. In addition, the researcher obtained permission (Appendix A) from the individual college presidents to administer the surveys. A cover letter (Appendix B) was enclosed with the three-part questionnaire (made up of the CSQ, the MLQ, and the demographic questionnaire) explaining the

purpose of the study and requesting their participation. The cover letter stated that the study was strictly voluntary, the returned information would be confidential, and the results would be reported in aggregate form. Therefore, all subjects in the study were assured of confidentiality in data gathering and data reporting.

Data Collection

The surveys were printed on colored paper. The following colors were assigned to the following colleges: blue--NMC, white--GCC, ivory--PCC, yellow--COM, and pink--CMI. The researcher compiled and personally distributed the survey packets containing a letter from the researcher, the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Appendix C), the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Appendix D), the Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix E), and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelop to the five community colleges in Micronesia. The surveys were distributed in the faculty mailboxes at each institution.

The participants were given an option to return the surveys to a designated drop-off location on campus or to personally mail the surveys to the researcher. After three weeks upon delivery of the surveys, the researcher contacted the college's point-of-contact via telephone and e-mail inquiring the status of the surveys after three weeks had elapsed. Additionally, the researcher e-mailed the faculty, with an e-mail address, requesting that they return the surveys.

Data Analysis

All the returned surveys were reviewed. Instruments with more than 4 unanswered questions were not used for the study. Missing or incomplete data were addressed using the imputation method; missing values were replaced with the average of non-missing values. Data were separated according to the colleges. The scores determined the perceived supervisor's leadership styles: transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire. Similarly, the 7 communication satisfaction subscales were scored according to the procedure employed by Down and Hazen (1977).

The researcher was interested in the relationship between the independent variables (leadership style, number of people in the department, number of meetings, education, number of years in the department, gender, gender of supervisor, ethnicity, age, and English as a second language) and the dependent variable of communication satisfaction. The researcher used multiple regression analysis to see if a set of predictor variables could be identified to explain the variation in the scores on the dependent variable and the ability to predict the effect that the independent variables had on the dependent variable.

Conducting multiple regression analysis had two advantages. First, the researcher gained an understanding of the variation of each variable independent of (or controlling for) the other. Second, the researcher was able to examine the joint or combined variation of variables on communication satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis allowed the researcher to investigate leadership factors and how demographic factors predicted or accounted for satisfaction with communication, allowing inferences to be drawn about the data.

The primary regression equation set communication satisfaction as the dependent variable and all other variables as independent variables. The model was recalculated after eliminating variables with no significant contribution to the prediction equation. Communication satisfaction, age, and years in the department were identified as continuous variables. Leadership style, department, number of people in the department, number of meetings, education, gender, gender of supervisor, ethnicity, and first language were identified as discrete variables. The discrete variables were changed into a series of dichotomous variables called dummy variables. For example, gender was coded: “1” for female, “0” for all others; ethnicity: “1” for white, “0” for all others, “1” for Pacific islanders, “0” for all others, “1” for other, “0” for all others. The remaining discrete variables were treated the same way. The Stepwise method was used for regression analysis. This method allowed the removal of “weakened variable” in the equation. A significance level of .05 was used.

The one-way ANOVA allows the researcher to examine if significant differences in communication satisfaction means between the five colleges existed. When k is equal to the number of groups, the hypotheses for the comparison of groups are:

$$\text{Null: } \mu_1 = \mu_2 \dots = \mu_k$$

$$\text{Alternative: } \mu_1 \text{ is not equal to } \mu_2 \text{ is not equal to } \mu_k$$

The analysis of variance uses an F statistic to test for differences between the means of groups. This value is compared to a table of values at the .05 level.

The sums of squares must be controlled by degrees of freedom, which tend to be the number of observations minus 1; for between group variation, $K-1$; for within group

variation, $n-1$, and for the test as a whole, $N-k$ (total number of subjects minus the number of groups). Once the sums of squares were calculated, information was presented in a table and the F statistic tested for significance. If the calculated F value was larger than the critical F value, then the researcher could reject the null hypothesis and conclude that at least one of the groups was significantly different from the others.

The CSQ had one open-ended question asking how communication could be changed to make the respondent more satisfied. This allows respondents to answer in their own words, which were subjected to content analysis. According to Patton (1990), *recurring regularities* must be sought out in the data. The regularities can then be sorted into categories. The researcher read and re-read the written responses to determine common concerns. Data were categorized and ranked.

Response Rate

According to Gall et al. (1996), although a 20-40 % response rate is fairly common in survey research, a return rate below 20% makes generalizing from the sample's data to the population it intends to represent almost impossible. A return rate in this range was considered acceptable for this study. A non-response bias was addressed by comparing the demographic makeup of the non-responders and the responders. The demographic makeup of the full-time instructional faculty was obtained by the individual community colleges.

Summary

This chapter described the research methodology for the study. It explained the research design, the population of the study, the instrumentation used for collecting data, the method of collecting data, how the data were analyzed, and the issue of response rate.

The data obtained were described and analyzed in Chapter Four, and conclusions and recommendations were made in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This study examined the satisfaction of Micronesian community college faculty with college communication and their perceptions of their department chairs' leadership style. This chapter reports the response rates, respondent characteristics, and analysis of findings to determine whether the hypotheses of this study can be rejected or fail to be rejected.

According to Heiman (1992), the logic of scientific research is to understand the "laws of nature" (p. 17) by understanding factors that cause a behavior in a particular group. This study sought to understand an aspect of human behavior by investigating faculty communication satisfaction and perceptions of the department chairs' leadership styles.

The data collected from the surveys were organized according to colleges. In order to avoid statistical distortion, the researcher searched for missing data, outliers, and data entry errors. Adjustments were made as appropriate. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), "there are as yet no firm guidelines for how much missing data can be tolerated for a sample of a given size" (p.60). The data gathered in this study were entered into a computer for various statistical analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) – Windows, Ver.10.0. Where there were missing data, the SPSS

was set to ignore the empty cell thereby adjusting the n accordingly. It is important to note that the level of significance in this study was set at $p < .05$. The level of significance is important because it establishes the probability of a Type I error. In other words, a significance less than .05 means that there is less than 5% chance that the relationship occurred by chance; there is 5 in 100 probability that the result happened by chance and 95 in 100 probability that the finding was reliable (Huck & Cornier, 1996).

The analysis of data was divided into three sections and the findings in this chapter follow these divisions. The first section summarized the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The second section reported the inferential statistical analyses to address the first three research questions. The third section reported the responses to the open-ended question on the survey.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The combined total of full-time instructional faculty of the five community colleges in Micronesia (Northern Marianas College, Guam Community College, College of Micronesia, College of the Marshall Islands, and Palau Community College) was 206. These instructional faculties were surveyed about their satisfaction with communication using the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (Down and Hazen, 1977) and their perception of their chairperson's leadership style using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Of the 206 instructional faculties, 93 returned their questionnaire, generating a response rate of 45%. All 93 respondents completed the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. However, eight of the

respondents did not complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and 21 of the respondents had incomplete demographic data.

Description of the Sample

The participants were asked to supply both personal and work related data. Personal data included gender, age, ethnicity, education, and primary language. Work related data included the department, years in the department, department size, gender of supervisor, and number of meetings.

In terms of gender, 58% of the respondents were male and 42% were female. The supervisors were predominantly males representing 59%. A majority of the respondents are male and their supervisors tend to be males.

Ethnicity was broken down into three categories: White, Pacific Islander, and Other. Forty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they were either White and 43% of the respondents indicated they were Pacific Islander. Only 14% fell into the category of "Other".

The respondents' ages ranged from 23 years old to 70 years old. The mean age was 45. Seventy-two percent of the respondents indicated having an education beyond Baccalaureate Degree. The mean score for years worked in the department was 7 years. The department size was broken down into three categories: small (5 or less), medium (6 to 10) and large (more than 10). Hence, 37 % of the respondents indicated that they are in a medium size department, 37% indicated they are in a large department, and 26% indicated they are in a small department.

Fifty-four percent of the respondent reported having five or less meetings in an academic year. Table 2 summarizes the subjects' personal characteristics. Table 3

summarizes the subjects' work-related characteristics, and Table 4 shows the mean age of the faculty members and the number of years in the department.

Table 2

Personal Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Number	Percent
Gender		
Female	36	42.4
Male	49	57.6
Ethnicity		
White	36	42.4
Pacific Islander	37	43.5
Other	12	14.1
Primary Language		
English	49	57.6
Non-English	28	32.9
Education		
Bachelor Degree	12	14.1
Beyond Bachelor	61	71.8

Table 3

Summary of Work-related Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Number	Percent
Department		
Liberal Arts	43	50.6
Vocational	32	37.6
Department Size		
Small (5 or less)	21	24.7
Medium (6 to 10)	32	37.6
Large (greater than 10)	32	37.6
Gender of Supervisor		
Female	35	41.2
Male	50	58.8
Number of Meetings Held		
Less than 5 Meetings	46	54.1
Greater than 5 Meetings	39	45.9

Table 4

Mean Scores for Age and Years in the Department

Variable	M	SD
Age	45	11.3
Years in Department	7.4	6.7

Testing of Hypotheses

Research Question One

Can a combination of demographic variables and perception of leadership styles of department chairs predict communication satisfaction in community college faculty?

H_{O1}: There is no significant relationship between the criterion variables of communication satisfaction and a combination of demographic variables and a leadership style.

H_{A1}: There is a significant relationship between the criterion variables of communication satisfaction and a combination of demographic variables and a leadership style.

As earlier stated, the independent variables were the demographic information and leadership style. The dependent variables were the seven communication satisfaction factors (organizational perspective, personal feedback, organizational integration, relationship with supervisor, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality) and an overall communication satisfaction score.

A series of separate regression analyses were conducted to find variables that significantly influence each of the seven dependent variables (organizational perspective, personal feedback, organizational integration, relationship with supervisor, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality) and one regression analysis to predict overall communication satisfaction. The overall communication satisfaction score was determined by taking all seven scores and obtaining a mean score for the overall communication satisfaction score.

The first step of the regression analysis was to perform a stepwise method using the SPSS. With the stepwise method, a dependent variable and all the independent variables was computed. The independent variables included gender, age, ethnicity, English as Second Language, education, department, years in the department, size of department, gender of supervisor, number of meetings, leadership style, and leadership quality. The regression analysis computed which predictor variable had the highest bivariate correlation with the dependent variable. This created the regression equation that included the designated dependent variable and only one independent variable. A second variable would be included into the regression equation only if it explained a significant amount of additional variance. This process continued until no additional variables significantly explain additional variance. Additionally, with the stepwise method, a previously entered independent variable can be removed if it no longer contributes significantly to the predictor equation. Thus, “weakened” variables are removed from the regression equation.

After examining the results of the initial regression the following independent variables had weak or no relationship to communication satisfaction and were removed

from the regression analysis: gender, English as Second Language, education, department, years in department, department size, number of meetings, and leadership style.

In view of the exploratory findings, the researcher identified four independent variables for the study. The predictors that contribute to the overall communication satisfaction were age, supervisor gender, ethnicity, and leadership quality. There are three ethnic categories: White, Pacific Islander, and Other. Anyone who considered himself or herself other than White or Pacific Islander were placed under the “Other” category. The result of the regression analysis is shown in Table 5. Since the study had a small sample size, the researcher reported the adjusted R^2 .

Table 5

Regression Analysis for Predicting the Overall Communication Satisfaction

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.455	.098	-.439*
Pacific Islander	.664	.212	.297*
$R^2 = .27$ Adj. $R^2 = .25$			

* $p < .05$

Overall communication satisfaction dealt with communication in general by taking all seven factors and obtaining a mean score to determine the overall communication satisfaction.

The results indicated that leadership quality and the ethnic background of “Pacific Islander” had influence on the overall communication satisfaction. β presents the strength of the relationship. The β values indicate that leadership quality ($\beta = -.44$) had greater influence on predicting the overall communication satisfaction followed by the ethnic group of “Pacific Islander” ($\beta = .30$). The direction of influence on leadership quality was negative suggesting a low communication satisfaction score. In contrast, the direction of influence on the ethnic group “Pacific Islander” was positive suggesting a high communication satisfaction score.

In other words, according to the data, for one unit increase in leadership quality, communication satisfaction score decreases by $-.46$. The data also implied that subjects in the “Pacific Islanders” category tend to be less satisfied with the overall communication satisfaction compared to the “White” and “Other” category. Readers of this study are reminded that low communication satisfaction score represented high satisfaction: communication satisfaction score values range from 1 (very satisfied) to 7 (very dissatisfied). The adjusted R^2 indicated leadership quality and the ethnic group of “Pacific Islander” explained 25 percent of the variance in the overall communication satisfaction.

Leadership quality contributed the most to predicting communication satisfaction followed by ethnic group of “Pacific Islander”. The researcher further explored the relationship between the independent variables (leadership quality, supervisor gender, ethnicity, and age) with the seven communication satisfaction factors (organizational perspective, personal feedback, organizational integration, relationship with supervisor, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality).

Effects on Organizational Perspective

Organizational Perspective dealt with broad information about the organization as a whole. This includes notification of changes, financial standing, and organizational goals and policies. Table 6 presents the results for organizational perspective.

Table 6

Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Perspective

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.425	.115	-.368*
Age	-.023	.011	-.214*

$R^2 = .19$ Adj. $R^2 = .17$

* $p < .05$

Results on organizational perspective suggest that leadership quality and age reduced the organizational perspective factor score. In other words, for one unit increase in leadership quality, organizational perspective score decreases by -.43. Furthermore, for a one year increase in age, organizational perspective score decreases by -.02, implying that as the mean age increases, the subjects tend to be more satisfied with organizational perspective. Readers of this study are reminded that low communication satisfaction score represents high satisfaction: communication satisfaction score values range from 1 (very satisfied) to 7 (very dissatisfied). The β indicates the strength of the relationship between the variables. The β values indicate that leadership quality had the

greatest influence on organizational perspective ($\beta = -.37$) followed by age ($\beta = -.21$).

The direction of the influence for both variables was negative.

Since the study had a small sample size, the researcher reported the adjusted R^2 . The adjusted R^2 indicates 17 percent of the variance in organizational perspective is explained by leadership quality and age – a slim strength. In other words, only 17% of the variance in organizational perspective was accounted for by leadership quality and age. Researchers need to find more variables that predict this element.

Effects on Personal Feedback

Personal feedback expresses satisfaction in communication with the supervisor. It measured whether the supervisor is open to ideas, listens, and pays attention and whether guidance is offered in solving job-related problems. The β indicates the strength of the relationship between the variables. The results in Table 7 suggest that leadership quality ($\beta = -.57$) had the greatest influence on personal feedback followed by the ethnicity group of “other” ($\beta = -.26$). The direction of the influence for both variables was negative.

Table 7

Regression Analysis for Predicting Personal Feedback

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.669	.107	-.566*
Other	-.966	.328	-.255*
$R^2 = .39$ Adj. $R^2 = .37$			
* $p < .05$			

The data suggest that for one unit increase in leadership quality, personal feedback score decreases by -.67. Readers are reminded that low communication satisfaction score represents high satisfaction. The data also implies that subjects in the “Other” category tend to be more satisfied with personal feedback compared to subjects in the “White” and “Pacific Islander” category”. The adjusted R^2 value is .37 which means that at least 37 percent of the variance in personal feedback was explained by leadership quality and the ethnic group of “other”.

Effects on Organizational Integration

Organizational integration deals with information about employee’s immediate work environment – departmental plans, job requirements, and some personnel news, suggest a significant relationship with leadership quality. The results in Table 8 suggest that leadership quality ($\beta = -.54$) contributes the most in predicting organizational integration followed by the ethnicity group of “other” ($\beta = -.19$). The β indicates the strength of the relationship between the variables.

Table 8

Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Integration

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.605	.102	-.538*
Other	-.661	.313	-.191*
$R^2 = .39$ Adj. $R^2 = .37$			
* $p < .05$			

The data indicates that for one unit increase in leadership quality, organizational integration score decreases by -.61. The results also suggest that the subjects in the "Other" category tend to be more satisfied with organizational integration compared to subjects in the "White" and "Pacific Islander" category. The adjusted R^2 value of .37 implies that at least leadership quality and the ethnicity group of "other" explain 37 percent of the variance in organizational integration.

Effects on Relationship with Supervisor

Relationship with supervisor included the upward and downward communication – the extent to which supervisor communicates with employees. The findings implied that leadership quality contributed the most to predicting the relationship with supervisor followed by the ethnic group of "Pacific Islander" as shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Regression Analysis for Predicting Relationship with Supervisor

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.889	.104	-.674*
Pacific Islander	.673	.224	.237*
$R^2 = .49$ Adj. $R^2 = .48$			
* $p < .05$			

The β values indicate that leadership quality had the greatest influence on relationship with supervisor ($\beta = -.67$) followed by Pacific Islander ($\beta = .24$).

According to the data, for a one unit increase in leadership quality, personal feedback score decreases by -.89. Furthermore, the results imply that the subjects in the "Pacific Islander" category tend to be less satisfied with relationship with supervisor compared to subjects in the "White" and "Other" category.

The adjusted R^2 indicate leadership quality and the ethnic group of "Pacific Islander" explain 48 percent of the variance in relationship with supervisor. The association between relationship with supervisor and leadership quality and the ethnic group of "Pacific Islander" has strong relationship as indicated by the adjusted R^2 value of .48.

Effects on Communication Climate

Communication climate deals with satisfaction with communication environment on a personal and organizational level. This includes the extent to which communication

in the organization motivates and stimulates employees to meet organization goals and makes them identify with the organization. It also includes estimates of whether people's attitudes toward communication are healthy in the organization. As indicated in Table 10, both leadership quality and the ethnic group of "Other" have significant relationship with communication climate. The β values indicate that leadership quality ($\beta = -.63$) had the greatest influence on communication climate followed by the ethnic group of "Other" ($\beta = -.19$).

Table 10

Regression Analysis for Predicting Communication Climate

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.731	.097	-.626*
Other	-.690	.299	-.192*

$R^2 = .43$ Adj. $R^2 = .42$

* $p < .05$

The relationship strength with communication climate shows some strength indicated by the adjusted R^2 value of .42. The adjusted R^2 indicates leadership quality and the ethnic group of "Other" explained at least 42 percent of the variance in relationship with supervisor.

The data suggest that for every one unit increase in leadership quality, communication climate score decreases by -.73. The results also imply that the subjects

in the "Other" category tend to be more satisfied with relationship with supervisor compared to subjects in the "White" and "Pacific Islander" category.

Once again, the reader must keep in mind that low score represented high satisfaction. Communication satisfaction scores ranged from 1 (very satisfied) to 7 (very dissatisfied).

Effects on Horizontal Communication

Horizontal and informal communication deal in satisfaction with perception of the grapevine and the degree to which horizontal and informal communication is accurate and free-flowing. Leadership quality ($\beta = -.37$) has the most influence in predicting horizontal communication followed by the ethnic group of "Pacific Islander" ($\beta = .31$) as indicated in Table 11. Leadership quality had a negative β , which means low communication satisfaction score presents high satisfaction. In contrast, the ethnic group "Pacific Islander" had a positive β , which means high communication satisfaction score presents less satisfaction.

Table 11

Regression Analysis for Predicting Horizontal Communication

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.407	.109	-.367*
Pacific Islander	.731	.235	.305*
$R^2 = .21$ Adj. $R^2 = .20$			
* $p < .05$			

In other words, for every one unit increase in leadership quality, horizontal communication score decreases by -.41. The results also imply that the subjects in the "Pacific Islander" category tend to be less satisfied with relationship with supervisor compared to subjects in the "White" and "Other" category.

The relationship strength of horizontal communication showed slight strength indicated by the adjusted R^2 value of .20. The adjusted R^2 indicate leadership quality and the ethnic group of "Pacific Islander" explain 20 percent of the variance in horizontal communication.

Effects on Media Quality

Satisfaction with media quality measures the extent to which meetings are well-organized, written communication is clear, and the amount of communication in the organization is about right. As shown in Table 12, a slight strength of the relationship indicated by the adjusted R^2 value of .38; at least 38 percent of the variance in media quality is accounted for by leadership quality and the ethnic group of "Other".

Table 12

Regression Analysis for Predicting Media Quality

Variable	B	SE B	β
Leadership Quality	-.601	.097	-.533*
Other	-.727	.300	-.210*
Age	-.02	.009	-.208*
$R^2 = .40$ Adj. $R^2 = .38$			
* $p < .05$			

The β values indicate that leadership quality has the greatest influence on media quality ($\beta = -.54$), followed by the ethnic group of "Other" ($\beta = -.21$), and then age ($\beta = -.21$). The β were negative indicating low scores, which point toward satisfaction as low communication satisfaction score presents high satisfaction. The analysis shows that for every one unit increase in leadership quality, media quality score decreased by -.60. In addition, an increase in the mean age tends to decrease the media quality score. The results also imply that the subjects in the "Other" category tend to be more satisfied with media quality compared to subjects in the "White" and "Pacific Islander" category. The adjusted R^2 indicates leadership quality, the ethnic group of "Other", and age explained 38 percent of the variance in media quality.

The findings in Tables 5 through 12 imply that there was significant relationship between combinations of independent variables (age, supervisor gender, leadership quality, and ethnicity) with communication satisfaction factors and the overall communication satisfaction. Leadership quality had the highest predictability on all of

the seven communication satisfaction factors as well as the overall communication satisfaction and more so on relationship with supervisor ($\beta = -.67$). The ethnic group of “Other” was a predictor on personal feedback, organizational integration, communication climate, and media quality. The β are all negative indicating high satisfaction. Although subjects in the “Other” category showed statistical significance in the data, only 14 percent of the respondents were in the “Other” category. Therefore, the findings may not be as important. The ethnic group of “Pacific Islander” were less satisfied with communication on relationship with supervisor ($\beta = .24$) and with horizontal communication ($\beta = .31$). The findings led to the rejection of the null hypothesis based on the calculated $p\text{-value} < .05$, rejecting H_{O1} .

Research Question Two

Is there a relationship between the subset scales of the MLQ and the scales of the CSQ?

H_{O2} : There is no significant relationship between the seven dimensions of communication satisfaction and the dimensions of leadership style.

H_{A2} : There is a significant relationship between the seven dimensions of communication satisfaction and the dimensions of leadership style.

Bivariate correlation analyses was calculated to determine whether there is a relationship between the MLQ scales (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire, and leadership quality) and the scales of the CSQ (organizational perspective, personal feedback, organizational integration, relation with supervisor, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality). Statistically

significant correlations were considered at $p < .05$ and reported in Table 13. Once again, the reader must keep in mind that low communication satisfaction score represents high satisfaction. Communication satisfaction factor score ranged from 1 (very satisfied) to 7 (very dissatisfied).

Table 13

Bivariate Correlation Analysis Between Communication Satisfaction Subscales and Multifactor Leadership Subscales.

Communication Factor	Transform Leadership	Transact Leadership	Leadership Quality
Organizational Perspective	-.285**	-.174	-.383**
Personal Feedback	-.482**	.001	-.567**
Organizational Integration	-.471**	-.119	-.538**
Relationship with Supervisor	-.624**	.017	-.660**
Communication Climate	-.541**	-.159	-.626**
Horizontal Communication	-.333**	.011	-.348**
Media Quality	-.484**	-.142	-.548**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to Huck and Cormier (1996), concerning correlation coefficients, any r that assumes a value close to either ± 1 imply strong correlation; conversely, the term low is used when the r lands close to 0.00. Any r that ends up in the middle (between 0.00 and ± 1) implies moderate correlation. Therefore, most of the relationship between transformational leadership and communication satisfaction factors have low negative

correlation. The correlation of communication climate ($r = -.541$) and transformational leadership was moderately negative. A strong negative correlation was found between relationship with supervisor and transformational leadership ($r = -.624$).

The correlation between transactional leadership and communication satisfaction factors are very close to zero indicating independency between the variables.

There are strong negative correlation of leadership quality between both relationship with supervisor ($r = -.660$) and communication climate ($r = -.626$). The strong negative correlation indicates that those who identified their department chair as exhibiting leadership quality and/or identified their department chair as a transformational leader tend to score less in communication satisfaction score. Low communication satisfaction score presents high satisfaction. In other word, faculty members tend to be most satisfied with the communication climate and their relationship with supervisor when their department chair demonstrates leadership quality and possesses transformational leadership style.

The result of the correlation analysis leads to a decisions to reject the null hypothesis based on the calculated p -value $<.05$, rejecting H_{02} .

Research Question Three

Is there no difference between the institutions in terms of satisfaction with communication or perception of leadership style?

H_{03} : There is no significant difference in: a) communication satisfaction between the community colleges; b) and there is no difference in perception of leadership style.

H_{A3}: There is a significant difference in: a) communication satisfaction between the community colleges; b) and there is a significant difference in perception of leadership style.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated to test for significant differences between the means of communication satisfaction and the means in perception of leadership style at the colleges. The Scheffe post hoc test was employed because the group sizes were unequal. Additionally, the Scheffe test can identify which groups differ significantly from each other (George and Paul, 2001).

The one-way ANOVA of the means revealed significant difference existed between the colleges $F(4,84) = 3.74$, $p < .05$ on the overall communication satisfaction shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Analysis of Variance of the Overall Communication Satisfaction

Source	<u>df</u>	F	p
Between Groups	4	3.74	.008*
Within Groups	80		

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Followed with the Sheffe test, the results shown in Table 15, indicate that College 2 and College 4 were found to be significantly different from each other ($p < .05$). College 2 and College 4 are the two extreme mean scores in the group. The mean

difference between the two colleges is 1.15. Simply put, College 2 is more satisfied with the overall communication compared to College 4 which is slightly satisfied with the overall communication.

Table 15

Sheffe Summary statistics on the Overall Communication Satisfaction by Colleges

Institution	N	M	Post Hoc Differences				
			C-2	C-5	C-1	C-3	C-4
C-2	14	2.62	-	-.25	-.84	-.97	-1.15*
C- 5	22	2.87	.25	-	-.59	-.72	-.90
C- 1	14	3.45	.84	.59	-	-.13	-.31
C- 3	15	3.58	.97	.72	.13	-	-.19
C- 4	20	3.77	1.15*	.90	.31	.19	-
Total	85	3.26					

Factor Score: 1-very satisfied, 2-satisfied, 3-slightly satisfied, 4-indifferent, 5-slightly dissatisfied, 6-slightly dissatisfied, 7-very dissatisfied

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

According to the data, College 2 and College 5 are only .25 different, which meant that they are similar in the overall communication satisfaction – satisfied with the overall communication. The differences between College 1, College 3, and College 4 did not show much difference in the overall communication satisfaction – slightly satisfied with the overall communication.

The data on overall communication satisfaction presented in Tables 14 & 15 was based on the calculated p -value $< .05$ prompting the researcher to reject part a of (H_{O3})

The findings on leadership style yielded no significant differences between perception of leadership style between colleges, $F = .368$, $p = .831$ shown in Table 16. According to the data, the respondents in the five community colleges perceived their department chair's leadership style as transformation leadership. Therefore, there is no difference in perception of leadership styles at the colleges.

Table 16

Analysis of Variance of Leadership Style

Source	<u>df</u>	F	p
Between Groups	4	.368	.831
Within Groups	80		

Findings on perception of leadership style, in Table 17, provide support for the alternative hypothesis (H_{A3}). Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypotheses in research question three, part b on perception of leadership style. This decision was also based on p value at .05 level of significance.

Research Question Four

What suggestions are made for improving communication and do they differ by colleges?

Only 39 out of 85 participants wrote comments on the open-ended question that asked to indicate changes in communication that would make them more satisfied. The open-ended question was analyzed using content analysis. The commonalities that emerged from the subjects' comments are presented below respectively.

1. Need for open communication.
2. Improve personal feedback.
3. Improve relationship with supervisor.

The respondents in all five colleges express the need for an open communication with their department chair and within their institution. The respondents felt that this would close the gap on communication problems. Open communication would allow the faculty to know what is going on within the institutions such as issues, challenges, and decisions affecting the institution. Open communication would allow information to be circulated within the college. While all of the five colleges suggested the need for open communication, College 4 commented most frequently.

In regard to the need for improvement of personal feedback, some faculty expressed the need for their leaders to provide feedback on their performance. One suggested, "come around and see... make suggestion or comments". The data imply that department chairs were not attentive to the needs of the faculty ranging from instructional materials to issues facing the department. College 4 had the most suggestions to improve personal feedback compared to the other colleges.

The respondents implied there was lack of communication between the faculty and the department chair. In addition, there was a sense of limited interaction within the

department pointing toward an aloof environment. Once again, College 4 had the most suggestions to improve relationship with the supervisor compared to the other colleges.

Two of the colleges reported the need for more meetings and the need for a newsletter within their institution. Suggestions by respondents can be found in Appendix F.

Summary

This chapter has presented the demographics of the participants, and the analysis and presentation of the findings. The first research question was to determine whether leadership quality, supervisor gender, age, and ethnicity were predictors of communication satisfaction. A significant relationship was found between the overall communication satisfaction and leadership quality and ethnicity. The second research question was to determine whether a relationship existed between the MLQ subscales and the CSQ subscales. The data revealed that the scales of the MLQ and the scales of the CSQ were significantly correlated. The third research question was to compare the colleges to determine whether differences existed in communication satisfaction and perception of leadership styles. The analysis of variance revealed differences in communication satisfaction between colleges. However, no differences existed in the perception of leadership between the colleges. All the colleges were similar, in that transformational leadership was the perceived leadership style. Finally, suggestions by faculty were analyzed to determine ways to improve communication at the institutions. Commonalities that emerged from the suggestions were: the need for open communication, the need to improve personal feedback, and to improve relationship with the supervisor. Only two colleges suggested the need for more meetings and the need for

a newsletter in the institution. The next chapter presents the summary of the study, implication of the study, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the satisfaction of Micronesian community college faculty with communication and their perception of their department chair's leadership style. Specifically, this study examined (a) the relationship of communication satisfaction with leadership and demographic data; (b) the relationship between the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire subset and the scales of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire; (c) the difference between institutions in terms of satisfaction with communication or perception of leadership style; and (d) suggestions for improving communication.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize and discuss the findings, to present the implications of the study and suggest areas for future research.

Summary of the Study

Research participants included 85 full-time instructional faculties from four community colleges in Micronesia (Northern Marianas College, College of Micronesia, College of the Marshall Islands, Guam Community College, and Palau Community College). Each participant completed the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (Downs and Hazen, 1977), Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass

and Avolio, 1997), and a demographic questionnaire. Descriptive, correlation, regression, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and content analysis were conducted to analyze the data.

The results of this study revealed the typical profile of the full-time instructional faculty as either White or Pacific Islander male, 45 years of age. A majority of the participants obtained a bachelor's degree or higher, and have been in the department for at least seven years.

Research Question One

The first research question of this study examined the relationship between a combination of demographic variables and perceptions of leadership style in predicting communication satisfaction. The regression analysis indicates a significant relationship existed between the independent variables (age, supervisor gender, leadership quality, and ethnicity) and communication satisfaction. The leadership style measured by the MLQ revealed no significant relationship with communication satisfaction. However, leadership quality that measured extra effort, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader had significant relationships with communication satisfaction.

The result revealed that leadership quality had greater predictability on communication satisfaction, followed by ethnicity. Additionally, leadership quality was the strongest predictor of all the subsets of communication satisfaction (organizational perspective, organizational integration, communication climate, relationship with supervisor, horizontal communication, and media quality). The β for leadership quality ranged from $-.367$ to $-.674$.

The ethnic group identified as “Other” had negative influences on personal feedback, organizational integration, communication climate, and medial quality. Whereas, the other ethnic group identified as “ Pacific Islander” had a positive influence on relationship with supervisor, horizontal communication, and the overall communication satisfaction. The readers of this study are reminded that that low communication satisfaction score represented high satisfaction.

Additionally, leadership quality showed a significant relationship with the seven factors of communication satisfaction (organizational perspective, personal feedback, organizational integration, relationship with supervisor, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality). In all cases, the calculated β were negative thereby decreasing the communication satisfaction scores. Readers of the study are reminded that low communication satisfaction score presented high satisfaction. In contrast, high communication satisfaction score indicated dissatisfaction. The rating scales for satisfaction in communication ranged from 1 (very satisfied) to 7 (very dissatisfied).

Research Question Two

The second research question of this study examined the relationship between the subscales of communication satisfaction and the subscales of leadership. The researcher found a significant relationship between the subscales of communication satisfaction and the subscales of the MLQ based on the bivariate correlation analysis. The findings show that the subscales of leadership had negative correlation with the subscales of communication satisfaction. The relationships ranged from low negative to high negative

correlation. Relationship with supervisor and communication climate showed strong negative correlation with transformational leadership and leadership quality.

Research Question Three

The third research question of this study compared the five community colleges (Northern Marianas College, College of Micronesia-FSM, College of the Marshall Islands, Guam Community College, and Palau Community College) in satisfaction with communication and in perception of leadership style.

Significant differences existed in the overall communication satisfaction among the five colleges. However, no differences in perception of leadership style were found. The respondents perceive their department chair's leadership style as transformational leadership.

Research Question Four

The final research question of this study solicited suggestions for improving communication satisfaction and whether the suggestions differ by college.

Commonalities across the colleges were found. Five categories emerged from the open-ended questions: The need for open communication, improved personal feedback, improved relationship with supervisor, more meetings, and the creation of newsletters. The categories were rank-ordered respectively.

Discussion of the Results

This study examined the relationship between demographic variables, leadership factors (measured by the MLQ), with the dependent variable, communication satisfaction. A significant relationship was found between age, supervisor gender, ethnicity, and leadership factors with communication satisfaction. Leadership quality was measured by follower's perception of leadership effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and willingness to exert extra effort. Leadership quality had the strongest predictability for communication satisfaction. Transformational leadership and transactional leadership were not predictors of communication satisfaction.

According to the data, the leadership quality demonstrated by the department chair plays a major role in communication satisfaction. The faculty's willingness to exert extra effort, perceived leadership effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader was correlated with the department chair exhibiting transformational leadership behavior. This was consistent with the findings on research question three in perception of leadership style. The data revealed that subjects perceived their department chair's leadership style as transformational leadership.

These findings supported the findings of Putti and Tong (1992), Singer and Singer (1990), and Lowe and Galen (1996). These authors found that the type of leadership style that tends to have a better impact on subordinates varies in the group. According to Pace and Faules (1994), "no single style or approach to leadership guarantees just the right type of help for everyone to achieve desirable goals. Different styles result in different goal attainments, depending on the conditions under which the styles are being used" (p. 206). The findings in this study support this contention.

Nevertheless, the subjects perceived the department chairs exhibiting transformational leadership behavior more frequently than transactional leadership practices. According to Bass (1998), when the environment is unstable in organizations, transformational leadership is likely to emerge and be effective. Given the fact that the five community colleges in Micronesia are geographically remote and are constantly facing economic and financial challenges, one would expect to see a preference on transformational leadership. This view was supported with the findings that no differences in perception of leadership style were found among the five community colleges. The subjects perceive their department chairs to possess or exhibit transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership is characterized by the ability to bring about significant change (Daft, 2002). One of the colleges in Micronesia had gone through several reorganizations in less than 18 months to address financial challenges. In order for change to occur without too much resistance, the president of the college was able to communicate her vision and strategy without jeopardizing or compromising the college's mission. The vision and strategy was disseminated to the department chairs, and in turn, communicated to the faculty. The department chairs were able to emulate the president's vision and strategy thereby reducing resistance to change.

This perception is consistent with the conclusions represented by Rouche, Baker, and Rose (1989) recognizing that although they studied community college Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), there might be other leaders in community colleges who meet the criteria of transformational leader.

There are three ethnic categories: White, Other, and Pacific Islander. It appeared that the subjects in the “White” and “Other” categories who had a female department chair were less satisfied with communication. The gender of the supervisor was not a predictor on communication satisfaction for subjects in the “Pacific Islander” category perhaps because of the intact matrilineal society found in some cultures in the Pacific islands where no decisions are made without approval from the women.

The subjects in the category of “Pacific Islanders” were found to be less satisfied with the overall communication satisfaction. This finding was consistent with the findings that “Pacific Islanders” were less satisfied with the relationship with supervisor, and the horizontal communication. Once again, cultural background may account for the findings. Culturally, many if not most of Pacific Islanders tend to avoid confrontations or expression of their dissatisfaction openly. The people in the islands tend to be related by blood, through marriage, through close friends, and through social connection.

Families, extended families, friends, and friends of a friend form a relationship that connects the people on the island. Therefore, one needs to be aware and to take into account of those connections in dealing with islanders. Since the islands are small, words travel like wildfire and will get back to the individual who is being criticized or talked about. Cultural and social connection could explain why those subjects identified as “Pacific Islander” were less satisfied with the overall communication.

The findings show that for all three of the ethnic groups, leadership quality was a predictor on the overall communication satisfaction. Communication accentuates leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Goldhaber, 1990, Boone & Krutz, 1993, and Barge,

1994). Faculty's willingness to exert extra effort, perceived leadership effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader imply that they are satisfied with the overall communication.

When looking at the seven communication factors, the ethnic group categorized as "White" was not a predictor in any of the seven communication factors. However, the ethnic group "Other" had low negative relationship with personal feedback, organizational integration, communication climate, and media quality. The findings imply that the subjects in the "Other" ethnic category were satisfied with their department chair's openness to ideas, ability to listen, degree of attention to what they are saying, offering of guidance, well informed in their work environment on a personal and organizational level, and the amount of communication that occurs. It must be noted that there were only 12 subjects in the ethnic category of "Other". They account for only 14 percent of the total sample. Though the findings may be statistically significant, any inference about the entire population of "Other" would be inappropriate due to the small sample size.

The subjects identified as "Pacific Islander" had low positive relationship with the communication satisfaction factors of: relationship with supervisor, and horizontal communication. Relationship with supervisor deals with the extent to which supervisors communicate with subordinates. This includes the upward and downward communication. Horizontal communication deals with informal communication. The data suggested that the subjects in the "Pacific Islander" category tend to be less satisfied in the way that their department chair communicates with them as well as informal communication. Yet again, these findings may be due to cultural customs in Micronesia – the aforementioned existence of a matrilineal society in some cultures of the Pacific

Islands and Islanders' avoidance of being opinionated or critical within their interpersonal relationships.

Overall communication satisfaction was compared among the five community colleges; College 2 and College 4 were found to be significantly different from each other. They had the extreme scores in the group. The mean score for College 2 was 2.62 and the mean score for College 4 was 3.77. The mean difference between the two colleges is 1.15 (refer to Table 15). Simply put, College 2 is more satisfied with overall communication than any of the other colleges. The factor scores for communication satisfaction are as follows: 1-very satisfied, 2-satisfied, 3-slightly satisfied, 4-indifferent, 5-slightly dissatisfied, 6-dissatisfied, and 7-very dissatisfied. No significant difference was found among College 5, College 1, and College 3. This finding was comparable to the finding on ethnicity. Subjects in the "Pacific Islander" category were less satisfied with overall communication. A majority of the subjects in College 4 were "Pacific Islanders". In contrast, a majority of the subjects in College 2 were "White".

Forty six percent of the subjects made recommendations to improve communication. Suggestions made by the respondents for improving communication satisfaction were: to increase the amount of open communication, improved personal feedback, and improved relationship with supervisor. The finding confirms the views of Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997), Boone and Kurtz (1993), Barge, (1994), and Daft (2002). Boone and Kurtz (1993) stated that open communication is desirable because it enhances human relationships and that communication, both formal and informal, is the lifeblood of any organization. Barge (1994) noted, "for leadership to be effective, communication must help organizational members reduce ambiguity" (p. 13).

Clearly educational leaders must foster and nurture a climate of open communication. According to Daft (2002), open communication means sharing all types of communication to include leader-follower relationships and formal and informal communication. He contended that open communication inspires collaboration and commitment to common goals. With effective communication, information passes without distortion upward, downward, and horizontally throughout the organization (Barge & Kurtz, 1993).

A correlation was found between leadership factors and communication satisfaction factors. As satisfaction with communication increases, so does the preference for transformational leadership as well as perceived quality of leadership. This finding reinforced Pace and Faules (1989) statement that leadership and communication are intimately intertwined. Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997) also shared the same view stating that communication is inseparable from leadership. Hoy and Miskel (1996, 2001) noted that understanding communication is important to educational leaders, who must use communication to create understanding within the organization.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that should be considered. The first being the method of data collection. The survey collection method was flawed in that the researcher was unaware that United States postal stamps were not accepted by some postal services in the Micronesian Islands. For example, the post office in the Federated State of Micronesia (FSM) would not mail out the surveys without an FSM postal stamp. Additionally, mail-drop boxes in the islands are few, remote, and in many cases

nonexistence. This circumstance might have discouraged participants from returning the surveys. For many, a trip to the post office is out of the way and inconvenient.

The second limitation of this study was the timeframe for the distribution of the survey. The researcher distributed the surveys personally during the last week of April 2000 and the first week of May 2000. Upon arrival on various islands (Marshall Island, Pohnpe, Saipan, Guam, and Palau) to distribute the survey, the researcher was surprised to learn that some of the colleges had changed the end of their spring semester. The timeliness could have discouraged the faculty from participation in the study.

The third limitation involves group size. There were an unequal number of subjects in each of the colleges thereby limiting the generalization of the results.

A fourth limitation of this study can be attributed to the participant's response. The researcher was an employee of one of the colleges at the time that the study was conducted therefore; subjects may have felt an obligation to provide desirable responses.

Implications and Recommendations

This study added to the limited knowledge of faculty communication satisfaction in community colleges in Micronesia and faculty perception of leadership.

The results of this study have implications for leadership in community colleges especially at the department level. Department chairs have the responsibility to provide information, direction, and support for faculty. The information drawn from this study is important not only to department chairs, but also to deans, vice presidents, presidents and the governing boards in their development of policies, that will assure quality training

and professional development, and to regularly evaluate leadership effectiveness for continuous institutional improvement.

Policy and Practice

It is recommended that policy makers support leadership and commit to ongoing leadership training to include communication training. Lucas (1994) emphasized the call for leaders at every level, who are capable of creating a vision, communicating that vision to others, and stimulating their people. “Such leadership is crucial not only in senior administrators but also in department chairs” (p.5).

A policy in selecting persons for department chairmanship should be considered in hiring or promoting individuals with good leadership behaviors as well as good communication skills. Historically people have been selected for administrative positions in community college from a faculty position to department chairperson or another administrative ladder without readiness and training in leadership that is so important to meet the challenges of their roles and to develop the skills of transformational leadership (Roueche et. al, 1989). An option is to educate and train individuals to become better leaders. Avolio and Bass (1999) contended that transformational leadership can be taught and it is possible to improve the leadership capabilities of individuals. “Clearly, the answer to the question, can transformational leadership be effectively taught and learned is affirmative” (Bass, 1998, p. 114). Hence, transformational leadership can be taught.

Good communication skills are imperative; particularly in a multicultural setting. “The potential for communication errors is increased because of cultural and language

differences” (Daft, 2002, p. 365). Therefore, policy makers must provide professional, qualified individuals to offer training in leadership and in communication. Equally important is provision of quality training programs for furthering the growth and professional development of department chairs. “Department chairs are key leaders in any successful higher education institution, and without such leadership by chairs, no institution can be continuously successful” (Seagren et.al., 1993).

Respondents commonly suggested the need for open communication, improved personal feedback, and an improved relationship with the supervisor. “Open lines of communication ensure that organizational members know why an action is being taken and what is expected of them” (Cohen et.al, 1994, p. 51). Bennis and Nanus (1985) corroborated this notion and accentuated the importance of open communication.

Faculty could support their leader by focusing on the goals and the objectives of the department as well as the mission of the college. One way of supporting a leader is to undertake a proactive role in the day-to-day affairs in the department. This can be achieved by simply asking questions or by telling the leader, what their needs are, or by making suggestions. Faculty need to open the lines of communication by building a relationship with the leader.

Department chairs must also open the lines of communication with faculty. The chairperson is immediately responsible for the health of the department (Cohen et. al., 1994). Therefore, the leaders in the department must find and provide every opportunity for faculty to communicate their satisfaction, dissatisfaction, opinions, and improvements.

In a multicultural environment, one way that leaders can deal with cultural issues in communication is to be aware, be sensitive, understand the culture, and discover innovative ways for faculty to express themselves without violating any cultural norms. Daft (2002) suggested, “leaders can use many communication methods including rich channels of communication, stories, metaphors, informality, openness, and dialogue” (p. 319). Department chairs could consider holding meetings in an informal setting. One example would be to conduct a meeting “after hours” in conjunction with food since food plays a major role in the island culture. Food symbolizes hospitality and openness.

Communication channels include face-to-face communication, telephonic, electronic mail, memos, and formal reports. The use of stories and metaphors bring about visual imagery and emotions that allow the leader to connect with employees. Dialogue is more than just talking. Dialogue means that each person suspends his viewpoints or differences to gain access to new information (Daft, 2002).

Department chairs could use stories and legends to communicate with faculty. For example, the department chair could use the legend of the coconut tree to communicate the importance of cooperation and unity in obtaining departmental goals and objectives. Long ago a dying young girl yearned for a fruit that would quench her thirst and hunger. The village people tirelessly searched the island but to no avail. Before the young girl died, she promised that such a fruit would exist and that the people would be reminded of her each time they have the fruit she so desired. One day, on the girl’s grave, a coconut tree grew and the villagers nurtured and protected the coconut tree to insure its survival. The tree bore coconuts on which one could see the imprinted face of the young girl.

The department chair could point out that the college community needs to work together to nurture and protect the institution's mission. The diligent efforts by the college community would be fruitful and beneficial to all on the island.

Instruments

The researcher found the CSQ and MLQ useful in obtaining information on communication and leadership. However, other communication and leadership instruments could be explored to analyze specific organizational needs. If subjects have a primary language other than English, researchers could develop a culturally appropriate instrument in gathering information concerning leadership and communication satisfaction to ensure respondents understand the survey questions.

Researchers should use the instruments in this study in similar organizational settings to confirm the findings of this study. Although a significant relationship was found between leadership and communication satisfaction, more research is needed to prove that the relationship is consistent in various settings.

The results of this study could assist organizations in making better decisions regarding policies on selection of leaders and professional development. Additionally, the instruments used in this study may assist in examining the condition of an organization with regard to leadership and communication satisfaction.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations should be considered in conducting further research:

1. The primary recommendation is to replicate this study with a larger sample population.
2. Future researchers might replicate this study in other community colleges and in multicultural settings in order to confirm or discredit the findings.
3. It would be insightful to examine the relationship between the independent variables (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire) and leadership styles and leadership outcomes (leadership effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and extra effort).
4. Research on the role of gender in how male and female department chairs are perceived in relation to leadership practices.
5. A case study or focus group in the five community colleges could be investigated to better understand leadership and its impact on communication—specifically in a multicultural setting.
6. A study on the influence of culture on leadership and communication satisfaction would contribute to our understanding.

Conclusion

Many organizations today are facing a multitude of issues that demand an effective leader. The findings of this study contribute to a better understanding of communication satisfaction and leadership. The results of this study have added to the

limited knowledge of instructional faculty in community colleges—specifically in Micronesia.

The education and training of department chairs have the potential to significantly improve communication satisfaction. Community colleges must implement the most effective leadership practices to remain successful in the face of serving a diverse, multi-racial faculty and student population, and in an environment of severe fiscal constraints in education. Although not a panacea, transformational leadership can be a tremendous source of stability in the ever-changing environment in the islands of Micronesia. It is important for community colleges to develop their leadership capabilities so that they become more effective and in the process have more satisfied employees. Additionally, it is important for leaders to communicate in ways that are satisfying to employees.

Communication satisfaction has important implications for organizations. Without effective communication there can be no effective sharing of ideas. Satisfied employees can put ideas into action. Organizations can increase their employee communication satisfaction through sound leadership. Further research on the essence of leadership will allow us to develop methods to teach individuals become better leaders in a diverse society. Effective leaders in higher education can positively affect realization of a college's vision, mission, goals, and objectives. Leaders who can communicate can build and maintain outstanding educational institutions.

REFERENCES

- Alfred, R.L. (1994). Research and practice on shared governance and participatory decision making. In Baker, G. A. (Ed). *A hand book on the community college in America*, (pp. 245-283). Wesport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Arnold, G.L., & Peterson, M.W. (1998). The influence of gender structures on perceptions of workplace culture and climate. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (38th, Minneapolis, MN, May 17-20, 1998). ED 422821.
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the ... *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 72(4) 441-463.
- Bailey, T.R., & Averianova, I.E. (1998). Multiple missions of community colleges: conflicting or complementary? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED439762)
- Barge, J.K. (1994). *Leadership: Communication skills for organizations and groups*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Bass, B.M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Harper.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). Concepts of leadership. In Pierce, J. L. & Newstrom, J. W. *Leaders and the leadership process* (pp. 5-12). Austin Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (Ed.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bennett, J. B. (1988). Department chairs: leadership in the trenches. In Green, M. F. (Ed). *Leaders for a new era* (pp. 57-73). Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985,1997). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S.(1964). *The Managerial Grid*, Houston: Gulf, 10.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1992). Reframing leadership: The effects of leaders' images of leadership. In K. Clark (Ed.). *Impact on leadership* (pp.269-280). Greensboro: Center for Creative Leadership.

Boone, L.E. & Kurtz, D.L.(1993). *Contemporary business communication*. Prentice-Hall

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Chemers, M. M., & Ayman, R. (Eds.). (1993). *Leadership theory and research*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Clampitt, P.G.(1988). Downs/Hazen communication satisfaction questionnaire. In C.W. Downs. *Communication audit* (pp. 112-132). Glenview IL: Scott-Foresman.

Clampitt, P.G., & Downs, C.W. (1993). Employee perception of the relationship between communication and productivity. A Field study. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 30 (1), 5-28.

Coats, L.T. (1996). Analyzing community college department chairs' effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Southeastern Association for Community College Research (25th, Panama City, FL, August 5-7).

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F.B. (1996). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Community College Leadership Development Initiative (2002). Meeting new leadership challenges in the community colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447888)

Crino, M. D. & M. C. White (1981). Satisfaction in communication: an examination of the Downs-Hazen measure. *Psychological Report*, 49, 831-838.

Crouch, B.S., & Hellweg, S.A. (1989). Subordinate communication satisfaction as a function of superior-subordinate co-orientation regarding performance feedback rules. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Spokane, Wa, February 17-21, 1989). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED316900)

Daft, R. L. (1999). *Leadership theory and practice*. Orlando: Dryden Press.

Daft, R. L. (2002). *The leadership experience*. South-Western, Thompson Learning.

Downs, C. W. & Michael D. Hazen (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 14_(3), 63-73.

Downs, C. W. (1998). Professional communication in Asia/Pacific organizations: A comparative study. Paper presented at the 1998 NIC Symposium on Intercultural Communication, November 26-28, Goteburg, Sweden.

Downs, C.W., DeWine, S. & Greenbaum, H.H. (1994). Measures of organizational communication. In R.B. Rubin et. al (Ed). *Communication research measures: A Sourcebook* (pp. 57-78). NY: Gilford.

Fielder, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Fiedler, F. E. (1972). How do you make leaders more effective? New answers to an old puzzle. In J. L Pierce, & J. W. Newstrom (Eds.), *Leaders and the leadership process* (pp. 107-111). Homewood: Austen Press

Grant, J.A. (1994). Compliance-gaining strategies, communication satisfaction, and willingness to comply. *Communication Reports*, 7(2), 99-109.

Gregson, T. (1990). Communication satisfaction: A path analytic study of accountants affiliated with CPA firms. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 2, 32-50

Gregson, T. (1991). The separate constructs of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 51(1) 39-49.

Gillett-Karam, R. (1999). Midlevel management in the community college: A rose garden? In Gillett-Karam (Ed). *Preparing department chairs for their leadership roles. New directions for community colleges*, (pp. 5-12). Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Goldhaber, G. M. (1990) *Organizational communication*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers. Gronn, P. (1995).

Goldhaber, G.M. & Rogers, D.P. (1979). *Auditing organizational communication system*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Goldhaber, G. M., Yates, M. P., Porter, D. I. & Lesniak, R. (1987). Organizational communication. *Human Communication Research*, 5 (1), 76-96.

Gronn, P., Ribbins, P. (1996). Leaders in context: Postpositivist approaches to understanding educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(3), p.452-474.

Heiman, G.W. (1992). *Basic Statistics for the behavioral sciences*, Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J.W. (1996). *Management* (7th ed.). International Thompson Publishing.

Hencley, S.P. (1973). Situational behavioral approach to the study of educational leadership. In L. C. Cunningham, & W.J.Gephart (Eds.), *Leadership: The science and art today*, (pp. 139-164). Itaska, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Hencley, S.P. (1973). Situational behavioral approach to the study of educational leadership. In L. C. Cunningham & W.J. Gephart (Eds.), *Leadership: The science and art today*. (pp. 139-164). Itaska, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of organizational Behavior utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). Situational Leadership. In J. L. Pierce & J. W. Newstrom (1995). *Leaders and the leadership process* (pp. 112-113).

Hezel, F. X. (1992). The expensive taste for modernity: Caroline and Marshall Islands. Retrieved from <http://www.micsem.org/pubs/publication/histwork>

- Hooper, R. A. & Potter, J.R. (2000). *Intelligence leadership: Creating a passion for change*. Random House, London.
- House, R. J. (1972). Path-goal theory of leadership. In J. L. Pierce and J. W. Newstrom *Leaders and the leadership process* (pp. 101-106). Austin Press
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (1987, 2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. (3rd Ed. 6th Ed.). New York: Random House.
- Hoy, W.K. & Brown, B.L. (1988). Leadership behavior of principals and the zone of acceptance of elementary teachers. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26 (1), 23-38.
- Huck, S. W. & Cormier, W.H. (1996). *Reading statistics and research*. HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1996). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*. Chicago: Irwin.
- Jablin, F. M. (1982). Organizational communication: An assimilation approach. In M. E. Roloff & C. R. Berger (Eds.), *Social cognition and communication* (pp. 255-286). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Johlke, M.C., Duhan, D.F., Howell, R.D., & Wilkes, R.W. (2000). An integrated model of sales managers' communication practices. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2) 263-278.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. (1995). Leadership: do traits matter? In J. L. Pierce, & J. W. Newstrom (Eds.), *Leadership & the leadership process*. (pp. 43-47). Chicago: Austen Press.

Kramer, M.W. (1995). A longitudinal study of superior-subordinate communication during job transfers. *Human Communication Research*, 22(1) 39-65.

Lee, Y. & Chen, C.(1996). A Study of the relationships among perceived leadership styles, employee communication satisfaction, and employee organizational commitment in the petrochemical industry in Taiwan. Presented at the Fourth Annual Conference on Global Business Environment and Strategy, Anchorage, Alaska (July)

Leithwood, K.A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K.A., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(4), 249-280.

Leithwood, K.A., & Steinbach, R. (1991). Indicators of transformational leadership in the everyday problem solving of school administrators. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 4(3), 221-244.

Levy, N.(2000). *Micronesian Handbook*. Avalon Travel Publishing.

Lewis, A. (1989). *Restructuring America's schools*. Arlington, Va: American Association of School Administrators.

Lowe, K.B., & Galen, K.K. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic... *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3) p.385-426.

Lucas, A.F. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass Inc.

Luthans, F. (1991). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M.(1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook*

of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE

Myran, G., Zeiss, T. & Howdyshell, L. (1995). *Community college leadership in the new century: Learning to improve learning*. Washington D.C.: Oryx Press

Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Pace, R.W., & Faules, D. F. (1989,1994). *Organizational Communication*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffe, New Jersey.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage Publications, Inc. Newbury Park, London.

Parrish, R.W., Tucker, M.L., Gulbro, R.D., & Dimas, T. (1995). Strengthening small business competitive advantage through leadership, communication, and customer satisfaction. *The Delta Business Review*. Spring/Summer95.

Pearce, G.C., & Segal G.J. (1998). Effects of organizational communication satisfaction on job performance and firm growth in small business. Retrieved from <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/docs/proceedingsII/98sbi178.txt>

Peters, T.J. & Waterman Jr., R.H. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row, Publisher, Inc.

Pettit, J.D., Goris J.R., & Vaught, B.C. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34(1), 81-89

Phillippe, K.A. (2000). National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics. Washington D.C. American Association of community colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED440671)

- Pierce, J. L., & Newstrom J. W. (1995). *Leaders and the leadership process*. Homewood: Austen Press.
- Pincus, D. J. & Rayfield, R.E. (1986). The relationship between top management communication and organizational effectiveness. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED269793)
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday R. T. & Boulian , P. V. (1974) Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Putti, J.M. & Aryee, S. (1990). Communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Management*, 15(1) 44-53.
- Putti, J.M., Tong, A.C., (1992). Effects of leader behavior on subordinate satisfaction in a Civil Service-Asian context. *Public Personnel Management*, Spring 92, 21(1) 53
- Pu, Ying-Pei. (1988). A study on the relationships of work value, leadership style, communication satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Doctoral Dissertation, National Cheng Chi University, Taipei, Taiwan, 1988, 54.
- Redding, W. C. (1970). Communication within Organization. *New York, Industrial Communication Council*, 21.
- REM Associates of Princeton, Inc. Open communication. Retrieved from <http://www.remassoc.com>
- Roberts, K.H. & O'Riley, C.A. (1993). Measuring organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59, 321-326

- Robles, H. J. (1998). Leadership in higher education. (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED426742)
- Rost, J.C., (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT, Praeger
Publishers.
- Roueche, J. E., Baker, G.A., & Rose, R.R. (1989). *Shared vision:
Transformational leadership in American community colleges*. Washington, DC.
Community College Press.
- Rubin, R.B., Palmgreen, P.R., & Styler, H.E. (Ed.). (1994). *Communication
research measures: a source book*. Guilford Press.
- Rubin, R.B., Palmgreen, P.R., & Styler, H.E. (1994). *Academic leadership in
community colleges*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln and London
- Ruch, R.S. & Goodman, R. (1983). *Image at the top: Crisis and renaissance in
corporate leadership*. New York: Free Press, London: Collier MacMillan
- Seagren, A.T., Creswell, J.W., & Wheeler, D.W. (1993). *The department chair:
new roles, responsibilities and challenges*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1,
Washington D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human
Development.
- Seagren, A.T., Cresswell, J.W., Wheeler, D.T., Miller, M.T., & VanHorn-
Grassmeyer (1994). *Academic leadership in community colleges*. University of Nebraska
Press.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1989). The leadership needed for quality schools. In T.J.
Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), *Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues
that count*. (pp. 213-226), Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 23-27.
- Singer, M.S., & Singer, A.E., (1990). Situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 130(3) 385-397.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. Harper Collens College Publisher.
- Thiry, R.A.(1977). Relationship of communication satisfaction to need fulfillment among Kansas nurses. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 38, 3131B.
- Tucker, M.L., Bass, B.M., & Daniel, L.G. (1992). Transformational leadership's impact on higher education satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. In K. Clark (Ed.), *Impact on leadership*, (pp. 170-175). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Twombly, S.B. & Amey, M.J. (1994). Leadership skill for participative governance. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America*, (pp. 268-283) Wesport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Tyrrell, F., Stine, D.O. (1997). Transformational leaders for new organizations. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 27(3) 34-36.
- Valle, M. (1999). Crisis, culture and charisma: The new leader's work in public organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(2) 245-258.
- Varona, F.(1996). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational communication in the three Guatemalan organizations. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 33, 2, 111-140.

Vogt, J.F. and Murrell, K.L.(1990). *Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance*. CA, University Associates.

Walther, C.N. (1988). Communication satisfaction in the bank: An audit evaluation. *Journal of Business Communication*, 25(3), 79-86.

Yukl, G. A.(1994). *Leadership in Organization*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc.

From: **Patrick Tellei** <tellei@belau.org>
To: **ulloa-heath@att.net**
Subject: **Re: Request to conduct study**
Date: **Thu, 08 Mar 2001 10:00:52 +0900**

HI Julie,

Good to hear from you, was in Saipan a few weeks ago and heard you've left island. I'm still on the same boat, still need to communicate with Human Subjects Committee.

No problem, will help you from this end.

Patrick Tellei

From: **"Alfred Capelle"** <cmi@ntamar.com>
To: <ulloa-heath@att.net>
Cc: **"John Tuthill"** <jtuthill_maj@yahoo.com>, **"Raymond J. Boucher"** <cmiexec@ntamar.com>
Subject: **RE: Research**
Date: **Sat, 10 Mar 2001 17:58:23 +1200**

Dear Julie Ulloa-Heath,

Thank you for your interest in CMI. You are welcome to conduct your doctoral dissertation research as you described in your request below. I'm forwarding a copy of this communication to Dr. John Tuthill, Vice President of Academic Affairs, with whom you will need to coordinate and schedule your research. I'm also informing my Executive Assistant, Raymond Boucher, so he can provide any further assistance that you may require of my office.

Since May is a busy time for us, let me suggest that you conduct your research during the week of April 22 to 28. A copy of the outcome of your research would be appreciated. Good luck.

Alfred Capelle

From: **Rowena Bartonico** <rbartonico@guamcc.net>
To: julieu@acusd.edu, ulloa-heath@att.net
Cc: drhero@guamcc.net, jrrider@guamcc.net
Subject: **Doctoral Dissertation Research**
Date: **Fri, 16 Mar 2001 14:14:19 +1000**

Dear Ms. Ulloa-Heath:

Your request to conduct a doctoral dissertation survey regarding a department chair's leadership style and faculty's satisfaction with communication here at the Guam Community College has been granted.

Dr. Rider, Vice President of Academic Affairs, has been notified and will be your point of contact. Please coordinate all efforts through him from this moment on.

Sincerely,

H. delos Santos, Ed.D.
President

From: **"Smoses"** <smoses@comfsm.fm>
To: <ulloa-heath@att.net>
Subject: **Re: Research**
Date: **Tue, 17 Apr 2001 12:31:14 +1100**

Dear Ms. Ulloa-Heath,

I apologize for the delay in responding to your request to include our staff in your study of the leadership style of division chairpersons. Before responding to your request, I consulted with the chairs who would be involved in this study. Yesterday I was advised to inform you that they would be willing to participate in your study.

Sue Moses

Alfred Capelle

From: **Rowena Bartonico** <rbartonico@guamcc.net>
To: julieu@acusd.edu, ulloa-heath@att.net
Cc: drhero@guamcc.net, jrrider@guamcc.net
Subject: **Doctoral Dissertation Research**
Date: **Fri, 16 Mar 2001 14:14:19 +1000**

Dear Ms. Ulloa-Heath:

Your request to conduct a doctoral dissertation survey regarding a department chair's leadership style and faculty's satisfaction with communication here at the Guam Community College has been granted.

Dr. Rider, Vice President of Academic Affairs, has been notified and will be your point of contact. Please coordinate all efforts through him from this moment on.

Sincerely,

H. delos Santos, Ed.D.
President

From: **"Smoses"** <smoses@comfsm.fm>
To: <ulloa-heath@att.net>
Subject: **Re: Research**
Date: **Tue, 17 Apr 2001 12:31:14 +1100**

Dear Ms. Ulloa-Heath,

I apologize for the delay in responding to your request to include our staff in your study of the leadership style of division chairpersons. Before responding to your request, I consulted with the chairs who would be involved in this study. Yesterday I was advised to inform you that they would be willing to participate in your study.

Sue Moses

Dear Faculty:

I am studying faculty perception on leadership and satisfaction with communication for the completion of my doctorate in the School of Education at the University of San Diego. I humbly ask for your participation in this study.

Through this study, I am hoping to obtain some valid statistics on seven dimensions of communication: organizational perspective; organizational integration; communication climate; media quality; communication with top management; personal feedback; and horizontal and informal communication. The outcome of the survey may help provide useful information that would address performance standards of the WASC accreditation. In addition, it may be helpful in improving communication, leadership, and professional development in your institution.

Attached you will find two instruments and a demographic survey. Your input is extremely valuable for my study, so I would greatly appreciate your help. Please complete the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. You can mail them using the self-addressed envelope or you can drop them off at _____ no later than May 15, 2001. It should take no more than 15 minutes of your time to complete them. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You may be assured of confidentiality. Please do not write your name in any of the forms. Also, be sure to answer every question. Every question should receive only one answer (except for the open-ended question).

All responses will be kept confidential. They will only be used in statistical analyses without mentioning any identifying details.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me using my e-mail of **julieu@acUSD.edu** or **ulloa-heath@att.net**

Let me thank you in advance for completing the questionnaire. Your participation is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Julie M. Ulloa-Heath

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

Introduction : Most of us assume that the quality and amount of communication in our jobs contribute to both our job satisfaction and our productivity. Through this study we hope to find out how satisfactory communication practices are and what suggestions you have for improving them. We appreciate your taking time to complete the questionnaire. It should take 20 to 30 minutes.

Your answers are completely confidential so be as frank as you wish. This is not a test – your opinion is the only right answer. Do not sign your name; we do not wish to know who you are. The answers will be combined into groups for reporting purposes.

1. How satisfied are you with your job? (check 1)

☐ 1. Very satisfied	☐ 5. Somewhat dissatisfied
☐ 2. Satisfied	☐ 6. Dissatisfied
☐ 3. Somewhat satisfied	☐ 7. Very dissatisfied
☐ 4. Indifferent	

2. In the past 6 months, what has happened to your level of satisfaction? (check 1)

- ☐ 1. Gone up ☐ 2. Stayed the same ☐ 3. Gone down

If the communication associated with your job could be changed in any way to make you more satisfied, please indicate how:

A. Listed below are several kinds of information often associated with a person's job. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the *amount* and/or *quality* of each kind of information by circling the appropriate number at the right.

	Very Satisfied			Indifferent			Very Dissatisfied		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
4. Information about my progress in my job								1	2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Personal news								1	2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Information about organizational policies and goals								1	2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Information about how my job compares with others								1	2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Information about how I am being judged								1	2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Recognition of my efforts								1	2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Information about departmental policies and goals								1	2 3 4 5 6 7

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

Very Satisfied	Indifferent					Very Dissatisfied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
11. Information about the requirements of my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Information about government action affecting my organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Information about changes in our organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Information about benefits and pay	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Information about our organization's financial standing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Information about accomplishments and/or failures of the organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following (circle the appropriate number at the right).

Very Satisfied	Indifferent					Very Dissatisfied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
18. Extent to which my superiors know and understand the problems faced by subordinates	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Extent to which the organization's communication motivates and stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting its goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Extent to which my superior listens and pay attention to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Extent to which the people in my organization have great ability as communicators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job related problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Extent to which the organization's communication makes me identify with it or feel a vital part of it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Extent to which the organization's communications are interesting and helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Extent to which I receive in time the information needed to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Extent to which the grapevine is active in our organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Extent to which horizontal communication with other organizational members is accurate and free flowing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Extent to which my work group is compatible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. Extent to which our meetings are well organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication in the organization are basically healthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. Extent to which the amount of communication in the organization is about right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Rater Form (5x-Short)

Please rate your department/division chair

This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.** Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

IMPORTANT (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?

- ☐ I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.
☐ The person I am rating is at my organizational level.
☐ I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.
☐ I do not wish my organizational level to be known.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently or always
0	1	2	3	4

THE PERSON I AM RATING...

1.	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.....	0	1	2	3	4
2.	Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.....	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Fails to interfere until problems become serious.....	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.....	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.....	0	1	2	3	4
6.	Talks about their most important values and beliefs.....	0	1	2	3	4
7.	Is absent when needed.....	0	1	2	3	4
8.	Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.....	0	1	2	3	4
9.	Talks optimistically about the future.....	0	1	2	3	4
10.	Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	0	1	2	3	4
12.	Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.....	0	1	2	3	4
13.	Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.....	0	1	2	3	4
14.	Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.....	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Spends time teaching and coaching	0	1	2	3	4

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. All rights reserved.

Distributed by Mind Garden, Inc., 1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 (650) 261-3500

Continued =>

	Not at all 0	Once in a while 1	Sometimes 2	Fairly often 3	Frequently or always 4
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.....	0	1	2	3	4
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."	0	1	2	3	4
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.....	0	1	2	3	4
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group	0	1	2	3	4
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action	0	1	2	3	4
21. Acts in ways that builds my respect	0	1	2	3	4
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.....	0	1	2	3	4
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	0	1	2	3	4
24. Keeps track of all mistakes.....	0	1	2	3	4
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence	0	1	2	3	4
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future	0	1	2	3	4
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards	0	1	2	3	4
28. Avoids making decisions	0	1	2	3	4
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others	0	1	2	3	4
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles	0	1	2	3	4
31. Helps me to develop my strengths	0	1	2	3	4
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	0	1	2	3	4
33. Delays responding to urgent questions.....	0	1	2	3	4
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission	0	1	2	3	4
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations	0	1	2	3	4
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.....	0	1	2	3	4
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs	0	1	2	3	4
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying	0	1	2	3	4
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do.....	0	1	2	3	4
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority	0	1	2	3	4
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way	0	1	2	3	4
42. Heightens my desire to succeed	0	1	2	3	4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements	0	1	2	3	4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder.....	0	1	2	3	4
45. Leads a group that is effective	0	1	2	3	4

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect demographic information for the study. Please answer each question by placing an "x" next to the one most appropriate answer. This information is confidential and will be used only in conjunction with research on this topic. Please do not add your name to the completed form. Thank you for your participation.

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. What is your age?
3. What is your ethnicity?
4. How many years have you used English as your primary language at work?
5. Education BA degree? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Beyond BA
6. What department are you in?
7. How long have you worked in current department?
8. Number of people in your department (including supervisor)?
9. Gender of your supervisor?
☐ Male ☐ Female
10. Since the beginning of the school year, how many department meetings has been conducted?

If the communication associate with your job could be changed in any way to make you more satisfied, please indicate how:

College 1

1. More transparency between administration and faculty on decisions that affect faculty and the quality of education standards at XXX. Weekly bulletin that is published and distributed to all employees (more often to inform us of executive decisions that are being considered. We often hear of finalized decisions after it had gone through admin. And executive council without employee/faculty consulting.
2. On all levels (faculty, admin, staff) people often do not go directly to others to clearly register disagreement and confusion. This needs to improve.
3. We have a great gap between faculty and administration which also is enhanced by communication problems of two different languages. I would wish for this gap to become more narrow or ways to bridge it.
4. To be aggressive.
5. If communication between myself and my students were improved.
6. More long range planning that really happens. Often management is done from crisis to crisis even though lot of lip service is given to plans for the future.
7. I was dissatisfied in the past because we rarely had meetings. Now we are having meetings and I feel much more informed and happy.
8. More discussions about what is going on – more information about decisions being made.

College 2

1. More public postings by President's office rather than subordinates.
2. Chair that communicates.
3. More avenues for effective communications for faculty – faculty empowerment.
4. More comments from Admin like VP, Dean of Instruction on individual success...feels like we are a part of a community and cared about
5. I would like the scope of my job to become more focused, as I understand it this will more likely occur soon.

6. More informal interaction between “upper echelon” admin and faculty.
7. Instructors are often the last to know about issues that affect them.
8. Less bosses.

College 3

1. The overwhelming support I get with the Tourism Academy.
2. Problem is actions speak louder than word. Verbal support without action is nothing. Frustration grows.

College 4

1. Just a little visit to come around and see what we are doing and make suggestion or comments to our student work.
2. Open a two- way communication. Give us the empowerment of budgeting and improving our jobs.
3. I need more visual aids.
4. I wish there would be less red tape and that people were just honest.
5. I would appreciate having my feedback considered when decision-making involves areas of the organization that affect me directly.
6. Eliminate middle person to allow direct.
7. None. My satisfaction has nothing to do with communication. It deals with the job itself, getting a bit routine.
8. More meetings and interaction.
9. To be more open between a supervisor and staff to iron out misunderstanding and confusion.
10. My supervisor needs to include me in their plan making and decisions in areas that I am responsible for. I was told to basically shut up.

11. Feedback and communication sometimes not effective.
12. Communication comes from supervisor not other people. Not many deadlines from other personnel other than supervisor.
13. To have more open communication between the administration and faculty.
14. Free and open communication. There are numerous occasions when I want to pour out what's inside of me (mostly frustration) but I can't because of my job security and mostly for others who don't take what I say seriously.

College 5

1. Administration needs to communicate in a more timely manner. All communication needs to pass down instead of kept by only a few people.
2. We don't share much professionally or socially, in my opinion, and are not really encouraged to do so. This is an apathetic department – nobody seems to know or care much about others.
3. If only I had received my feedback .
4. More faculty meetings of our department.
5. More open communication between staff and faculty members. Nicer relationship with one another.
6. My supervisor should ask in our monthly meetings for us to provide in writing individual problems that are sensitive to be discussed in group meetings to be reviewed and discussed without revealing the name of individual for group input to resolve the problem.
7. Provide newsletter on upcoming events and results of important activities that have taken place or that would be considered useful information. Circulate external news to all divisions or disseminate informative email to everyone.

College 1	College 2	College	College 4	College5
More transparency	More public posting	Action speaks louder than words	Come around and see	Need to communicate and pass down
Weekly bulleting-published and distributed	Chair that communicates		Make suggestion or comments	We don't share much
People don't go directly to others	More avenues of communication		Open a two-way communication	If only I receive feedback
Great gap-bridge it	More comments on individuals		Need more visual aids	More meetings
Communication between myself and student	Scope of my job to become more focused		Less red tape	More open communication
Mgt is done crisis to crisis	More informal interaction		My feedback considered	My supervisor should ask problems
Rarely had meetings	Instructors are last to know		Eliminate middle person	Provide newsletter-circulate & disseminate
More discussion about what is going on			Job getting routine	
			More meetings	
			More interaction	
			To be open	
			Iron out misunderstanding & confusion	
			Include me in their plan in areas I'm responsible	
			Communication	
			Feedback	
			Communication comes from supervisor	
			More open communication	
			Open communication