2007-05-01

Communication and Leadership: Faculty Perceptions of the Department Chair

Kathleen Czech EdD
University of San Diego

COMMUNICATION & LEADERSHIP: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

by

KATHLEEN CZECH

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
University of San Diego

May 2007

Dissertation Committee

Fred J. Galloway, Ed.D., Chair
Mary Woods Scherr, Ph.D., Member
Jo A. Birdsell, Ed.D., Member

ABSTRACT

With department chairs providing a critical link between faculty and administration, their leadership impacts universities on a broad level. However, chairs often report dissatisfaction with the position and experience rapid turnover. In an effort to help understand the role that communication plays in effective leadership for department chairs, this study provides an empirical test of Gibb's theory of defensive vs. supportive communication.

As such, this project investigated the communication and leadership behaviors of university department chairs as evaluated by their faculty members. Specifically, 202 randomly selected faculty members from colleges and universities affiliated with the Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C., comprise the sample. Respondents completed a multi-page survey assessing supportive and defensive communication, Bureaucratic, Machiavellian, and Transformational leadership behaviors of their department chair, and in addition, faculty members evaluated perceived chair effectiveness, their own relational and job satisfaction, as well as organizational commitment.

T-tests revealed that more effective chairs utilized all six supportive communication behaviors more and five of six defensive behaviors less than their more negatively evaluated peers. Furthermore, multiple regression procedures explained 53% of the variance in perceived chair effectiveness showing that the supportive behaviors of problem orientation and description and the defensive behaviors of strategy and control were the most powerful predictors. Secondly, a series of regression procedures were used to explore the three types of leadership included in this study; communication

behaviors explained 17% of the variance in bureaucracy scores, 69% of the variance in Machiavellianism, and 62% of the variance in Transformational leadership.

Lastly, the study explored faculty job satisfaction and commitment using regression models; communication behaviors explained 56% of the variance in faculty job satisfaction and 41% of the variance in organizational commitment.

Based on the findings of this study four implications are discussed. The first implication is that communication does indeed matter. The second implication gleaned from this study is that leadership is a communication phenomenon. The third implication discusses the need for policy implementation of training for department chairs. Finally, it is recommended that Gibb's original instrument be utilized in more empirical research to continue to test his concepts validity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to first and foremost express my deep gratitude and sincere appreciation to my advisor and chair, Dr. Fred Galloway. He provided insight and enthusiasm through this entire journey which could not have been possible without him. I also am indebted to my committee. Dr. Mary Scherr provided encouragement and invaluable advice on the style of academic writing. I am grateful for her meticulous readings of the manuscript. Dr. Jo Birdsell lent her talents and insights to this project, and I particularly thank her for listening to me vent and understanding the dissertation process. My endless thanks go to the perfect doctoral committee.

The second group of people that helped make this project possible is my family. I wish to thank them for their patience, support, and enduring love. I thank my mom and dad for always believing in the value of education. To my son Kevin, who has missed play time with me when I had to do school work, but proudly calls me Dr. Mom. I am forever grateful for the day I married my husband, G.L. He has been my rock through this entire process, and he is truly the best thing that has ever happened to me. I love you G.L.

My journey would not have come to this end without the numerous educators who influenced my life along the way. I wish to express my appreciation to Ronna Liggett, who mentored me during my graduate studies. I also thank Dr. John Monsma, who first filled a passion in me for communication and research. Finally, I acknowledge the guidance of Jesus Christ throughout my entire life. Without Christ this journey and many others would never have been undertaken. Christ has given me the strength to do all things through Him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I: Introduction

Background

The modern university is in a continuous state of flux. "Radical changes are occurring," notes Muntiz (1995, p. 9) "that will alter fundamentally the nature of the university as we have known it for nearly a century." In part this change is occurring in colleges and universities across the country as more emphasis is being placed on leadership and accountability in higher education (Lucas, 2000). As tuition prices reach new highs, parents, taxpayers, and government officials are taking a more comprehensive review of the costs and benefits of colleges and universities (Ehrenberg, 2004). Researchers have reported that higher education is experiencing a "great leadership crisis" (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). The late president of Yale, A. Bartlett Giamatti, summed up the crisis in his essay "The Academic Mission" by stating "American institutions...for higher education...are not perceived as leading...because, in fact, the institutions themselves, while being competently managed in most cases, are not necessarily...being led" (Fryer & Lovas, 1991, p.5).

There is little doubt that change in higher education will continue throughout the next decade (Lucas, 2000). However, universities do not change easily, especially the type of change that requires restructuring management processes and modifying traditional notions about academic leadership (Muntiz, 1995). One facet of governance that colleges and universities must give more attention to is their smallest though most important subsystem, the department. Higher education will need to take the position of the department chair more seriously, as the role becomes more paramount in the transformation of higher education.

Statement of the Problem

Research identifies the department chair as key in the management of today's colleges and universities (Gmelch & Burns, 1994). The department chair can be viewed as the most important administrative position in higher education (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999). Chairs play an instrumental role in nearly every aspect of departmental life, with their actions reaching far beyond their individual departments (Lindholm, 1999). In 1996, The Pew Charitable Trusts' *Policy Perspectives* described the department chair as, "the principle change agent for the purposeful recasting of American higher education" (p.6). Chairs must be able to deal with constant change and develop critical skills to cope with and shape change in new and beneficial ways for higher education.

Perhaps, the most critical issue facing department chairs is the development, or lack there of, of leadership in higher education (Armstrong, Blake, & Pitrowski, 2000). However, effective leadership at the chair level will be critically important in the coming years (Lindholm, 1999). It is clear that the ultimate goal of a department should be to enhance leadership skills and potential despite the limitations of a bureaucratic higher educational system. A new leadership role for chairs is required for departments, universities, and higher education to continue to thrive.

The department chair is a different position than it was 20 years ago. The impact of changes in higher education has department chairs performing a wider range of crucial duties than ever before (Diamond, 1996). Tucker (1992) catalogued fifty-four separate duties of department chairs. The numerous roles that a chair performs include, but are not limited to, curriculum manager, budget manager, agent of change, mentor, mediator, entrepreneur, recruiter, rule interpreter, planner, and department representative (Hubbell

& Homer, 1997). To complicate matters more, the role of the chair is often contradictory in nature. It is for this reason that the position of chair has been compared to the Roman mythology god Janus, the god who has two faces. The chair's two faces consist of one oriented toward the administration and the other the face of a faculty member (Gmelch & Burns, 1994). Chairs often feel a divided loyalty between that of the administration and the faculty.

Even with divided loyalties, chairs interact and work more within the department on a daily basis. A large portion of the chair's time is devoted to issues that directly concern and affect faculty. Chair-faculty relationships are responsible for the motivation and socialization of faculty members within academia (Barge & Musambira, 1992). The type of relationship chairs cultivate with their faculty will further influence teaching and scholarly activities. The chair's ability to persuade, motivate, and guide faculty members is "enhanced when faculty perceive the relationship they have with their chair as positive" (Barge & Musambira, 1992). A key finding in higher education is that a department chair promotes academic excellence by developing appropriate relationships with faculty members (Knight & Holen, 1985).

While research has highlighted the importance of the chair-faculty relationship researchers have generally ignored the role of communication in developing the chair-faculty relationship or vaguely suggested improved communication. Unfortunately, little attention is given as to how one becomes a more competent communicator, and how chairs can adapt their own communication style and skills to promote leadership throughout the entire department (Munitz, 1995). It is unclear what types of

communication behaviors develop, maintain, and alter the chair-faculty relationship (Barge & Musambira, 1992).

Chairs rank communication at the top of the list of effective leadership skills they need to possess to be an effective chair, yet are provided a paucity of practical advice for using effective communication skills. Jack Gibb (1961) conceptualized and developed specific categories of defensive and supportive communication behaviors. Gibb's work provides insight into the specific communication behaviors that can create a supportive communication climate. These individual communication climates will be discussed at length in the review of the literature.

Further research is needed in the area of department chair's specific communication behaviors, specifically using Gibb's theory of defensive vs. supportive communication. Finding out what communication behaviors chairs utilize may help in creating a more effective leadership style and overall supportive department climate. Research in both leadership and communication needs to be undertaken in order to provide productive training to those who take on the role of chair and in order to help the chair and the department meet the challenges facing higher education in the next century.

Purpose statement.

The purpose of this study is to investigate specific communication behaviors that department chairs utilize in helping to build effective chair-faculty relationships. The study will utilize Jack Gibb's supportive and defensive communication climates to determine which behaviors faculty perceive as effective in enhancing chair-faculty interaction. The study will further investigate possible relationships between supportive communication and leadership style of the department chair. Finally, the study will look

for relationships between the department chair's communication climate and faculty job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Research questions.

This study will be guided by the following research questions:

RQ1: To what extent do department chairs utilize defensive or supportive communication behaviors as reported by faculty?

RQ2: What types of communication behaviors, defensive or supportive, do faculty perceive as effective for chair-faculty relationships and chair job effectiveness?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the perceived use of defensive and supportive communication climate and the department chair's leadership style?

RQ4: Is there a relationship between communication climate and faculty job satisfaction and organizational commitment?

Significance.

Hirokawa, Barge, Becker, and Sutherland (1989) began the initial attempt at a competency-based model to study the academic leadership of the department chair. Although a considerable amount of research had focused on the department chair, a visible void of specific behavioral competencies still remained. Their research eventually identified four categories for effective academic leadership. One of those categories dealt with the importance of climate management and communication (Hirokawa, Barge, Becker, & Sutherland, 1989). The crucial link of the discipline of communication and the field of higher education was brought together in Hirokawa's research as well as Hickson and McCroskey's 1991 research. Further research today identifies communication as the "lifeblood of every organization" and identifies effective

communication as a vital role in universities (Gizir, & Simsek, 2005, p.197). Communication and higher education finally connect as it is now "commonplace to depict and conceptualize the university as an organization" (Newton, 2002). The relationship between the disciplines of communication and higher education leadership are still very new and considerable research is still needed to connect these two fields.

The proposed study will hopefully contribute to the field of applied communication as well as adding to the higher education leadership literature by looking at one of the most important roles in the university system: the department chair. The purpose of this study is to determine what specific behaviors chairs can use in their communication style to be effective leaders and build satisfying chair-faculty relationships. There has been an emphasis upon identifying central characteristics of the chair, but few studies have examined the exact type of verbal and non-verbal communication behaviors a chair should use to build a communication climate and in turn, the organizational climate of the department to be the most effective leader (Barge & Musambira, 1992).

Limitations

There are three limitations already recognized at the on-set of this proposed research. The first limitation is the quantitative nature of the research itself. It can be argued that quantitative research is an over generalization of those individuals represented. All quantitative research has the possibility of over generalizing a particular public (Hays, 2005). Researchers should use extreme care in drawing conclusions from their data.

Limitation one is especially pertinent when considering the second limitation of this study which is that the sampling frame for this study was drawn exclusively from the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC). Since these colleges are in many ways different from public institutions any conclusions from this study are generalizable only to CIC institutions.

The third limitation also stems from the nature of doing quantitative research. The major mode of data collection is through a self-report instrument. Self-report data does not allow for clarification of the questions or take into account any confusion of the questions (Fowler, 1995). In other words, information provided on the questionnaire is assumed truthful and valid, but there is no guarantee that a respondent will answer in such ways. In addition, not all participants will return the survey and there may be differences in those that return the survey and those who do not (Gay, 1992).

Finally, other limitations are expected to arise during the study. In particular, attention and detail was paid to the sample and return rate. The data analysis was carefully monitored for accuracy and procedural protocol. All research was evaluated and monitored in the attempt to produce a sound study of merit. Further limitations will be discussed in chapter five.

Conclusion

This study pulls together several unique areas of study. Chapter two provides a review of the relevant literature. A mix of higher education leadership literature and communication literature is presented to ground the study. Chapter three will describe the methodology employed in this study, which is of a quantitative nature. The results

will be presented in chapter four, and analysis and discussion of those results will be considered and discussed in chapter five.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

This chapter will review relevant literature dealing with higher education leadership and communication. Within these areas there are four distinct bodies of literature that need to be investigated in order to fully understand the context of this study. The four areas of research critical to this study have been reviewed, beginning with an in-depth look at the role of the department chair in higher education. This is followed by an examination of higher education leadership literature. Next, literature focusing on research in the area of communication will be explored, along with communication research pertaining to higher education and findings in other communication contexts. The third area of research, which includes the organizational communication literature, will explore the various predictors and outcomes of organizational practices. The final portion of research will focus, specifically on Jack Gibb's defensive vs. supportive communication climates.

The department chair.

At one time the chair position was reserved for the most prestigious scholars and chairs presided over departments in a ceremonial manner. These chairs were not expected to deal with budget cuts, declining enrollments, productivity reports, accountability measures, and changing technology (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). Institutions today expect more than a figurehead from the department chair. Department faculty seek a strong advocate, consensus builder, and superb manager, while the administrators also want a leader with great communication skills, loyalty to the administration and mission of the university, and ability to implement

university policies. The role of the department chair is essential to the success of an academic institution (Bare, 1986).

Role expectations. The role of the department chair is far more challenging and different today than it was 10 years ago. The impact of the changes chairs face is enormous. Department chairs are performing a wider range of crucial duties than ever before (Diamond, 1996). A recent survey by Giles-Gee and McMahon (1997) showed a 79 percent increase in responsibilities for chairs, with greater emphasis on administration, accountability, productivity, and leadership functions. The changes in the nature of the department chair role deserve critical investigation. The role of the chair can no longer be a "pre-retirement stopover or an assignment that faculty members take turns filling simply because someone has to do it" (Diamond, 1996). This is an all too familiar sentiment among today's department chairs and faculty.

Many of the skills needed to be an effective department chair are not those cultivated while teaching and conducting research (Hickson & McCroskey, 1991). Most of the tasks routinely listed in the job description are becoming more demanding and complex. There is an astonishing variety of tasks and duties that face the department chairperson including labels such as leader, curriculum manager, budget manager, recruiter, mediator, decision maker, instructor, peer and colleague, and agent of change (Bliss, 1996). Department chairs deal with all of these roles and many more causing increased confusion and ambiguity about their own job description.

Challenges. The position of department chair is further complicated by its paradoxical nature. Department chairs have been compared to the god Janus, who has two different faces. The dual role the chair takes on is that of an administrator and

faculty member (Gmelch & Burns 1994). These roles can cause divided loyalties and contradictory demands between a chair's department faculty and the chair's dean. On the one hand, deans expect chairs to be part of the "management team" and therefore loyalty is of significant importance. On the other hand, faculty members expect the chair to represent forcefully the views and needs of the department to the deans and upper administrations (Hubbell & Homer, 1997). The complexity of the chair position is one few can comprehend, including most chairs. With increased ambiguity and role conflict, most faculty fear taking on the role of department chair.

The transition from faculty member to university department chair is an abrupt change from a, "collegial, discipline-based world to a hierarchical, university-based reality" (Seedorf, 1991, p.3). A department chair is socialized and trained in an academic discipline, and yet is asked to serve as an administrator. Those accepting the position often come without leadership training and without the awareness of the cost to their academic career and personal life (Creswell, 1986).

The role of the chair has not changed at most institutions and remains compromised by the systemic and personal aspects of life (Garcia, 1997). Institutionally, the chair is the lowest ranking administrator on campus and the only one with an explicitly temporary appointment, despite the fact that the chair is the nexus of the department (Rakos, 2001). The importance of the department chair to the effectiveness of the university is clear. Nonetheless, department chairs often see themselves as scholars who, out of a sense of duty, are temporarily responsible for the administrative tasks that must be tended to so that other professors can continue with their teaching and research (CSDC, 1990).

Job satisfaction. Department chairs have been viewed as the leader who sets the tone for the department, and while there are success stories, most chairs experience dissatisfaction during their tenure as chair (Wilson, 2001). Many chairs frequently complain about being picked on by people inside and outside the department. Administrator Milton Greenberg (1999) noted that "you will immediately notice a change in your relationships with friends and colleagues. You will be identified by the position you hold, the powers you might exercise, and the privileges you now have" (p.44).

Some chairs who do take the position report being convinced to do so by the dean or other colleagues. Still others felt forced to take the position because they thought that no one else could do the job properly. Other chairs were persuaded out of need, reporting that they were the only available person to do the job (CSDC, 1990). Even when most chairs do accept the position it comes with an immense amount of fear and trepidation. As one chair noted, "in many departments, the attitude of the faculty towards a colleague who accepts the chairmanship is much like that of nuns toward a sister who moves into a house of prostitution" (McKeachie, 1975, p.221).

In a national survey less than two percent of chairs said that they are satisfied all or most of the time. Others were simply pleased when another Friday afternoon rolled around or on payday (CSDC, 1991). Further research by Singleton (1987) and Gmelch and Burns (1994) accentuate the fact that role conflict and ambiguity results in low job satisfaction, increased tension and anxiety, and a propensity to leave an administrative position. This research is further supported by Carroll's (1990) research that finds, 66% of department chairs return to faculty status after their tenure as chair and only one in five chairs continue in higher education administration.

Despite faculty member's reluctance to serve as a department chair, most will, if only for a brief moment, face the possibilities of becoming and serving a term as chair. Most chairs are selected by the faculty or dean in their department and are appointed on a rotating basis, thus implementing a turn-taking approach (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). Those who actually make the transition from faculty member to chair soon realize that there are drastic differences between the two roles of scholar and administrator (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999).

Training. It is becoming increasingly known that chairs need more training and development for the complex and crucial role they play in the university environment. Much too often, successful teachers and researchers with little or no administrative training find themselves promoted into department chair positions. Staton-Spicer and Spicer (1987) in their examination of the problem's of academic managers, found that academic department chairs are among the least prepared of all managers. Most accept the position of chair without leadership training, without a vision for the program, without a clear understanding of the time demands, the inherent stress and conflict in the position, and without the awareness of the demands on their academic career or personal life (Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, 1990). A shared characteristic among chairs is the lack of preparation for the major change agent role they will undertake (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999).

Since nearly 80 percent of all administrative decisions in higher education are made at the department level, it becomes imperative that our colleges and universities search for department chairs with a sense of commitment and leadership ability, not just a passing interest, or out of just a sense of duty (Bennett, 1989). The central

administration needs effective leadership at the department chair level more than ever to implement change and assure program quality (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). An investigation into models of leadership in higher education deserves attention, as the department chair quickly becomes one of the most picked upon and least respected positions in academe (Wilson, 2001).

Higher education leadership.

Universities do not change easily, and major shifts in higher education have been rare (Munitz, 1995). A rather pessimistic picture of higher education has been painted as a system incapable of adapting. Some say it is "easier to move a cemetery than to change a university" (Lucas, 2000, p.7). This conceptualization of higher education stems from several problems including the traditional model of governance that universities have followed (Fryer & Lovas, 1991). The leadership dilemma stems from the nature of the leadership model higher education has embraced for years. Leadership in colleges and universities is problematic because of the dual control systems, conflict between professional and administrative authority, unclear goals, and other professional organizations (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Many institutions seem by default to develop a bureaucratic model of leadership.

Bureaucratic leadership models. Birnbaum (1988) uses the term bureaucracy to describe the structure of colleges. As a college expands, some form of a relatively complex, bureaucratic decision structure inevitably is established (Fryer & Lovas, 1991). Principles of scientific management were enthusiastically adopted in both industry and education. While these principles were not a full-fledge theory of organization and administration, they gave rise to the concept of bureaucracy (Sergiovanni, Burlingame,

Coombs, & Thurston, 1992). Max Weber describes bureaucracy as, "a set of structural properties and characteristics such as hierarchy, division of work, rules, and procedures (Weber, 1946). Leaders who employ a bureaucratic framework emphasize setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating through established lines of authority.

Bureaucracy remains a part of the reality of most educational organizations. Bureaucracy endures in education because of its rationality, accountability, and stability (Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston, 1992). Colleges and universities have many bureaucratic properties and research reveals a high level of bureaucratic leadership (Bensimon, Neumann, Birnbaum, 1989). In a report by Lees, Smith, and Stockhouse (1994) higher education administrators defined leadership as "a one way approach whose purpose was getting others within the organization to conform to or comply with the leader's directives by using various sources of social power" (p.12). The bureaucratic leader can control the institution, but this style of leadership does not motivate the faculty, who must approve or at least implement new programs and other changes if they are to be successful (Wolverton, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 1999). This has created a perception that higher education is experiencing a great leadership crisis. Colleges and universities will have to examine and modify their traditional notions about academic leadership to move forward in the future (Munitz, 1995).

Transactional leadership & alternative models. Leadership in higher education is still a relatively new field of study and research. Unfortunately there is a temptation to say more than we know about leadership in higher education, when academic leadership is at best ambiguous (Seagran, 2000). In the past 50 years there have been as many as 65

different models developed to define the dimensions of leadership (Northouse, 2001). Some of these models employed in higher education include trait theories, power and influence theories, and behavioral theories, contingency theories, and cultural theories (Bensimon, Neumann, Birnbaum, 1989).

Christie and Geis (1970) first developed the notion of the Machiavellian personality. Machiavellianism quickly began to appear as an individual trait utilized in persuading others throughout social science research. Trait theories have long been a part of leadership studies (Northouse, 2001). Trait theories examine leadership as a dimension of the leaders' innate personality characteristics. The trait approach emphasizes that organizations will work better if the people in managerial positions have designated leadership profiles (Northouse, 2001). The trait approach has provided a benchmark for what we need to look for in leaders, but does not entirely explain leadership and leaders. Research has agreed that there are at least five major traits that seem to contribute to more effective leadership. These five central traits include: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Northouse, 2001).

Machiavellian traits can be seen to an extent in the five central traits. There is also evidence of earlier trait research that includes Machiavellian type traits. Some earlier traits believed to be important for a leader to possess and also somewhat Machiavellian in nature include, masculinity, dominance, influence, and persistence (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1974). A leader with a Machiavellian personality is described as being, "cool, detached, logically oriented, prone to establish structure, and advocate the use of guile and deceit in relationships, with an unflattering view of human nature" (Durand & Nord, 1976). Many agree that personality does have a part in predicting leader

behavior, however; researchers continued to search for more answers to the leadership puzzle. In the search for more ways to understand leadership, one man pioneered a new vision of leadership in the seventies: James MacGregor Burns.

Two major types of leadership paradigms emerged in James MacGregor Burns (1978) work titled *Leadership*. These two types encompass many of the models listed previously. Burns distinguishes between two types of leadership: transactional and transformational (Burns, 1978).

Transactional leadership attempts to satisfy the needs of followers by exchanging rewards or privileges for desirable outcomes (Hackman & Johnson, 2000). Transactional leadership provides rewards for efforts and recognizes performance, while ultimately striving to maintain the status quo, only intervening when the acceptable performance levels have not been met (Hackman & Johnson, 2000). Many college and university presidents find models of transactional leadership particularly useful in gaining power and acceptance from colleagues. However, the transactional perspective does little beyond clarifying task and role requirements, or simply getting followers to meet minimal expectations (Brown & Moshavi, 2002).

Additional studies on department leadership have investigated the role of the chair from less traditional models. Hubbell and Homer (1997) classify four management styles for department chairs. The "burnout" style of management is a chair who has become unavailable for the faculty and does little to promote department or faculty needs or interests. The "rational" style relies on the powers of upper administration for decision making, thus making the chair's role easier by always deferring to those higher up the ladder. The "rouge" style plays favorites and builds dominate alliances in the

department. Finally, the "appeaser" style, seeks to promote harmony and happiness by satisfying the needs of all. These management styles do not address or illustrate the qualities or characteristics of the skills researchers have determined effective chairs must possess. These types of so-called leadership or management styles populate the literature leaving department chairs little but their instincts to guide them (Gomes & Knowles, 1999).

It is clear that a different leadership model is needed that recasts the relational paradigm, on which notions of leadership are predicated (Forward, 2001). Over the past several years, much attention has been given to the notion of transformational leadership (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). While leadership is as complex as any aspect of human interaction, there is one dimension of leadership almost universally cited in any discussion; the moral dimension.

Transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is centered on this moral dimension of leadership. Burns (1978) characterizes transformational leadership as a process that motivates followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. For Burns, leadership is only leadership if it is moral leadership, and it is only moral leadership if it is transformational leadership. Transformational leadership seeks to raise followers' levels of consciousness about the importance and value of specified and idealized goals and moving followers to address higher-level needs (Covrig, 2000). This type of leadership is concerned with followers' values and beliefs, and adds a dimension of spirituality to leadership by asking followers to respond to a higher level of moral and ethical conduct (Northouse, 2001). Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) also suggest that moral leadership has a spiritual quality to it. This quality goes beyond communication of

a central vision to altering the followers' innermost core values and goals (Kanungo & Mendocnca 1996). A concern with values and goals ultimately makes leadership a moral activity (Hodgson 1994).

Most chairs would probably prefer to put their energies into engaging the hearts and minds of others and inspiring followers to do the "right thing" which is at the core of transformational leadership (Birnbaum, 1992). Transformational leadership utilizes this commitment to emphasize the inspirational aspects of the relationships between leaders and followers (Brown & Moshavi, 2002).

Newer approaches to uncovering leadership in the department chair role have just recently appeared. Brown and Moshavi (2002) researched the effects of transformational leadership on the department chair. Transformational leadership is generally associated with desired organizational outcomes such as effectiveness, follower willingness to expend extra effort, and satisfaction (Brown & Moshavi, 2002). This study also found that transformational leadership behaviors are positively associated with faculty satisfaction with department chair supervision and perceptions of organizational effectiveness.

While many administrators do not utilize a transformational style of leadership, the challenge to be change agents for their institutions and take the initiative in planning and implementing change is paramount for most (Hilosky & Watwood, 1997). Transformational leadership especially emphasizes motivating followers to support leader-intended change and focus on values and goals. Firth-Cozens and Mowbray (2001) argue that transformational leaders are more likely to be entrepreneurial, willing to take risks, and informal in their relationships with others. Brown and Moshavi's

(2002) findings should prompt higher education to pay more attention to transformational leadership behaviors and the faculty that possess these behaviors.

Communication

Given the obvious importance of chairs to higher education many researchers have attempted to find out what competencies are necessary for them to effectively perform their delegated responsibilities (Gmelch & Burns, 1994). Communication competence skills rank top among the list (Townsend & Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996).

Communication & higher education. Some of the first researchers to address communication as a specific key to department chairs were Mark Hickson and Don Stack (1992) in their volume, Effective Communication for Academic Chairs. These authors were looking for the core talent that any chair most posses. Their answer was communication constituted the "make-or-break" skill (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). Other researchers began to investigate the chair, and Higgerson (1996) used case studies to demonstrate the importance of communication in solving problems in departments. Bowman (2002) suggests that chairs must be skilled in communication, decision- making, time management, advocacy/persuasion, conflict resolution, goal setting, cultural management skills, and transition skills. Lindholm (1999) recognizes that in order to prepare a department chair for leadership; chairs should understand how to build effective teams. This is a reoccurring theme in a majority of the literature that states that building a collective team climate is crucial for the chair to do (Jones & Holdaway, 1996). Collective team climates are characterized by factors such as: (a) clearly stating and agreeing on long term goals; (b) actively involve team members; (c) openly share information; (d) constructive approach to resolving conflicts; (e) attention to

individual growth. Rakos (2001) continues to suggest the various skills department chairs need to possess in order to be effective, insisting that once again chairs must be skilled in communication.

The work of Ann Lucas (1994, 2000) is perhaps the most comprehensive in terms of skills department chairs need to lead a department successfully. Her work emphasizes communication and team building as the key factors to the job of the department chair. Lucas (1994) asserts that the kinds of abilities that make chairs effective leaders are excellent communication, understanding of small groups, and conflict management. She also presents the idea of creating a supportive communication climate to empower faculty, help teams perform, and to prevent dysfunctional conflict (Lucas, 1994).

While creating a supportive climate in the department sounds like the type of leadership a chair would want to employ, the literature leaves little in the way of practical suggestions or empirically tested studies. A supportive climate is obtainable, and can be integrated into a chair's communication, but little has been done to produce or agree upon a competency based model for training that would be most beneficial to academic administrators (Armstrong, Blake, & Pitrowski, 2000). Hickson and McCroskey (1991) address the interesting and problematic issue of the lack of communication research in higher education.

Hickson and McCroskey's 1991 study sought to find an applied communication model to help diagnose academic chairs communication problems. They note that while "most organizational communication research is conducted by individuals who are employed in higher education, such scholars seem loath to look in their own backyards" (Hickson & McCroskey, 1991, p.8). Research drawn from the field of communication is

distinctly limited in writings dealing with management and leadership in higher education. However, research in other organizational contexts indicates that many managerial problems center on communication. More research needs to come from the communication discipline. This could help college and university administrators to deal with the array of communication problems that arise in their day-to-day lives as academic administrators.

Communication theory. The discipline of communication is complex with many different angles and theories providing insights. This study in particular takes on a social science perspective of communication theory. It is within this paradigm that communication focuses on the individual subjective response in order to understand how people think and evaluate (Littlejohn, 1989). Communication leads to a discourse of understanding and a socially constructed reality. Mumby (2000) emphasizes that "communication is not simply a conduit for ideas about the world...the discourse of understanding is premised on a dialogic, social constructionist approach" (p.79). Communication is intertwined with all of human life and any study of human activity must look to the communication process (Littlejohn, 1989). It is this specific nature of human dialog and social construction that many scholars have studied.

Jack Gibb (1961) was one of the first scholars to study specific communication behaviors that contributed to one's overall communication style or climate. Gibb, in an eight year study of groups, identified specific communication patterns that both increase and decrease defensiveness. Gibb's categories of supportive and defensive behaviors are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Categories of Behavior Characteristics of Supportive and Defensive Climates

Defensive Climates	Supportive Climates
1. Evaluation	1. Description
2. Control	2. Problem Orientation
3. Strategy	3. Spontaneity
4. Neutrality	4. Empathy
5. Superiority	5. Equality
6. Certainty	6. Provisionalism

Gibb's categories provide an extensive typology of communication behaviors. It was for this reason that his model was used for this study. However, it is also appropriate to examine other communication theorists that have created additional typologies of communication behaviors, before returning to Gibb.

In 1972, communication theorists Hart and Burks introduced the concept of "rhetorical sensitivity". Along with the communication style of rhetorical sensitivity, they also generated two more general communication styles, including "noble self" and "rhetorical reflector" (House, Dallinger, & Kilgallen, 1998). Hart and Burks' premise is that communication is most effective if people are rhetorically sensitive and communicate with specific behaviors and patterns that reflect that sensitivity. Communication behaviors that reflect sensitivity include honesty, open-heartedness, non-possessive warmth, and non-manipulative intentions towards others (Conrad, 1985). Hart and Burks, further maintain that rhetorically sensitive communication behaviors can be learned and adapted when appropriate.

Perhaps the best known research dealing with specific communication climates or styles was developed in 1978, by Robert Norton. Communicator style is defined as the way an individual "verbally, nonverbally, and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, filtered, or understood" (Norton, 1978, p.99). An individual's communicator style can be comprised of any combination of ten communication attributes: contentious, open, dramatic, dominant, precise, relaxed, friendly, attentive, animated, and impression leaving (Norton, 1978, 1983).

Research continues today to develop practical measures of specific communication behaviors as is evident in Burleson and Samter's (1990) research. This research examined eight distinct communication skills and the perceived importance of these skills on interpersonal relationships. The eight skills included (a) comforting; (b) ego support; (c) conflict management; (d) persuasion; (e) conversational skill; (f) narrative ability; (g) regulative skill; (h) referential ability. For each skill four questions were asked in regards to the specific communicative behavior displayed. This research concluded that moderate and high-complexity individuals perceived affectively oriented communication skills as significantly more important in relationships (Burleson & Samter, 1990). These findings are consisted with research on skills department chairs need since affectively oriented skills includes conflict management, comforting, and ego support.

All of these different measures of communicator style consistently represent skills that research has determined chairs must possess in order to be effective. This study will utilize Gibb's schema of defensive vs. supportive behaviors, because it appears to give the most insight into not only the behaviors chairs needs to develop, but furthermore

highlights specific behaviors to stay away from. Gibb's categories also provide the most specific direction in terms of how to create or avoid a specific communication style instead of just labeling a person as possessing that behavior. It is this specific information that this study hopes to bring to the attention of department chairs, so they can actively control their communication behaviors for positive chair-faculty relationships.

It is obvious that a chair does not operate in a vacuum. The literature confirms that chairs must be skilled in communication, decision-making, time management, advocacy, conflict resolution, goal setting, and stress management (Rakos, 2001). Chairs skills inherently involve relationships with their faculty, administration, and staff. When all of these facets of communication are developed they produce the overall communication climate in a department and institution. The notion of organizational culture, climate, and communication deserves attention at this juncture.

Organizational culture, climate, & communication.

Organizational climate can be defined as the members' generalized beliefs and attitudes about the organization (Guzley, 1992). Organizational climate is not the same as organizational culture, and research argues that culture is more inclusive of value and beliefs systems that exist among the organization and the people the organization tends to serve (Schauber, 2001). Organizational climate is focused on the attitudes and behaviors of the organizational members revealing a consensus of perceptions rather than a cultural set of values and assumptions (Payne, 2000). The different focus of organizational climate is further echoed in research by Verbeke, Volgering, and Hessels (1998), who make the distinction this way, "organizational climate is a reflection of the way people

perceive and come to describe the characteristics of their environment" (p.320). Alvesson and Berg (1992) find that "climate is comparatively close to experience...it concerns attitudes rather than (deeper) values" (p.88-89). Both culture and climate deal with sense-making attempts of an individual's environment. Culture exists at a higher level of abstraction than climate and climate is a manifestation of the culture (Allen, 2003).

There is yet another level by which to discuss organizational culture and climate. Pace (1983) was one of the first to allude to communication climate as a subset of organizational climate. Communication represents a separate dimension apart from organizational climate by focusing on the perceptions that directly happen during the communication process (Guzley, 1992). In addition, Poole (1985) also places a distinction between the two arguing that communication climate is part of the organizational climate. Communication climate is found in the private language of the organization. This is manifest in the conversations about work among staff (Schauber, 2001). Dennis (1974) defines communication climate as "a general cluster of predispositions identifiable through reports of members' perceptions of messages and message-related events occurring in the organization" (p.29). It is clear that communication climate is a distinct phenomenon that contributes to both the organization climate and culture. Several researchers in the communication field have attempted to define and measure the concept of communication climate more concretely.

Defensive vs. Supportive Communication

Often the research reports that one should be skilled in communication but offers little in the practical realm of how to actually be a competent communicator. Several

communication researchers provide the answers in an investigation of the literature on the specific communication behaviors that result in the most supportive and effective environments. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Gibb (1961) first looked at communication climate as a fundamental way to improve communication and make specific changes in interpersonal relationships. Communication climate consists of both supportive and defensive communication behaviors.

A defensive communication climate is one in which an individual feels threatened or anxious when in communication with others (Gibb, 1961). A defensive conversation outwardly may appear normal, while inwardly the person is putting mental energy into defending him or herself. Besides talking about the topic, defensive thoughts a person may be preoccupied thinking about consist of how one appears to the other, how one can be seen more favorably, or how one may end up a winner in the conversation through domination, by impressing the other, or by avoiding punishment or attack. Defensive outward acts tend to create similarly defensive postures in others, and if unchecked the ensuing circular response becomes increasingly destructive (Gibb, 1961). According to Gibb, as a person becomes more and more defensive, they become less and less able to perceive accurately the motives, the values, and the emotions of the sender.

Chairs tasks inherently involve behaviors tending to cause defensive behavior, which affects their ability to communicate openly with faculty. As defensives are reduced the communicators are better able to concentrate upon the structure, the content, and the cognitive meanings of the message. Changing a communication style from defensive to supportive is a feasible process and one easily adapted once a person is

aware of their style. A department chair can create a supportive communication climate that leads to understanding and problem solving.

Major themes in the defensive communication climate include a critical judgmental attitude that overshadows working conditions; individuals feel certain they are right; departments are run autocratically, people are manipulated; there is little support or interest for faculty; and members are made to feel inadequate (Lucas, 1994).

The major communication themes in a supportive department are sharing and understanding. Communication is clear and accurate with information not withheld. Faculty opinions are accepted, and faculty are encouraged to achieve goals. Most important is that accusation and blame are minimized. Supportive communication that is accepting, nonjudgmental, empathic, and does not make assumptions about the other person's motives is a necessary part of interpersonal effectiveness (Lucas, 1994).

Gibb (1961) created twelve categories of behaviors that can create either a supportive or defensive climate. The supportive behaviors look for the exact opposite of the defensive behaviors to happen. The 6 pairs of climates are contrasted in specific communication behaviors and styles.

Evaluation vs. description. Evaluation consists of communication behaviors that engage in judgmental and accusatory language. Evaluation is often marked by "you language" that places blame immediately on the other person. If a senders' expression, tone of voice, or language seems to be evaluating or judging the listener, then the receiver goes on guard in an attempt to protect themselves. Communication that is descriptive, in contrast, tends to arouse a minimum of uneasiness. Language in which the listener perceives genuine requests for information or is neutral is descriptive. Descriptive

language is marked by the use of "I language" that places the responsibility on the sender of the message (Gibb, 1961).

Control vs. problem orientation. Language which is used to control the listener evokes defensiveness. A basic interpersonal need is to control, and most social interaction with someone is trying to get them to do something, change an attitude, or to influence their behavior or activity. Control however, is marked with by implicit attempts to be manipulative. The speaker may view the listener as ignorant, unable to make decisions, uninformed, unwise, or possessed of wrong or inadequate attitudes. Problem Orientation seeks to use language that is not overtly persuasive or controlling, but instead focuses on communicating a desire towards collaboration. The sender engages in language that seeks understanding and a mutual definition of the problem. The sender implies thus, that there is no predetermined solution, attitude, or method to impose and they are open to finding the best solution (Gibb, 1961).

Strategy vs. spontaneity. Strategy is a communication behavior that implies hidden motives and deceit. When the sender is perceived as engaging in strategy involving ambiguous and multiple motivations, the receiver becomes defensive. Most people have a high aversion to deceit that can even result in violent reactions especially if they are using strategy as a substitute for honesty. Gibb (1961) calls for communication that is spontaneous. Spontaneous is defined as straightforwardness, directness, and honesty. Spontaneity consists of communication that does not make up excuses, but instead is consistent and honest (Rothwell, 2004).

Neutrality vs. empathy. Neutrality in speech occurs when a speaker indicates a lack of concern or welfare for the listener. People desire to be perceived as valued

persons, as individuals of worth, and worthy of concern and affection. Communication that exhibits low affect and little warmth or caring is seen as rejection (Gibb, 1961). This indifference is countered with empathy. Empathy is thinking and feeling what you perceive another to be thinking and feeling (Rothwell, 2004). Communication that conveys empathy contains messages that indicate that the speaker identifies with the listener's problems, shares their feelings, and accepts emotional reactions at face value.

Superiority vs. equality. When a person communicates to another that they feel superior in a position, power, wealth, intellectual ability, or physical characteristics they arouse defensiveness. A superior attitude is a turnoff for most people. A receiver of this type of communication is likely to react by not hearing the message, by forgetting it, by competing with the sender, or by becoming jealous of them (Gibb, 1961). Equality recognizes that whatever the differences in our abilities, talents, or intellect, that in order to produce encouragement and productivity, one should treat people with respect and politeness, and as equals (Rothwell, 2004).

Certainty vs. provisionalism. Certainty is a behavior that generates a high amount of defensiveness in others. Certainty is defined as dogmatic, single-minded behavior; combined with unwillingness to compromise. The dogmatic individual is seen as needing to be right and wanting to win the argument rather than solve a problem. People who communicate with certainty appear to have and know all the answers. Provisionalsim reduces defensiveness by allowing provisional attitudes, a willingness to investigate issues rather than taking sides, and demonstrate openness to new possibilities (Gibb, 1961).

The moment we begin to interact with another person we establish a communication climate. Research supports the idea that department chairs that develop, "trusting, close, and supportive relationships with their faculty members are perceived as effective" (Barge & Musambira, 1992, p.55). A supportive climate is essential for the department chair. These supportive behaviors provide practical, non-defensive, assertive communication techniques that can help chairs create the supportive climate so essential to an organization (Cross, 1978). Gibb sums up his own work by concluding that, "arousing defensiveness interferes with communication and thus makes it difficult—and sometimes impossible—for anyone to convey ideas clearly and to move effectively toward the solution of therapeutic, educational or managerial problems" (Gibb, 1961, p.148).

Little of Gibb's work has been replicated to date, however; Jack Gibb continues to appear in today's communication textbooks and course material as the leading theorist on small group communication climates. Ever since Jack Gibb brought the attention of defensive communication to organizations, its detrimental effects have been observed. Simply recognizing that defensive communication is "debilitating to interpersonal relationships is not enough" (Cross, 1978, p.441). Practical, non-defensive, assertive communication techniques, such as Gibb provides, need to be employed by those in higher education organizations.

The current review of literature brings together four distinct bodies of literature. Higher education research has examined the complex yet crucial role of the chair. Leadership research has investigated a variety of models and recommendations on what leadership is and the skills that go hand in hand with it. The influence of organizational

theory and culture literature was explored as it relates to the university as an organization. Finally, the communication literature was examined, due to the connectedness of leadership skills and traits, which are primarily communication related behaviors.

The proposed study will incorporate all of the previous literature. The study will hopefully add to the minimal amount of literature and studies that have combined the fields of higher education, leadership, and communication. It is important to recognize that communication scholars may have information and advice, which can go a long way toward helping chairs to deal with the problems they face in their role and in their leadership within higher education (Hickson & McCroskey, 1991).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter will describe the research design and methods used to investigate faculty's perception of their department chair's communication climate. Issues pertaining to the sample and sampling technique will be discussed in detail. A discussion of the research procedures and method of data collection is presented along with in depth explanation of the instrumentation. Finally the overall research design and methods for data analysis will be addressed, including identifying all dependent and independent variables.

Research Participants.

The focus of this research is on faculty's perceptions of department chairs in higher education. The sample frame was established by securing a membership directory from the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) headquarters in Washington, D.C. The CIC is a professional organization comprised of faculty and administrators in private, four-year colleges and universities in the United States.

At present the CIC is comprised of 544 colleges. A random systematic sample was used to select the frame. A random systematic sample is an effective sampling technique that is simple and unbiased. Using a randomly ordered sampling frame, results in a truly random sample (Keyton, 2001). A table of random numbers was utilized to select the starting point. Every $k = 27^{th}$ college was selected until 26 colleges total had been selected for the sample. The departments in each college were divided into four academic domains including (a) humanities, (b) professional studies, (c) social sciences, and (d) natural sciences. One department from each of the four academic domains was

randomly and systematically selected for each college in the sample. The names of all the faculty members in each of the departments were recorded to comprise a mailing list of 420 faculty members.

Research Procedures.

This research utilized both self-report data and faculty evaluations of their chair through the use of the Department Chair Communication Inventory (DCCI). The DCCI was pilot tested on 30 faculty members from a range of disciplines at Point Loma Nazarene University. Upon receiving the pilot test data, Cronbach's alpha was calculated on all survey items to assess internal reliability. Cronbach's alpha is a commonly used measure of reliability for a set of two or more construct indicators. Values range between 0 and 1.0, with higher values indicating higher reliability among the indicators. Keyton (2001) has suggested that a coefficient alpha of .70 is a generally accepted standard for communication research scholars measuring ambiguous, hard-to-assess aspects of human behavior or using parsimonious instruments with few questions. Alpha levels should be expected and accepted at no lower than .70. Items that did not contribute to acceptable reliability, below .60, were either eliminated or re-worded.

All data collection and mailings took place within January to May of 2006. A "pre-notice letter" was sent by mail to all faculty members in the sample announcing the arrival of an important survey in a few days. Research has noted that sending a 'pre-notice letter" results in higher response rates (Dillman, 2000).

A survey packet was then mailed to each faculty member. The packet consisted of a cover letter, survey, and separate response card so that names could be removed from the mailing list in preparation for a second mailing to non-respondents. The survey was

confidential and no names or institutions were associated with each survey. Informed consent was considered given when the respondents filled out and returned the survey. The packet also included a coffee single pack to enjoy while filling out the survey in attempts to improve the response rate (Dillman, 2000).

A second mailing was sent to all faculty members who had not already responded. The second packet contained a cover letter, survey, and additional information about me and my research, in attempt to personalize the research and increase the response rate.

Instrumentation.

Respondents completed the Department Chair Communication Inventory. I created this instrument by using a composite of pre-existing surveys. The DCCI is a four-page survey containing 87 questions. These questions were divided into six sections, (a) communication climate, (b) leadership, (c) job satisfaction, (d) organizational commitment, (e) effectiveness, and (f) demographic items. The survey consists primarily of Likert-type questions measured by using a 5 point metric scale from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). An in-depth discussion of each portion of the survey instrument follows.

Communication climate. Jack Gibb (1961) first identified six characteristics of a supportive communication climate and six factors of a defensive communication climate. The Communication Climate Inventory (CCI) developed by Costigan and Schmeidler (1984) uses Gibb's initial twelve factors to assess the communication climate within work groups in organizations. Thirty-six questions are presented in a Likert-type scale format. The original wording of each question was altered to reflect the department chair and faculty member relationship as the specific superior and subordinate in the

interaction. The perceived level of supportive/defensive communication was assessed with questions like the following: "My chair treats me with respect" (supportive) and "My chair criticizes my work in the presence of others" (defensive).

The instrument operationalizes the notions of defensive and supportive communication climates (Larsen & Folgero, 1993). The total scores of the first 18 questions indicate the degree to which the faculty's relationship with their department chair is supportive in communication climate. The next 18 questions indicate the degree to which the faculty's relationship with their department chair is defensive in communication climate (Costigan & Schmeidler, 1984). In addition there are three questions for each of the 12 communication climate factors described (Larsen & Folgero, 1993). The Communication Climate Inventory can be used to measure the organization's total communication environment or the climate of individual work areas (Costigan & Schmeidler, 1984). In this study the inventory was utilized to assess the individual work area climate between a department chair and faculty member.

Effectiveness & satisfaction. Two questions were utilized to evaluate effectiveness and satisfaction of the chair with the faculty. Both questions provided a 10 point Likert-type scale in order to maximize variance. The first question asked faculty to rate how effective their department chair is in doing his/her job. The second question asked faculty how satisfied they are their chair-faculty relationship.

Leadership. Leadership was assessed using the Leadership Style Questionnaire, developed by Girodo (1998). This instrument conceptualizes leadership as consisting of three leadership styles labeled as Machiavellian, Bureaucratic and Transformational. These styles are defined primarily in terms of interpersonal orientation toward others in

the use of influence and power (Hitt, 1990). A high score on Machiavellianism suggests a willingness to use coercion or manipulation for an end result. Example items include: "My chair uses tactics to gain power to control things and shape events in order to be successful".

A Bureaucratic style focuses on officially mandated policies and procedures and the enforcement of rules. A high Bureaucratic score suggests that chairs rely heavily on written policies and the hierarchical chain of command. Example items include: "My chair uses the operations manual that details how rules are to be followed as the best tool to deal with faculty", and "My chair utilizes hierarchical organization with clearly defined lines of authority in order to be effective".

A Transformational style of leadership engages followers in behaviors that are supportive, and lead to individual growth and mutual accountability (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2000). A high Transformational leadership score indicates that a leader that motivates people to a higher level of productivity and moral standards. Example items include: "My chair treats people in terms of their potential when determining their effectiveness", and "My chair motivates people by purposely giving them more responsibility and authority to get things done".

Organizational outcomes. Two outcome variables were measured in this study. The first variable was Job Satisfaction. Job Satisfaction is the affective response to one's organizational role, and was measured using Spector's (1997) Job Satisfaction scale. Job Satisfaction will be assessed with questions like the following: "I feel a sense of pride in doing my job". The second outcome variable measured was Organizational Commitment. Organizational Commitment is the intention to continue in one's present

role, and will be measured using the instrument constructed by Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979). Organizational Commitment was assessed with questions like the following: "I feel very loyal to this department".

Demographics. The final section of the survey collected data about the respondents (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity), their personal history (e.g., length in department, number of years with current chair) and institutional data (e.g., number of faculty in the department, number of majors).

Research Design and Data Analysis Methods

The data was analyzed using SPSS 14.0 statistical software. Descriptive statistics containing the mean, standard deviation and alpha, were reported on all summated scales in order to address the first research question. In addition frequencies were calculated for all demographic variables. The second research question was addressed by using two *t*-Tests to identify differences among chairs. The third and fourth research questions utilized multiple regression procedures to find possible predictors for chair and faculty leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

RQ1: To what extent do department chairs utilize defensive or supportive communication? Research question one sought to determine the frequency of the chair's use of defensive and supportive communication behaviors. Gibb's twelve sub-scales were summated and reported for each defensive and supportive behavior, including the mean, standard deviation, and alpha level.

RQ2: What types of communication behaviors, defensive or supportive, do faculty perceive as effective for chair-faculty relationships and chair job effectiveness? The second research question sought to identify whether defensive or supportive behaviors

were utilized by chairs that were perceived as effective in doing their jobs and at maintaining satisfying chair-faculty relationships. The second research question was addressed utilizing an independent samples *t*-Test and a regression analysis.

A *t*-Test is used to determine whether two means are significantly different (Gay, 1996). In this study the *t*-Test assessed how effective and ineffective chairs differ in their communication behaviors. The variables included all twelve defensive and supportive communication behaviors. The *t*-Test showed what communication behaviors, defensive or supportive, were associated with chairs rated overall as effective and which ones were associated with chairs rated overall as ineffective.

Multiple regressions were also utilized to analyze the second research question. Regression analysis is by far the most widely used and versatile dependence technique. The use of regression analysis is appropriate for this study since regression is a powerful analytical tool designed to explore all types of dependence relationships (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1992). Multiple regressions are a simultaneous method used when all independent variables in the analysis are computed concurrently. Regression is further an appropriate statistical procedure for the sample size of this study (N = 202). Hays (2005) recommend that for every two to three predictor variables there should be at least a sample size of 100. This study exceeds those limits.

Two multiple regressions were performed. The first regression assessed overall chair effectiveness in their job as the dependent variable, with all twelve communication climates and demographics as the independent variables. The second regression assessed overall satisfaction from faculty with their chair-faculty relationship as the dependent

variable. The twelve communication climates and demographics served as the independent variables in the equation.

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the perceived use of defensive and supportive communication climate and the department chair's leadership style? Research question three sought to find a relationship between perceived use of defensive and supportive communication climate and the department chair's leadership style. Research question three was analyzed using multiple regression procedures. Three multiple regressions models were used, in which the leadership style (Machiavellian, Bureaucratic, and Transformational) served as the dependent variable, and the 12 communication climate behaviors and demographics served as the independent variables.

RQ4: Is there a relationship between communication climate, and faculty job satisfaction and organizational commitment? Research question four sought to find a relationship between communication climate and faculty job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This final research question was also addressed using multiple regression analysis. Two regression models were utilized to assess job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The first model consisted of job satisfaction as the dependent variable and the twelve communication behaviors as the independent variables. The second model consisted of organizational commitment as the dependent variable and the twelve communication behaviors as the independent variables. These regressions helped to explain what department chair communication behaviors contribute to overall job satisfaction and or organizational commitment.

Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

In this chapter, the findings of the study will be presented. A description of the sampling frame and characteristics will be given first, to give context to the study. Instrumentation will also be discussed and reported including the item means, standard deviation, and alpha levels. In addition the results of the t-test will be described, and finally a comprehensive presentation of the independent and dependent variables and their effects will be summarized in several regression models.

Sampling Frame

The subjects in this study (N = 202) were randomly sampled from the Council of Independent Colleges. The study was conducted using a first and second mailing. The first mailing resulted in n = 145 returned surveys. The second mailing resulted in n = 57, combing for an overall response rate of 48%. According to Baruch (1999) this is an appropriate response rate for survey research in general and is especially robust given the context of the university as the organization of the research. Dillman (2000) concurs with Baruch citing an average response rate of 21% for most organizations.

Sampling Characteristics

The subjects in this study (N = 202) ranged in age from 27 to 82 years with a mean age of 50.3% (SD = 10.9). Forty-seven percent (n = 95) were male, 53 % (n = 106) were female, and one unreported. The sample was predominately white (83.2 %, n = 202) but included 10 (5 %) individuals who identified themselves as Black/African American. The sample also included 9 (4.5 %) individuals who identified themselves as Hispanic, 9 (4.5 %) individuals who identified themselves as Asian,

2 (1%) individuals who identified themselves as American Indian/Alaska, and 3 (1.5 %) individuals who identified themselves as other. One individual did not respond.

Descriptive statistics reveal that the majority of respondents (45 %, n = 91) are part of a department that has a total of 6-10 faculty members. Respondents also belonged to various other size departments including 5 or fewer faculty members (24.8 %, n = 50), departments with 11-15 faculty members (20.3 %, n = 41), departments with 16-20 faculty members (5.9 %, n = 12) and finally departments with 21 or more faculty members (4 %, n = 8). The academic domain that each respondent belonged to varied among humanities (27.2 %, n = 55), professional studies (32.7 %, n = 66), social sciences (20.3 %, n = 41) and natural sciences (19.3 %, n = 39). One respondent did not identify their academic domain. These sampling characteristics were similar to the population make up of the entire Council of Independent Colleges.

Respondents indicated that their present department chair had been in their current assignment as chair anywhere from 1 to 25 years with a mean of 5.89 (SD = 5.1) years in the current assignment as chair. Subjects in this study had been at their current institution for a mean length of 10.6 (SD = 9.5) years, and had been involved in higher education for a mean length of 16.7 (SD = 11.3) years.

Instrumentation

Respondents completed the Department Chair Communication Inventory (DCCI) which measured defensive and supportive communication, leadership, chair job effectiveness, chair relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Each variable was measured using Likert-type questions using a 5- point

metric scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Keyton (2001) notes that most survey response sets have a 5-point scale as response choices.

The items related to overall chair effectiveness and chair relationship satisfaction were measured using a 10-point metric scale from 1 (not at all) to 10 (Extremely). Chair effectiveness and chair satisfaction was measured using only one question each. Since this study is addressing the global overarching opinion of faculty, asking additional questions about effectiveness or satisfaction was deemed unnecessary. In addition both variables function as dependent variables and are not predictors. The scale for each of these single items was expanded to 1 through 10 in order to maximize the variance for a more optimal result. Due to the singular nature of each of these questions, no alpha level is reported. The descriptive statistics for the communication, leadership, and outcomes variables including, mean, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha are contained in Table 2.

A correlation matrix was obtained to assess multi-collinearity among any of the variables in the DCCI instrument. Multi-collinearity refers to the correlation among three or more independent variables that is evidenced when one is regressed against the other. The simplest and most obvious means of identifying collinearity is through the examination of a correlation matrix. The presence of high correlations, generally those .90 or above, are indicative of collinearity (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, (1992). Substantial signs of multi-collinearity were not found to be present in examination of the correlation matrix, shown in Table 3.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Alpha
Supportive Communication			
Descriptive	3.86	0.97	.87
Problem Orientation	4.15	0.84	.77
Provisionalism	4.31	0.83	.88
Empathy	4.05	1.01	.91
Equality	4.31	0.98	.91
Spontaneity	4.07	1.05	.93
Defensive Communication			
Superiority	1.87	0.83	.71
Evaluation	1.50	0.79	.73
Certainty	1.81	0.99	.90
Neutrality	3.84	0.90	.65
Control	2.04	0.90	.82
Strategy	1.90	1.03	.90
Leadership			
Machiavellian	1.94	0.86	.88
Bureaucratic	2.89	0.76	.70
Transformational	3.56	0.87	.87
Outcomes			
Job Satisfaction	3.71	0.68	.91
Organizational Commitment	3.73	0.88	.92
Chair Job Effectiveness	7.41	2.24	---
Chair Relationship Satisfaction	7.90	2.35	---

Table 3

Correlation Matrix (N = 202)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Description												
2. Problem Orientation	.71**											
3. Provisionalism	.62**	.71**										
4. Empathy	.67**	.84**	.79**									
5. Equality	.67**	.75**	.79**	.85**								
6. Spontaneity	.67**	.75**	.74**	.83**	.85**							
7. Superiority	-.56**	-.54**	-.65**	-.61**	-.74**	-.63**						
8. Evaluation	-.60**	-.63**	-.70**	-.71**	-.81**	-.73**	.73**					
9. Certainty	-.71**	-.65**	-.68**	-.70**	-.70**	-.72**	.75**	.67**				
10. Neutrality	.40**	.64**	.44**	.60**	.46**	.49**	-.34**	-.40**	-.44**			
11. Control	-.66**	-.61**	-.67**	-.63**	-.73**	-.69**	.78**	.68**	.76**	-.45**		

Table 3 (Continued)

Correlation Matrix (N = 202)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
12. Strategy	-.71**	-.74**	-.73**	-.79**	-.81**	-.86**	.69**	.75**	.78**	-.46**	.76**	
13. Chair Effectiveness	.61**	.66**	.51**	.61**	.54**	.58**	-.37**	-.45**	-.53**	.50**	-.44**	-.62**
14. Chair Satisfaction	.64**	.80**	.71**	.83**	.80**	.81**	-.58**	-.66**	-.66**	.62**	-.61**	-.74**
15. Machiavellianism	-.61**	-.68**	-.70**	-.70**	-.72**	-.73**	.67**	.71**	.72**	-.50**	.75**	.78**
16. Bureaucratic	.11	.11	-.10	.10	-.01	.01	.17*	.11	.04	.10	.16*	.06
17. Transformational	.60**	.74**	.62**	.71**	.67**	.68**	-.49**	-.55**	-.58**	.58**	-.50**	-.67**
18. Job Satisfaction	.53**	.68**	.55**	.69**	.61**	.67**	-.49**	-.59**	-.61**	.56**	-.59**	-.70**
19. Organizational	.49**	.54**	.48**	.54**	.56**	.58**	-.44**	-.56**	-.50**	.43**	-.52**	-.59**

Table 3 (Continued)

Correlation Matrix (N = 202)

Variable	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
13. Chair Effectiveness							
14. Chair Satisfaction	.71**						
15. Machiavellianism	-.52**	-.68**					
16. Bureaucratic	.31**	.14*	.12				
17. Transformational	.76**	.76**	-.60**	.31**			
18. Job Satisfaction	.68**	.70**	-.66**	.09	.64**		
19. Organizational	.55**	.61**	-.58**	.06	.57**	.83**	

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level. * Correlation is significant at the .05 level.

Department Chair Communication

Research question one sought to find out to what extent department chairs utilize defensive and/or supportive communication behaviors as reported by their faculty. Respondents (N = 202) reported that their department chairs more frequently engaged in supportive communication behaviors with a mean of 4.1 (SD = .84) than defensive communication behaviors with a mean of 2.4 (SD = .77). Further analysis in the study addresses whether chairs that were rated high in both job effectiveness and personal relationship satisfaction, also engaged in specific supportive or defensive communication behaviors.

Research question two sought to find out what types of communication behaviors, defensive or supportive, faculty perceive as effective for chair-faculty relationships and chair job effectiveness. A t-test was utilized to answer this question. In order to determine which chairs were considered high or low in effectiveness the overall mean for chair job effectiveness was calculated (Mean = 7.4, SD = 2.2).

After calculating the overall mean, the middle standard deviation was eliminated to provide the extremes. In keeping with standard statistical procedure rankings that were ½ or more standard deviations away from the mean in either direction were used (Hays, 2005). Thus chairs receiving a ranking of 1 to 6 were considered to have low effectiveness, while chairs receiving a ranking of 9 to 10 were deemed to have high effectiveness. Department chairs who utilized supportive communication were seen as more effective in their jobs on all predictor variables with $p < .00$, $df = 124$. The reverse was also found, in that department chairs that utilized defensive communication were seen as less effective. Full results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

t-Test Comparison of High vs. Low Effectiveness in Chair Communication Behaviors

	High Effectiveness (n = 74)		Low Effectiveness (n = 53)		
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t
Supportive Com					
Description	4.45	.72	3.01	0.97	-9.12
Problem Orientation	4.67	.52	3.34	0.89	-9.72
Provisionalism	4.70	.48	3.70	0.96	-7.03
Empathy	4.60	.58	3.13	1.14	-8.54
Equality	4.75	.55	3.53	1.30	-6.57
Spontaneity	4.70	.51	3.20	1.30	-8.10
Defensive Com					
Superiority	1.60	.66	2.29	0.97	4.43
Evaluation	1.21	.52	2.04	1.00	5.30
Certainty	1.30	.58	2.53	1.13	7.39
Neutrality	4.27	.72	3.24	0.94	-6.70
Control	1.63	.72	2.60	0.93	6.32
Strategy	1.40	.61	2.87	1.17	8.60

Note. All variables were statistically significant at the $p < .00$.

A second t-Test was utilized to determine how satisfied respondents were with their faculty-chair relationship. The t-Test also found that there was a difference in satisfaction levels of the faculty based on whether the chairs engaged in defensive or supportive communication behaviors. Once again the mean was calculated for the chair-faculty personal relationship satisfaction. The mean was 7.8 (SD = 2.3). The middle standard deviation was eliminated and again scores that fell ½ or more away from the

standard deviation on either tail were utilized resulting in scores ranging from 1-6 reporting low satisfaction and scores ranging from 9-10 reporting high satisfaction with their personal chair-faculty relationship.

Results indicated that indeed the two groups were significantly different on all variables with $p < .00$, $df = 144$. The respondents were more satisfied in their personal relationship with their chair if they reported their chair as utilizing supportive communication. All results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

t-Test Comparison of High vs. Low Satisfaction with Chair-Faculty Relationship

	High Satisfaction (n = 104)		Low Satisfaction (n = 42)		
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t
Supportive Com					
Description	4.30	0.73	2.60	1.02	-8.46
Problem Orientation	4.60	0.51	3.10	0.87	-10.73
Provisionalism	4.78	0.48	3.30	1.00	-8.87
Empathy	4.62	0.55	2.70	1.03	-11.61
Equality	4.80	0.51	3.00	1.16	-9.56
Spontaneity	4.63	0.53	2.60	1.10	-11.45
Defensive Com					
Superiority	1.67	0.63	2.61	1.07	5.89
Evaluation	1.16	0.45	2.35	1.16	7.02
Certainty	1.34	0.61	2.87	1.14	8.28
Neutrality	4.24	0.68	3.05	1.00	-7.39
Control	1.64	0.70	2.88	1.00	7.56
Strategy	1.46	0.61	3.20	1.10	10.25

Note. All variables were statistically significant at the $p < .00$.

The t-Tests showed highly significant differences between the two groups of department chairs. To further determine how defensive and supportive communication effects faculty's perceptions of chair job effectiveness and faculty-chair relationship satisfaction, two regression models were utilized.

The first regression model looked at chair job effectiveness as the dependent variable with supportive and defensive communication and demographics as the independent variables. The regression resulted in an adjusted $R^2 = .52$, $F(14,187) = 16.36$, $p<.00$. Defensive and supportive communication behaviors along with demographics was able to explain 52 percent of the variance contributing to job effectiveness of department chairs as perceived by faculty.

The second regression model utilized chair-faculty relationship satisfaction as the dependent variable with supportive and defensive communication and demographics as the independent variables. The regression resulted in an adjusted $R^2 = .76$, $F(14,187) = 46.97$, $p<.00$. Both regressions were also calculated using the entire summated scale of defensive and supportive behaviors, and not just the sub-scales. This was an additional check for any multicolinearity that might inflate the adjusted R^2. The two defensive and supportive communication summated models for effectiveness and satisfaction both yielded extremely similar adjusted R^2. This procedure again, ensured that there was not an artificial inflation of the regression based on using only the sub scales for defensive and supportive communication.

A major purpose for this study was to identify specific communication behaviors for chairs to use. To further this purpose additional post hoc analysis was done in the form of a stepwise regression to find what specific communication traits contributed most

to chair job effectiveness. The stepwise regression for job effectiveness resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .53, F(6,195) = 39.17, p<.00. Six significant predictors of job satisfaction were identified in the stepwise regression. These six in order of significance were problem orientation, description, gender, strategy, control, and neutrality. All of the variables had a positive association with job effectiveness, except strategy which as a defensive communication behavior had a negative impact on effectiveness.

The stepwise regression for chair-faculty relationship satisfaction resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .77, F(5,196) = 132.01, p<.00. Five significant predictors for personal relationship were identified in the stepwise regression. These five in order of significance were empathy, spontaneity, neutrality, problem orientation, and equality. All five variables were found to have a positive impact on personal relationship satisfaction. Specific variable statistics that result from the stepwise regressions are listed in Table 6 and 7 respectively.

Department Chair Leadership

Research question three sought to determine if there was a relationship between the perceived use of defensive and/or supportive communication behaviors and the department chair's leadership style. Three regression models were utilized to answer this question. The three leadership styles included Machiavellian, Bureaucratic, and Transformational. In three separate regression models each leadership style served as the dependent variable, while the defensive and supportive communication behaviors and demographics served as the independent variables.

Table 6

Stepwise Regression of Chair Job Effectiveness (N = 202)

Variables	R^2	R^2cha	b	t
Problem Orientation	.43	.43	.66	2.74 **
Description	.47	.04	.71	3.97 ***
Gender	.50	.03	.71	3.19 **
Strategy	.51	.01	-.69	-3.52 **
Control	.52	.02	.58	3.00 **
Neutrality	.53	.01	.39	2.40 *
Constant			-.51	

Note. Adjusted R^2 = .53. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .00

The first regression model used Machiavellian leadership and resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .69, F(14,187) = 32.87, p<.00. The second regression model used Bureaucratic leadership and resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .18, F(14,187) = 4.11, p<.00. The third regression model used Transformational leadership and resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .63, F(14,187) = 25.37, p<.00.

In order to produce applied communication results, post hoc analysis in the form of stepwise regression was again utilized. The first stepwise model looked at Machiavellian leadership as the dependent variable and the twelve communication behaviors and demographics as the independent variables.

Table 7

Stepwise Regression of Chair-Faculty Relationship Satisfaction (N = 202)

Variables	R^2	R^2cha	b	t
Empathy	.68	.68	.44	2.27 *
Spontaneity	.72	.04	.59	3.74 ***
Neutrality	.75	.03	.44	3.67 ***
Problem Orientation	.76	.01	.59	3.16 **
Equality	.77	.01	.41	2.33 *
Constant			-2.21	

Note. Adjusted R^2 = .77. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .00

This stepwise regression resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .69, F(4,197) = 112.60, p<.00. Four significant predictor variables were identified with Machiavellian leadership. These variables were strategy, control, problem orientation, and evaluation. All the variables were positively associated with Machiavellianism except problem orientation which as a supportive communication behavior had a negative impact. Specific variable statistics from the stepwise regression are listed in Table 8.

Table 8

Stepwise Regression of Machiavellian Leadership (N = 202)

Variables	R^2	R^2 cha	b	t
Strategy	.61	.61	.24	3.60 ***
Control	.66	.06	.29	4.93 ***
Problem Orientation	.68	.02	-.18	-2.93 **
Evaluation	.69	.01	.18	2.70 **
Constant			1.34	

Note. Adjusted R^2 = .69. **p<.01. ***p<.00

The second stepwise model used Bureaucratic leadership as the dependent variable and the 12 communication behaviors and demographics as the independent variables. This stepwise regression resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .17, $F(3,198) = 14.20$, p<.00. Three significant predictors were identified and included, gender, control, and description, and all three variables were positively associated with Bureaucratic leadership style. The specific variable statistics from the stepwise regression are listed in Table 9.

Table 9

Stepwise Regression of Bureaucratic Leadership (N = 202)

Variables	R^2	R^2 cha	b	t
Description	.07	.07	.33	4.89 ***
Gender	.12	.05	.41	4.18 ***
Control	.16	.04	.37	5.09 ***
Constant			.24	

Note. R^2 = .16. ***p<.00

The third stepwise regression model used Transformational leadership as the dependent variable and the 12 communication behaviors and demographics as the independent variables. This stepwise regression resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .62, F(4,197) = 81.19, p<.00. Four significant predictor variables were identified for Transformational leadership, including problem orientation, spontaneity, gender, and neutrality. All variables were positively associated with a Transformational leadership style. The specific variable statistics are listed in Table 10.

Table 10

Stepwise Regression of Transformational Leadership

Variables	R^2	R^2 cha	b	t
Problem Orientation	.55	.55	.48	6.11 ***
Spontaneity	.58	.03	.23	4.28 ***
Gender	.61	.03	.27	3.41 **
Neutrality	.62	.01	.13	2.30 *
Constant			-.24	

Note. Adjusted R^2 = .62. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .00

Faculty Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The fourth research question tried to determine if there was relationship between department chairs's perceived use of defensive and supportive communication and faculty job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Two regression models were used to answer this research question. The first utilized job satisfaction as the dependent variable and the 12 communication behaviors and demographics as the independent variables. This model resulted in an adjusted R^2 = .57, $F(14,187) = 20.33$, $p < .00$. Overall faculty were more satisfied with their job if their department chairs used supportive communication and did not use defensive communication.

When organizational commitment was the dependent variable, and the 12 communication behaviors and demographics were the independent variables, the regression resulted in an adjusted $R^2 = .40$, $F(14, 187) = 10.37$, $p < .00$. Again, results found faculty were more committed to their organization when the department chair was perceived as using supportive communication and not utilizing defensive communication.

In order to identify specific communication behaviors, post hoc analysis was again completed in the form of a stepwise regression. The stepwise regression model for job satisfaction resulted in an adjusted $R^2 = .56$, $F(3,198) = 87.53$, $p<.00$. Three significant variables were identified in order of importance as strategy, neutrality, and problem orientation. Strategy, a defensive communication behavior, was the most significant predictor of job satisfaction and had a negative impact. The other two variables, neutrality and problem orientation, had a positive association with faculty job satisfaction. Results and specific variable statistics from the job satisfaction stepwise regression are presented in Table 11.

The stepwise regression model for organizational commitment resulted in an adjusted $R^2 = .41$, $F(5,196) = 28.50$, $p<.00$. Five significant predictors of faculty's organizational commitment were identified. These variables in order of significance included strategy, neutrality, evaluation, gender, and age. All variables were positively associated with organizational commitment, except strategy and evaluation, two defensive communication behaviors, had a negative impact on commitment. Results and specific variable statistics from the organizational commitment stepwise regression are presented in Table 12.

Table 11

Stepwise Regression of Job Satisfaction

Variables	R^2	R^2 cha	b	t
Strategy	.48	.48	-.28	-6.18 ***
Neutrality	.55	.08	.17	3.81 ***
Problem Orientation	.57	.02	.17	2.60 **
Constant			2.87	

Note. Adjusted R^2 = .56. **p<.01. ***p=.00

The results for the four initial research questions of the study have been presented in this chapter. Along with addressing the four research questions, statistics were provided for all demographic variables. Reliability of the instrument was reported along with the correlation matrix. Further post hoc results were included in the form of step-wise regression analysis for a deeper understanding of the variables operating within each model. The next chapter will present a discussion and interpretation of these results.

Table 12

Stepwise Regression of Organizational Commitment

Variables	R^2	R^2 cha	b	t
Strategy	.34	.34	-.281	-3.88 ***
Neutrality	.37	.03	.16	2.60 *
Evaluation	.38	.02	-.27	-2.93 **
Gender	.40	.02	.23	2.40 *
Age	.41	.01	.01	2.10 *
Constant			3.25	

Note. Adjusted R^2 = .41. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.00.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter will interpret and analyze the results from the data, specifically the four research questions posed at the onset of this study. The discussion will also offer recommendations and implications for department chair communication and leadership in higher education based on the findings. Finally, suggestions for future research in the area of department chair communication and leadership.

Department Chair Effectiveness

It has been widely agreed that department chairs must possess communication competence in dealing with faculty and administrators (Townsend & Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996). This study sought to discover the extent to which chairs demonstrated communication competence in the form of supportive communication or contributed to defensive communication climate. The findings revealed that faculty members overwhelmingly reported their department chairs as more frequently using supportive communication in comparison to defensive communication. This finding supports the literature, which argues that in order to be an effective chair one must first create a supportive communication climate.

Carroll & Gmelch (1992) highlight that many department chairs are starting to recognize the importance of supportive communication as a skill that is most important to their role. In one study chairs ranked "maintaining a conducive work climate, which includes reducing conflict among faculty", as the 5th most important duty out of 26 duties that chairs believe to be most important in their work (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992, p.8). The

high use of supportive communication behaviors demonstrates that faculty do indeed notice the communication climate created by the chair.

In a survey reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education, survey results concluded that, "faculty members care more about department climate, culture, and collegiality than they do about...compensation" (Fogg, 2006, p.1). This research again confirms that faculty differ from previous generations, and are paying close attention to the departmental climate created by the chair (Fogg, 2006).

While more chairs are engaging in actual supportive communication behaviors, this study wanted to understand communication both in correlation to perceived chair effectiveness and faculty's satisfaction with their personal relationship with their chair. The findings in this study confirm that chairs who use supportive communication behaviors are seen as more effective in their job. In addition faculty members also rated their personal relationship satisfaction with their chair higher if they perceived their chair as using supportive communication. Chairs that were perceived as using more defensive communication behaviors were seen as less effective in their job and faculty were less satisfied with their personal relationships with the chair.

Chairs use both defensive and supportive communication, but this study clearly demonstrates that how much they use of each behavior profoundly impacts their perceived job effectiveness and relationships with faculty. Chairs need more guidance in what constitutes supportive or defensive communication to reap the benefits of a supportive department climate. A closer look at Gibb's communication categories utilized in this study reveals which aspects of supportive communication and which aspects of defensive communication one should use or avoid for maximum effectiveness.

Jack Gibb's measure of defensive and supportive communication was utilized in this study with the hopes of identifying specific communication behaviors. Simply advising a chair to be more supportive leaves some vagueness in how to actually communicate. The categories included in Gibb's instrument give a much more concrete explanation for one's personal communicative behavior. Providing more specific, practical communication guidance was the major purpose of this study. Therefore, the stepwise regressions were most useful in determining if advice could be given relative to specific defensive and supportive communication behaviors.

Faculty were most satisfied with their chair's job effectiveness when the chair engaged in the supportive communication behavior labeled by Gibb as problem orientation. This supportive communication behavior calls for language that is inclusive of everyone in the group, and ultimately promotes an atmosphere of collaboration. Problem orientation takes into consideration everyone's input and ideas. Previous research consistently notes the importance of a supportive climate that utilizes the communication of problem orientation. Research by Kremer-Hayon, & Avi-Itzhak (1986) reports that, "academic chairs are viewed as more effective when they invite participation in departmental decision making" (p.110).

Collaboration in decision-making is a key component in the success of many organizations. People want to be involved in the process. Organizations have long espoused the importance and value of collaboration for improved organizational functioning. Researchers have documented the benefits of organizational collaboration including greater efficiency, effectiveness, and enhanced learning (Kezar, 2005). This study clearly supports collaboration as a means to perceived chair job effectiveness.

Chairs can incorporate problem orientation into their departmental interactions by ensuring that everyone is verbally included in face to face exchanges and is provided with needed information. Author and president of Communication Strategies, Diane St. John (1996) advises department managers to ask, listen, and respond to their employees. She asserts that one-on-one times with the immediate supervisor are your employees' most valued moments. St. John (1996) also reports that the most important factors that influence employees are the informal communication messages that come from the leadership in an organization.

The second predictor of job effectiveness included the supportive communication behavior labeled description. Description calls for communication that does not evaluate but instead uses facts and simple descriptions to communication information. Description calls for clarity, which is seen as one of the most important dimensions in a positive organizational climate. In highly rated organizations, Snow (2002) found that when people have a clear idea what is expected of them, how they contribute to the mission and policies, and lines of authority are clear, then productivity tends to be high. Description calls for communication that is accepting and nonjudgmental, and does not make assumptions about the other person's motivates and is a necessary part of interpersonal effectiveness (Lucas, 1994).

Description is further categorized by using "I" instead of "you" statements. One way to avoid evaluating others is to eliminate the accusatory "you" from one's communication. These statements are often found to attack a person's sense of self-worth and usually result in a defensive climate (Beebe, Beebe, & Redmond, 2005). By using an "I" statement, chairs and faculty can describe their own feelings and thoughts in

a situation without creating defensiveness. Since chairs are seen as colleagues, this communication can be particularly useful during faculty performance reviews. The prospect of formally reviewing one's colleague can be uncomfortable and it is often the chairs job to be very clear and descriptive in their communication (Shedd, 2005). Faculty in this study saw this type of descriptive "I" language by chairs as a very effective communication behavior, and highly indicative of overall chair job effectiveness.

The third predictor was gender. Female faculty members were more inclined to view their department chair as effective, than male faculty members were. This result was significant enough to suggest that gender identity does in fact play a part in the perception of the department chair and in evaluating other management like positions. A study by Dennis and Kunkel (2004) found similar gender related results in the evaluation of chief executive officers. They found that female participants rated targets in general as more competent and effective and less hostile than did male participants (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004).

The fourth contributing factor to perceived chair effectiveness was strategy. Strategy had a large negative impact on perceived effectiveness. Strategy is communication that is ambiguous and vague and aims to conceal. Keeping information from faculty members and excluding them from processes negatively impacts the perception of chair effectiveness with the faculty. While this idea is not new in organizational research, this study confirms that lack of sharing information and or manipulation of information decreases chair effectiveness with faculty. When communication is not clear or shared honestly, people feel they are being manipulated in some way. The defensive communication behavior of strategy was reported by faculty as

ineffective for department chairs to use. This information highlights the importance of open, honest, inclusive communication for an effective work environment.

The last two variables that contributed to perceptions of chair job effectiveness were somewhat unexpected. The last two predictors were control and neutrality, which were hypothesized by Gibb (1961) to be defensive behaviors. Nonetheless, both of these behaviors had a positive impact on faculty perceived chair job effectiveness. I believe there is a possible explanation for both of these results predicated on the nature of being a faculty member. No faculty member is like another faculty member. Research into faculty cultures has found that faculty members see themselves as, "under-appreciated by administrators and students, isolated from the general public, keepers of wisdom and knowledge in a vaporous society, true and honest, and the reason students attend college" (Bila & Miller, 1997, p.9). Faculty's own description of themselves can be contradictory in nature to say the least. Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, and Beyer (1990) describe faculty in a rather fickle way. They summarize faculty by saying,

> Faculty want autonomy but request assistance, demand quick decisions, yet belabor issues, seek power and authority but delegate decisions to administrators. Years of academic freedom have bred a work force of rugged individualists, people who vary widely in competencies, goals, energy, and general crankiness. p.5

It is possible that the results of neutrality and control speak to the faculty dilemma of wanting academic freedom and individualism but also wanting the department chair to take control of matters not related directly to their interests. Furthermore, faculty are highly independent and may not mind, but rather embrace a neutral chair who does not micro-manage them.

Personal Relationship Satisfaction

Barge and Musambira (1992) assert that chair-faculty relationships play an important role in the motivation and socialization of faculty members within an organization. The results of this study clearly confirm the importance of chair-faculty personal relationships. Faculty overwhelmingly reported being more satisfied in their personal relationship with their department chair if their chair communicated using supportive behaviors. The behaviors that predicted relationship satisfaction include, empathy, spontaneity, neutrality, problem orientation, and equality.

Sometimes a speaker merely wants a listener to know what it is like to walk in the other person's shoes. This is the heart of empathy and does not include active problem solving, but simply listening. Lucas (1994) explains, for example, that some faculty may complain about the incompetence of students simply so their chair can relate to the difficulty in teaching undergraduates. Most faculty want to be understood and appreciated and the communication behavior of empathy is a powerful way to send that message.

The second predictor of relationship satisfaction is spontaneity; open, honest, communication. Relationships cannot be built without the key elements of trust and honesty. Research by Redding (1973) indicates that openness and candor are among the top five variables in creating a supportive communication climate among employees. He asserts that whatever the relationship, "there must be openness and candor in message telling and listening" (p.66). Out of openness and candor comes the development of trust. Trust is a fundamental element of relationships, and once deception has been detected, it is difficult to regain a persons' trust (O'Hair & Cody, 1994). Research

indicates that the issues of honesty and trust are a major concern for faculty. In one such study, 50 faculty members were interviewed on faculty culture. All faculty reported being distrustful of middle-level administrators, and generally neutral toward or "mocking of senior level managers" (Bila & Miller, 1997). Even in a survey of 224 chief academic officers, they reported that one of their biggest leadership challenges was earning trust from faculty members (Forward & Czech, 2005). Faculty clearly want open and honest communication if they are to have a satisfying, trusting relationship with their department chair.

The third predictor of chair-faculty relationship satisfaction was neutrality. This result was again unexpected since neutrality is seen as a defensive behavior, according to Gibb. There are two plausible explanations for this result. First, higher education is not structured to support collaborative approaches to learning, research, and organizational functioning (Kezar, 2005). Most faculty work independently, and have more identity with others in their own specific sub-discipline or professional area than with a specific department or institution (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999).

In this regard faculty are like any other type of employee in an organization. Most employees keep neutral relationships with their co-workers, not wanting to discuss personal problems. Most interpersonal relationships formed in organizations are not close but rather acquaintance type in nature (Fritz, 1997). Research within higher education confirms that most chair-faculty relationships center on such topics as evaluative feedback, information regarding the rules and norms of the department, and organizational functioning (Barge & Musambira, 1992). Faculty have an enormous amount of autonomy and freedom in their work. As such, a satisfactory relationship with

their chair is a neutral one, where they are not micromanaged or have to deal with problems outside their own workload.

A second reason for neutrality appearing as a positive predictor of chair-faculty relationships may be due to the nature of Gibb's work and the lack of empirical support scholars have dealing with Gibb's theory. While Gibb's categories were originally conceived as polar opposites, this study does not seem to support Gibb's theoretical construct in some aspects. Costigan and Schmeidler (1984) developed an instrument based upon Gibb's 1961 theory. The unique feature of this instrument is the ability to either measure the communication climates as polar opposites as Gibb had hypothesized, or to measure the climate behaviors orthogonally.

This study, as did the study by Larsen and Folgero (1993), used Costigan and Schmeidler's scale to measure all six defensive and supportive communication behaviors individually. The assumption in doing this leads to the notion that any given person can exhibit both supportive and defensive traits and that a resulting communication climate is neither completely defensive nor supportive. More empirical testing of this instrument is needed to determine if Gibb's categories actually do exist as polar opposites. For now, this study would seem to indicate that neutrality is not functioning as Gibb had intended in terms of faculty's perceptions of satisfaction with their chair relationship.

The fourth communicative behavior that contributed to overall satisfaction with the chair-faculty relationship was the supportive behavior of problem orientation. This behavior was also seen as a strong predictor of overall chair effectiveness. Problem orientation utilizes communication that is inclusive of the whole and focuses on communicating a desire for collaboration. A department chair that comes to decisions

too quickly, or without having thoroughly thought through the problem, risks not being perceived as collaborative. This affects the entire department because individuals are not likely to work to implement someone else's decisions (Lucas, 2000). Thus, faculty want to be included and are more satisfied with their chair when participative decision making is used.

The last predictor of relationship satisfaction was equality. The department is a unique organizational setting since everyone in the department who has achieved tenure is seen as essentially equal. In this way, a department chair is still a colleague and does not necessarily hold permanent authority over the rest of the faculty. Within many institutions the chair endures a short term in their position and often the position is rotated among the faculty (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004). Faculty perceive the department chair as a colleague and the chair must be careful to treat their colleagues as equally valuable and competent. Treating employees as equals has produced positive results in research in other organizations as well.

According to Salacuse (2005) durable working relationships begin with equality. The principle of equality between parties is the, "sense that each side recognizes that the other brings something valuable to their common enterprise and that both sides deserve to be heard" (p.4). Faculty expressed in this study that their chair must be willing to build relationships on this supportive communication behavior of equality in order to form satisfying personal relationships.

Chair Leadership & Communication

The ability to communicate effectively is not as common as one might expect, but it is essential to effective leadership (Gilley, 2003). This study sought to find out exactly

what types of communication behaviors characterize different styles of leadership. While a large percentage of the faculty perceived the use of supportive communication to be in conjunction with transformational leadership, there were other important findings in the communicate behaviors utilized with Machiavellian and bureaucratic leadership as well.

Machiavellian leadership. The first leadership finding deals with Machiavellian leadership. A strong relationship with defensive communication was found. If faculty members perceived their chair as utilizing a Machiavellian leadership style, they also reported their chair as utilizing defensive communication behaviors. This supports the perception that Machiavellian leaders are detached, manipulative, aggressive, and exploiting (Teven, McCrosky, & Richmond, 2006). These characteristics listed above are strikingly similar to the types of defensive communication behaviors that predicted Machiavellianism.

The first predictor was the defensive behavior of strategy. Strategy in communication always implies vagueness, with intent to engage in deceit. When using strategy the sender is perceived as ambiguous and as having multiple motives. This style of communication conceals information and may result in making issues larger than they really are (Gibb, 1961). A defensive reaction is sure to follow if the receiver feels that information is being withheld. It is obvious that strategy plays a key role in the behavior of a Machiavellian leader, and in this study also led to a more negative perception of the chair's effectiveness.

The second predictor of a Machiavellianism was the defensive communication behavior of control. A leader who is perceived as Machiavellian is by definition trying to manipulate and control situations. A broad set of "strategies" is purposely used to

accomplish the personal goals of the Machiavellian leader (Teven, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006). Some forms of communication that include elements of control are emphasizing legalistic details, restrictive regulations and policies, and conformity to norms (Gibb, 1961). Machiavellian leaders exert more control over their environment and take greater personal risks to gain control and influence than do other types of leaders. This results in a defensive attitude from the receiver as they may feel the sender is trying to make them feel inadequate or incapable of making decisions on their own. When the sender of the message makes all the decisions and controls the environment, defensive communication and Machiavellian leadership are present.

When a leader does not attempt to control those around them, they allow for input and operate without a predetermined solution in mind. This results in the third predictor of Machiavellianism. The third predictor was a negative correlation with the supportive communication behavior of problem orientation. If a leader did not exhibit problem orientation they were perceived as being more Machiavellian. This again was no surprise as Machiavellian leaders are not likely to openly collaborate with others (Teven, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006).

The last predictor of Machiavellian leadership was the defensive communication behavior of evaluation. When using evaluation moral judgments are made of colleagues. This type of blaming and exaggerated black-and-white thinking often leads to others questioning the values and motives of the sender (Gibb, 1961). This is again consistent with the type of characteristics displayed by Machiavellian leaders.

Overall, chairs that were perceived as Machiavellian utilized defensive communication behaviors typical of that style of leadership. As will be discussed in depth

later, both defensive communication and Machiavellian leadership negatively impact job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The premise is explained well by Ricks and Fraedrich (1999); in that when employees perceive that a supervisor is manipulating or controlling them in any way, the supervisor comes across as less credible, less trustworthy, less caring, and less competent. This is consistent with research by McHoskey, Worzel, and Szyarto (1998) that concluded that while deception and manipulative strategies will work in the short run, a negative interpretation and backlash by others is certain to follow.

Bureaucratic leadership. The next style of leadership that was examined was Bureaucratic leadership. Bureaucratic leadership seems to be at the heart of higher education. Colleges and universities have many bureaucratic properties because the same processes that create bureaucracies in other settings do so in higher education. The bureaucratic perspective on leadership in higher education focuses on extensive practical advice, including "how to deal with day to day tasks, the appropriate way of communicating and working with faculty and students, and how to exercise authority diplomatically"(Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989, p. 52). The concept of Bureaucracy may tend to conjure up negative images of higher education and even lead to leaders being labeled as autocratic and hierarchical.

This study reported modest results in measuring communication as a predictor of Bureaucratic leadership. In explaining this finding, one reason that Bureaucratic leadership was not as highly correlated with communication behaviors as Machiavellianism or Transformational may be due to the highly prescriptive nature of Bureaucracy. Since Bureaucracy is a structural form of leadership, principles and

policies tend to be straightforward. Often times these policies and procedures come in written form, thus negating the need for face-to-face interaction. This rationale is further supported by taking a closer looker at the communication variables that predicted Bureaucratic leadership.

The first predictor of Bureaucratic leadership was the supportive communication behavior of description. Descriptive communication is non-judgmental, information seeking communication. This finding is not as surprising as it may seem, but rather is indicative of the prescriptive and structural approach of Bureaucracy. Descriptive communication values clarity in communicating. "Clarity is the feeling that everyone knows what is expected of them and that they understand how those expectations relate to the organization" (Snow, 2002, p.295). Written policies often offer a clear answer to many of the issues faced by faculty and department chairs. No longer are issues open to discussion, but instead are deferred to a clearly written policy. Bureaucracy tends to work by stressing rational administrative procedures (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Description is another way in which faculty are asking for clear communication from their department chairs as to the policies and procedures of the department and larger university. However, when this is the only type of communication faculty receive from their chair, it becomes easy to see how department chairs would be perceived as utilizing a bureaucratic leadership style. Simply clarifying a policy is also an easy way to avoid more in-depth and involved conversations.

The second predictor of Bureaucratic leadership was gender. Females were more likely to report their department chairs as Bureaucratic. While research was not directly found to support this finding, there is one plausible explanation. Studies reveal small

differences in leadership style between men and women (Northouse, 2001). However, gender studies have shown that women are still somewhat less likely to "ask for what they want" (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). Furthermore, women are also less likely to negotiate issues. These gender differences become critical since negotiations are often needed to ascend into the leadership hierarchy (Small, Gelfand, Babcock, and Gettman, 2006). With these gender differences in mind, department chairs, regardless of their gender, can more easily answer a female colleague with descriptive policy and end an interaction precipitously without the female asking or negotiating for more. This type of policy communication may lead to a Bureaucratic perception of the chair. Obviously additional research in this area is needed to make any kind of concrete claim. In addition future research should include the gender of the chair to make gender dyad specific conclusions.

The last predictor of Bureaucratic leadership is the defensive communication behavior control. The Bureaucratic leader is described as the final authority figure who controls most of the organization power. This picture of the Bureaucratic leader is consistent with past research and theory. Weber (1947) characterized Bureaucracy as a "closed system driven by rational-legal authority, with a reliance on rules, clearly established hierarchy, and centralized power" (p.30).

Issuing orders and demanding compliance from others, with little or no input from other members, is controlling communication (Rothwell, 2007). Chairs are the critical link between the faculty and the administration. Many faculty members find out about important administrative decisions through their department chairs after the decision has already been made. This can lead faculty members to feel they have no say in the

process. The chair then appears to be the one with all the power and control when representing all the faculty issues to the administration. In reality, a chair may or may not have control over administrative decisions, but oftentimes faculty perceive the chair as the one in control due to the hierarchical nature of higher education administration (Rakos, 2001). It is the chairs job to pass down information regarding budget issues, curriculum modification, faculty searches, performance evaluation, and governance processes. Based on the information the chair has to communicate to faculty and how this information is communicated, he or she can be perceived as having complete control.

Transformational leadership. The last form of leadership this study measured was Transformational leadership. A very robust relationship was found between communication and Transformational leadership. Transformational leadership emphasizes goals and values and moving leader and followers to higher levels of motivation and morality (Northouse, 2001). While Birnbaum (1992) asserts that "Transformational leadership is an anomaly in higher education" (p.29), this study holds promise for the use of Transformational leadership by department chairs.

A prominent predictor of Transformational leadership is communication. Supportive communication overwhelmingly predicted Transformational leadership. Many of the supportive communication behaviors are not only predictive of Transformational leadership, but are the same supportive communication behaviors associated with high chair job effectiveness and chair-faculty relationship satisfaction. This is again consistent with previous research. Brown and Moshavi (2002) found that transformational leadership behaviors are positively associated with faculty satisfaction with department chair supervision and perceptions of organizational effectiveness.

The first supportive communication behavior associated with Transformational leadership is problem orientation. This is no surprise since problem orientation was also the top predictor of chair job effectiveness and the third predictor of chair-faculty relationship satisfaction in this study. Problem orientation is language that communicates a desire to collaborate and engage in mutual problem solving and seeking (Gibb, 1961). Effective chairs function as team leaders, not as autocrats or peers. Problem orientation can nonverbal as shown through listening. In a supportive climate of problem orientation chairs visit faculty offices frequently and attempt to include faculty members in decision making and respect their feelings and values (Lucas, 1994, 2000).

Along with being included in the process, faculty desire communication with department chairs that is clear and accurate; information that is not withheld, or contains deliberate attempts to deceive (Lucas, 1994). This is especially clear in the second predictor variable of Transformational leadership which is spontaneity. Spontaneity is a supportive communication behavior that calls for all information to be shared openly and honestly with others (Gibb, 1961). Spaid and Parsons (1999) found that chairs view themselves as needing to be honest, able to promote teamwork, and able to break down communication barriers. Honesty topped the list in Spaid and Parsons (1999) study. Lucas (2000) states that "in an effective team, communication is open and honest...shared with all team members and individuals" (p.23). Faculty clearly do not want to be deceived and embrace a leadership style were information is shared openly.

The last two predictors of Transformational leadership are not quite as obvious a fit as the first two. The third factor was gender and the fourth neutrality. Females were more inclined to rate their department chairs as Transformational. While there is evidence

to support that more females utilize Transformational leadership more than men (Careless, 1998), this did not help to explain this study's findings since the gender of the department chair was unknown. With little research to explain why women perceive leaders as more Transformational than their male counterparts perceive leaders, an examination of gender differences once again is in order.

Women are often attributed characteristics such as concern for others, sensitivity, warmth, helpfulness, and nurturance. In contrast, gender characteristics attributed to men are confidence, assertiveness, independence, and rationality. There is substantial empirical evidence that reveals that gender differences and stereotypes can significantly alter the perception and evaluation of female leaders (Northouse, 2001). However, the gender of the department chair in this study would need to have been known to validate this claim. Since the chair's gender was not known, one can only hypothesize that the gender characteristics of women are more in-line with Transformational leadership than are the characteristics of males. Obviously more gender specific research is needed to fully explain this finding.

The fourth predictor of Transformational leadership, neutrality, is seen as a defensive behavior according to Gibb (1961). However, neutrality has consistently appeared in this study as contributing to positive outcomes. Two explanations are provided for this continuing result. The first is the nature of faculty culture and autonomy. For many years faculty have enjoyed an immense amount of freedom. Academics have an autonomy that is unique to most organizational settings. Faculty teach their courses and conduct their research without having to interact with other faculty members. Many faculty members control their own schedules and may not have

to account for their time. While the stereotype of the solitary scholar working alone in a laboratory is changing, many faculty members still embrace a life of autonomy (Austin & Baldwin, 1991). Neutrality is a communication behavior that does not attempt to become personally involved with others issues and problems. With such a high sense of autonomy and freedom among faculty, neutrality may just be the type of communication faculty seek from their chairs, less they feel they are being micromanaged. This also seems to coincide with Transformational leadership where members feel a sense of empowerment to act on their own (Northouse, 2001).

The second explanation for the abundant appearance of neutrality deals with the validity of Gibb's initial construct. There has been little empirical research done using Gibb's communication climates and behaviors. It may be possible that Gibb's categories are not reflective of the original definitions and intent Gibb surmised. This issue will be discussed in greater detail in the implications section. It is clear that the use of supportive communication is crucial to achieve a Transformational style of leadership.

Lucas (1994, 2000) emphasizes supportive communication as the key element chairs need to be effective leaders. This has been found to be true in this study. Communication behaviors have a profound effect on predicting effectiveness, satisfaction, and leadership style of the department chair. While this study focused on faculty's perceptions of department chairs, the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the faculty were assessed as well.

Job Satisfaction & Organizational Commitment

Until the late 1920's management theory paid little attention to whether or not employees were satisfied and happy. The Human Relations approach expanded the

thinking of the time to also consider the individual needs of employees (Miller, 2006). With this new perspective toward management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment increasingly became topics of wide interest to people who work in organizations and to the people who study them (Spector, 1997).

Job satisfaction. Until recently, job satisfaction was the most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior research (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and the different aspects of their jobs. Communication behaviors accounted for over 50% of reported faculty job satisfaction. Faculty were more satisfied with their jobs when supportive communication behaviors were used and when defensive ones were not used by their department chairs.

The first predictor of faculty job satisfaction is strategy. Strategy, a defensive communication behavior, had a highly negative correlation with job satisfaction. Strategy appeared frequently in this study as a type of communication behavior that faculty deemed negative and not desirable. It cannot be stressed enough that faculty do not want to be manipulated, deceived, and/or have information withheld from them. When this happens receivers of communication become defensive and resent the deliberate assumption of the sender to deceive (O'Hair & Cody, 1994). When strategic or manipulative communication is used, the social relationships and team effectiveness of the members are destroyed (LaFasto & Larson, 2001).

The second predictor of job satisfaction was the defensive behavior of neutrality. Neutrality, even though defensive in Gibb's schema, was positively correlated with faculty job satisfaction. Once again the need to more closely examine the nature of faculty work and their environment may provide a reasonable explanation for this result.

As mentioned earlier, faculty function in an environment with high autonomy. They are responsible for their own schedule, classes, and research. Furthermore, work relationships are typically not intimate in nature and may indeed have more neutral properties. Research by Kram and Isabella (1985) reported three levels of closeness in peer relationships in organizations: information peer (lowest level), collegial peer, and the special peer (highest level). The information peer (lowest level) was the most common organizational relationship found and functioned mainly to provide information about work and task issues (Kram & Isabella, 1985).

A second explanation for the neutrality finding is that Gibb's (1961) construct as he conceptualized it, is not congruent with the experience of faculty members. This study will assert that several of Gibb's constructs may need to be re-examined in light of new empirical research utilizing them. This will be discussed in more detail in the implications section.

The third and final predictor of job satisfaction was the supportive communication behavior of problem orientation. Problem orientation is a positive communication behavior that has appeared numerous times in this study as a predictor of effectiveness, leadership and now job satisfaction. Problem orientation deals with the inclusion of members in collaborating on issues and problems. In a study of US companies it was found that when an executive attempted to impose their ideas on colleagues, 58% of the time the plans were rejected. In comparison, when colleagues were asked for their problem solving ideas, 96 % of the plans were approved (McNutt, 1997). Obviously an open environment where faculty ideas are regularly sought out and incorporated leads to higher job satisfaction.

Organizational Commitment. Today many organizations bemoan the fact that employee commitment is a thing of the past. A committed employee is one who stays with the organization through "thick and thin" (Meyer & Allen, 1997). There are several factors affected by organizational commitment including less turn-over, and less training for organizations. Organizational commitment can also influence employee productivity and job satisfaction (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

In this study faculty noted high organizational commitment when defensive communication behaviors were not utilized by their department chairs. Organizational commitment was also higher based on sex and age. Findings show that females were more inclined to higher organizational commitment scores. In addition, the older the faculty member was correlated with more organizational commitment.

The first communication behavior predicting organizational commitment was the defensive communication behavior of strategy. Strategy had a highly negative correlation with organizational commitment. This means that the more faculty perceived their chairs to used strategy as a communication behavior the lower their organizational commitment. Strategy manipulates and deceives and has appeared throughout this study as a negative contributor to effectiveness, satisfaction, leadership, and now commitment.

The second predictor was once again the defensive behavior of neutrality, which was positively associated with organizational commitment. Neutrality results were not expected and definitely call into question the conception of neutrality at least as Gibb had defined it. However, the same plausible explanation regarding faculty culture can begin to explain this finding. The more a faculty member felt that they were left alone or empowered to make their own decisions, the more organizational commitment they

reported. Based on the autonomous environment of the faculty culture, ability to choose classes, times, textbooks, etc., this conclusion seems reasonable.

The last communication predictor of organizational commitment was the defensive behavior of evaluation. Evaluation had a negative relationship with organizational commitment. Thus, the more a faculty member felt their chair used evaluative communication, the lower their organizational commitment. Evaluative communication involves blame, criticism, and contempt. Baron (1990,1988) found that workers who were criticized produced more conflict, felt more demoralized, reduced their work effort, and refused to work with those who criticize and evaluate. In essence the reduction of work effort and even refusal to work with others could lead to an eventual organization change, let alone a decrease in organizational commitment.

The last two predictors of organizational commitment were the demographic variables of gender and age. In this study females reported slightly higher organizational commitment than males. While some studies have reported gender differences in commitment, there is no consistent conclusion on gender and organizational commitment. In addition it is argued that when gender differences are found in commitment levels, they are more appropriately attributed to different work characteristics and experiences than to gender (Meyer & Allen, 1997). It is arguable that work characteristics and experiences are the reason for the slightly higher female commitment in this study.

Organizational commitment was highly correlated with age. The older the faculty member was the more organizational commitment they reported. This is very consistent with previous research that also found that organizational commitment increases with age (van der Velde, Bossink, & Jansen, 2003). This finding is not surprising given the "up or

out" tenure decision most faculty face. This study's sample also included only full-time faculty members, which may also explain the high reporting of organizational commitment.

All employers have a stake in assessing and knowing their employees' satisfaction and commitment. Both outcomes have been correlated with higher job productivity and more job involvement. Both of these elements are definitely desirable for any organization and especially for higher education.

Implications

There are four major implications that can be drawn from this study. The following implications are: (1) communication matters, (2) leadership is a communication phenomenon, (3) chair training may improve communication skill and the overall communication climate in a department, and (4) Gibb's theoretical construct needs to be re-examined. Each of these implications will be discussed in some depth.

The first and most important conclusion of this study is that how someone communicates makes a huge impact. It is no wonder that almost every book, article, or interview, has chairs citing communication skills among the top skill needed to be an effective chair (Hickson, & McCrosky, 1991; Lindholm, 1999; Townsend, & Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996). Entire volumes have been dedicated to looking for the core talent that any chair must possess. In 1992, Hickson and Stack concluded in *Effective Communication for Academic Chairs,* that communication constituted the "make it or break it" skill.

It is no accident that communication is the "make it or break it" skill. Organizational communication scholars have been studying the effects of communication on organizations since the 1950's (Redding, 1973). However, the field of higher

education management has neglected to utilize their information (Allen, 2003; Hickson, & McCroskey, 1991). This neglect is unwarranted since the communication climate in any organization is a key determinant of its effectiveness (Costigan, & Schmeidler, 1984). The communication climate is also highly predictive of organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Guzley, 1992). A communication climate can have an enormous impact on an organization, but little is known learning to communicate in a specific manner to produce the right climate.

A communication climate is created "through reports of members' perceptions of messages and message-related events occurring in the organization" (Dennis, 1974, p.29). This implies that communication must be examined on the micro-level of each individual. Jack Gibb did just that in his communication climate studies in the 1960s. He provided a concrete model of specific communication behaviors that happen in small groups. However, little of his research has been empirically tested to date. This study tested Gibb's theory and found significant results in how the use of defensive and supportive communication shapes the climate of a department. The unique contribution of this study is that it provides a specific working model for chairs to change and improve their communication behaviors. Based on the testing of Gibb's schema, chairs can now learn the verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors they need to utilize and those they need to stay away from. With the proper communication climate a department could be more effective, satisfied, and committed.

The communication behavior most frequently reported by faculty members was the supportive behavior of problem orientation. Problem orientation was a predictor of chair effectiveness, chair-faculty relationship satisfaction, Transformational leadership,

and job satisfaction. The significant conclusion here is that chairs must communicate that a collaborative environment exists where faculty's ideas are included and implemented. Chairs can do this through communicating a desire to collaborate; defining problems as mutual and departmental, and letting faculty know that there are no predetermined solutions.

The next communication behavior that faculty frequently reported was the defensive behavior of strategy. Strategy had a highly negative impact on predicting effectiveness, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The conclusion here is that department chairs should not use strategy as a means of communication. Instead chairs should communicate in an open manner, which shares all information and honestly answers all faculty questions. Faculty in the department should know the same information and have available information from their chair. While there are several other behaviors that chairs can learn that this study found significant, problem orientation and strategy were two of the most reported communication behaviors that impacted faculty.

The second implication that can be drawn from this study is that leadership is indeed a communication phenomenon. Hackman and Johnson (2000) define leadership as a communication function. When we recognize that the communication climate is created by the stories and information reported and perceived by its members, we also understand that this is the main means of communicating leadership as well. Leaders use language, stories, and rituals to discuss the past, present, and future in which they reveal their visions and goals (Hackman & Johnson, 2000). Bowman (2002) best explains the communicative aspect of leadership for department chairs by realizing, "the real work of

department chairs is not to manage departments or even functions. Rather, they manage conversational inquiry that engages others in creating possibilities, breakthroughs, and a sustainable future" (p. 161).

This study did not only look at specific communication behaviors, but how these behaviors affect the overall communication and organizational climate. Both of these climates are created through communication and set the stage for leadership to occur. Bowman (2002) concurs, that chairs function as leaders when they focus on the key aspects of organizational culture. Organizational culture is a direct result of the communication, stories, metaphors, and narratives that happen among people in an organization (Mohan, 1993).

Transformational leadership seems to embody the notion that leadership is a communication function. Transformational leadership is based on the ability to raise organizational members to a higher standard and communicate a common vision. Munitz (1995) maintains that to be a transformational leader in higher education a "major talent for managing organizational change, skill with people, and the ability to speak well and disseminate and sell ideas" is paramount (p.14). Recent studies have suggested that universities should consider selecting department chairs on the basis of their transformational leadership behaviors (Brown & Moshavi, 2002).

It is clear that academic departments are more than structures and hierarchies, and future leaders will have to possess a diverse set of leadership skills with "well-honed" communication skills toping the list (Bowman, 2002). Transformational leadership fits the style of leadership that is being called for in higher education today. This study

confirms that transformational leadership is in essence a product of careful attention to communication style and behavior.

The third implication of this study is the continuing emphasis that chairs need training prior to taking on the position. Given the critical role chairs play it is curious that so little attention is paid to the manner in which chairs are chosen and trained. Adding to the problem is the notion that in many places to be "faculty" means not to be "administration" (Peters, 1994). Institutions must begin to offer opportunities for training. It stands to reason that an institution has much at stake in the appointment and performance of its chairs. Ultimately, the institution itself has a primary obligation to assist in the training of chairs (Peters, 1994). Universities will also have to re-visit the issue of rotating versus permanent chairs. While Lucas (2000) makes the argument that either method of selecting chairs can result in effective leadership, more research looking specifically at this issue is needed to determine if a change in policy should be considered. For now, regardless of how the chair arrives at the position, training and support is a must.

There are several institutions that have implemented chair-training programs that are making a difference. Some recommendations are chair-training workshops. Programs at Michigan State (Peters, 1994) include varied workshops such as, personnel policies and procedures, faculty performance review, legal affairs, grievances and complaints, and planning and budgeting. North Carolina State University (NCSU) utilizes case scenario engagements to more fully examine practices and implementation of leadership. Shadowing is also another highly utilized activity at NCSU (Lindholm, 1999). The Administrative Leadership Institute was founded to provide opportunities for

chairs (Spanger, 1999), along with The Chair Academy, which holds international conferences to promote social and professional interaction of academic chairs (Filan, 1999). In addition to workshops and conferences, administrators might benefit from reading publications such as *The Department Chair* and other additional reference materials about the chair position (Diamond, 1996). In order for colleges to be successful in the future, it is essential that department chairs have the necessary skills.

The fourth and final implication from this study deals with the empirical testing of Gibb's theory. Based on the findings from this study it is suggested that Gibb's theory be reexamined. There were three of Gibbs behaviors that did not appear in this study as significant. Certainty, provisionalism, and superiority were not found to be significant predictors of the dependent variables utilized in this study. The original definitions of these behaviors may not apply in the organizational setting of higher education.

Furthermore, the concept of neutrality, a defensive behavior, appeared as a significant predictor of effectiveness, satisfaction, transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. While Gibb conceptualized neutrality as a defensive behavior, it could be that faculty and others enjoy neutrality and view the construct more positively than when Gibb first conceived of the notion of neutrality.

Gibb continues to appear in numerous textbooks in the communication discipline, and we should not simply abide by his theory without more empirical testing. Gibb's theory does provide to date the most concrete prescription for communication behavior. Gibb's model could be improved upon with more inquiry and attention to his notions of defensive and supportive communication.

Limitations & Recommendations

Along with the initial limitations recognized at the onset of this study, there were also others that did arise along the way. The biggest limitation of the study was the population itself, since only schools belonging to the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) were sampled. Ultimately conclusions can only be drawn in regards to this specific population. While CIC schools share many of the same characteristics as other colleges, caution in drawing too general of a conclusion is warranted. Replicated studies should include all types of higher education institutions to confirm this studies finding.

The second limitation of this study was the use of the communication climate scale. While all individual construct alpha levels were high, this instrument has not been widely used in empirical research and certainly not in the educational setting. More refinement of the instrument is recommended along with wider spread use of the instrument in research.

The last limitation of this study lies in the questions not asked, that most likely should have been included in the survey and were not. There are several future questions that should be asked to help clarify this study's finding. One of the most critical questions would be the gender of the department chair. This would aid in better understanding of the gender findings in this study. The method by which the chair is appointed should also be considered. While it was asked how long the current chair had been in their position, there was no way of differentiating between a hired chair and a rotating chair. This information could supply insight into leadership patterns and the implementation of future types of training programs.

Conclusion

This study aimed to produce a conceptual model of communication for department chairs. The results of this study were able to find specific communication behaviors that department chairs might utilize or avoid in order to increase their effectiveness with faculty. Supportive communication behaviors by department chairs led to more perceived effectiveness, relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, and organization commitment, by faculty members. Furthermore, Transformational leadership was reported as a leadership style that is predicted by supportive communication. All of the findings of this study point to the importance of creating a supportive communication climate as a crucial department chair leadership goal.

As scholars and administrators bemoan the great leadership crisis in higher education, there is hope that there are solutions to this leadership dilemma (Gmelch, 2004). While many leadership issues in higher education continue to evolve, this study sought to focus on the critical leadership role of the department chair. It is possible for chairs to learn to develop their leadership skills through practice and training. There are many complex skills that chairs must hone, but one in particular that seems to make the difference is communication. No longer does one need to confront the empty truism that they need to "communicate better". This study contributes the specific communication behaviors that a chair should engage in, as well as avoid, in order to create effective communication between the faculty and the chair. Ultimately, leading a department is a continuous interaction between the faculty and the chair (Thomas & Schuh, 2004).

References

Allen, D.K. (2003). Organisational climate and strategic change in higher education: Organisational insecurity. *Higher Education, 46,* 61-92.

Alvesson, M., & Berg, P.O. (1992). *Corporate culture and organizational symbolism: An overview.* Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Armstrong, T., Blake, S., & Pitrowski, C. (2000). The application of a 360-degree Feedback managerial development program in higher education: The Florida Model. *Education, 120,* 691-696.

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bare, A. (1986). Managerial behavior of college chairpersons and administrators. *Research in Higher Education, 24*(2), 128-138.

Barge, K., & Musambira, G. (1992). Turning points in chair-faculty relationships. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 20,* 54-77.

Baron, R. (1988). Negative effects of destructive criticism: Impact on conflict self-efficacy and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73,* 199-207.

Baron, R. (1990). Countering the effects of destructive criticism: The relative efficacy of four interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 235-243.

Baruch, Y. (1999). Response rate in academic studies: A comparative analysis. *Human Relations, 52*(4), 421-438.

Beebe, S., Beebe, S., & Redmond, M. (2005). *Interpersonal communication: Relating to others* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, J. (1989). About department chairs. *American Association for Higher Education, 42,* 9-11.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1.* Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Bila, T., & Miller, M. (1997). *College faculty cultures: Dominance in the academy.* Paper presented at the sixth annual meeting of the Popular Culture Association of the Pacific Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass..

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bliss, T. (1996). Secondary department chair roles: Ambiguity and change in systemic reform. *Journal of School Leadership, 6,* 30-46.

Bowman, R. (2002). The real work of department chair. *Clearing House, 75,* 158-162.

Brown, W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 8,* 79-93.

Burleson, B., & Samter, W. (1990). Effects of cognitive complexity on the perceived importance of communication skills in friends. *Communication Research, 17,* 165-183.

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

Careless, S.A. (1998). Gender differences in Transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Role, 39*(11/12), 887-901.

Carroll, J.B. (1990). *Career paths of departmental chairs in doctoral granting institutions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, WA. Center for the Study of the Department Chair. (1991). *Job satisfaction for chairs, 2*(1), 15-18.

Carroll, J. & Gmelch, W. (1992). *The relationship of department chair roles to the importance of chair duties.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Carroll, J., & Wolverton, M. (2004). Who becomes chair? *New Directions in Higher Education, 126,* 3-10.

Center for the Study of the Department Chair. (1990). *Chairs in transition, 1*(2), 7-10.

Christie, R., & Geis, F.L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism.* New York: Academic Press.

Conrad, C. (1985). *Strategic organizational communication: Cultures, situations, and adaptation.* New York: NY, CBS College Publishing.

Costigan, J.L., & Schmeidler, M.A. (1984). Exploring supportive and defensive communication climates. In J.W. Pfeiffer & L.D. Goodstein (Eds.), *The 1984 handbook for group facilitators* (pp. 112-114). San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Covrig, D.M. (2000). The organizational context of moral dilemmas: The role of moral leadership in administration in making and breaking dilemmas. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(1), 40-59.

Creswell, J., Wheeler, D., Seagren, A, Egly, N., & Beyer, K. (1990). The academic chairperson's handbook. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Creswell, J. (1986). *The academic department: Faculty growth and development practices of excellent chairs.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Cross, G. (1978). How to overcome defensive communication. *Personnel Journal, 3,* 441-456.

Dennis, H.S. (1974). *A theoretical and empirical study of managerial communication climate in complex organizations.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Dennis, M. & Kunkel, A. (2004). Perceptions of men, women, and CEO's: The effects of gender identity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 32*(2), 155-172.

Diamond, R.M. (1996). What it takes to lead the department. *The Department chair: A newsletter for academic administrators, 8,* 3-5.

Dillman, D. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method.* New York: Wiley.

Durand, D.E., & Nord, W.R. (1976). Perceived leader behavior as a function of personality characteristics of supervisor and subordinates. *Academy of Management Journal, 19*(3), 427-438.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 735-744.

Ehrenberg, R.G.(Ed.) (2004). *Governing Academia.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Filan, G. (1999). The need for leadership training: The evolution of the chair academy. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 47-56.

Firth-Cozens, J., & Mowbray, D. (2001). Leadership and the quality of care. *Quality in Health Care, 10,* 113-117.

Fogg, P. (2006). Young Ph.D.'s say collegiality matters more than salary. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(6), 1-1.

Forward, G. L. (2001). Servant or CEO? A metaphor analysis of leadership in a nonprofit context. *The New Jersey Journal of Communication, 9*(2), 145-165.

Forward, G.L., & Czech, K. (2005). *Therapist, juggler, or cheerleader? Conceptualizing CAO leadership, communication, and job satisfaction.* Paper presented at the National Communication Association, Boston, Massachusetts.

Fowler, F. (1995). *Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation.* Applied Social Research Methods Series, v 38, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Fritz, J.H. (1997). Men's and women's organizational peer relationships: A comparison. *Journal of Business Communication, 34,* 27-46.

Fryer, T., & Lovas, J. (1990). *Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Garcia, E. (1997). The chair as mediator: Balancing the new and the old while the winds roar. *ADFL Bulletin, 28,* 18-20.

Gay, L.R. (1996). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gibb, J. (1961). Defensive communication. *The Journal of Communication, 11,* 141-148.

Giles-Gee, H., & McMahon, M.J. (1997). System-wide and institutional development Programs for chairpersons. *The Department Chair, 8*(1), 18-19.

Gilley,D. (2003). Bedside manner and effective academic administrative leadership. *New Directions for Higher Education, 124,* 95-102.

Girodo, M. (1998). Machiavellian, bureaucratic, and transformational leadership styles in police managers, Preliminary findings of interpersonal ethics. *Perception and* Motor Skills, 86(2), 419-427.

Gizir, S. & Simsek, H. (2005). Communication in an academic context. *Higher Education, 50,* 2, 197-221.

Gmelch, W. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. *New Directions for Higher Education, 126*, 69-84.

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

Gmelch, W., & Parkay, F. (1999, April). *Becoming a department chair: Negotiating the transition from scholar to administrator.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Gomes, R., & Knowles, P. (1999). Marketing department leadership: An analysis of a team transformation. *Journal of Marketing Education, 21,* 164-174.

Greenberg, M. (1999). So you want to be an administrator? *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45,* 44-45.

Guzley, R. (1992). Organizational climate and communication climate: Predictors of commitment to the organization. *Management Communication Quarterly, 5,* 379-402.

Hackman, M., & Johnson, C. (2000). *Leadership: A communication perspective.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (1992). *Mutlivariate Data Analysis with Readings* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Hart, R. & Burks, D. (1972). Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. *Speech Monographs, 39,* 75-91.

Hays, A. (2005). *Statistical methods for communication science.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hecht, I., Higgerson, M., Gmelch, W., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader.* Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Hickson, M., & McCroskey, J. (1991). Diagnosing communication problems of Academic chairs: Applied communication in context. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 78,* 8-13.

Hickson, M., & Stacks, D. (Eds.). (1992). *Effective communication for academic chairs.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Higgerson, M.L. (1996). *Communication skills for department chairs.* Bolton, MA: Anker Press.

Hilosky, A., & Watwood, B. (1997). Transformational leadership in a changing world: A survival guide for new chairs and deans. In Walking the Tightrope: The balance between innovation and leadership. *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the Chair Academy.* Reno, NV.

Hirokawa, R., Barge, K., Becker, S., & Sutherland, J. (1989). The department chair as responsible academic leader: A competency based perspective. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 67,* 8-19.

Hitt, W.D. (1990). *Ethics and leadership: Putting theory into practice.* Columbus, OH: Battelle.

Hodgson, T.A. (1994). Understanding leadership's moral dimension. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*(3), 67-77.

House, A., Dallinger, J., & Kilgallen, D. (1998). Androgyny and rhetorical sensitivity: The connection of gender and communicator style. *Communication Reports, 11*(1), 11-20.

Hubbell, L., & Homer, F. (1997). The academic department chair: The logic of appeasement. *Political Science and Politics, 30,* 209-213.

Jones, D., & Holdaway, E. (1996). Post-secondary department heads: Expectations for academic leadership and authority. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 10,* 10.

Kanungo, R.N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Keyton, J. (2001). *Communication research: Asking questions, finding answers.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kezar, A. (2005). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions: An exploration into the development process. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 831-860.

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

Kram, K. & Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 110-132.

Kremer-Hayon, L. & Avi-Itzhak, T.E. (1986). Roles of academic department chair persons at the university level. *Higher Education, 15*(1/2), 105-112.

LaFasto, F., & Larson, C. (2001). *When teams work best: 6,000 team members and leaders tell what it takes to succeed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Larsen, S., & Folgero, I. (1993). Supportive and defensive communication. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 5*(3), 22-26.

Lees, K., Smith, D., & Stockhouse, J. (1994, October). *Implicit theoretical leadership frameworks of higher education administration.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Sun Valley, ID.

Lindholm, J. (1999). Preparing department chairs for their leadership roles. *Eric Digest.*

Littlejohn, S.W. (1989). *Theories of human communication.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lucas, A., & Associates (2000). *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

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

Mann, R.D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 56,* 241-270.

McHoskey, J.C., Worzel, W., & Szyarto, C. (1998). Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 192-210.

McKeachie, W. (1975). Memo to new department chairmen. *Educational Record, 56*(4), 221-227.

McNutt, P. (1997). When strategic decisions are ignored. *Fast Company,* 17-22.

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, K. (2006). *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes* (4th ed). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Mohan, M.L. (1993). *Organizational communication and cultural vision.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mowday, R., Stears, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 14, 224-247.

Mumby, D.K. (2000). Common ground from the critical perspective: Overcoming binary oppositions. In S.R. Corman & M.S. Poole (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Munitz, B. (1995). Wanted: New leadership for higher education. *Planning for Higher Education, 24,* 9-16.

Newton, J. (2002). Barriers to effective quality management and leadership: Case study of two academic departments. *Higher Education, 44,* 2, 185-212.

Northouse, P. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Norton, R. (1983). *Communicator style: Theory, application, and measure.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Norton, R. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. *Human Communication Research, 4,* 99-112.

O'Hair, D., & Cody, W. (1994). Deception. In W.R. Cupach & B.H. Spitzberg (Ed.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp.181-213). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pace, W.R. (1983). *Organizational communication: Foundation for human resource development.* Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Payne, R.L. (2000). Climate and culture: How close can they get? In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, & M.F. Peterson. (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture & climate* (pp.163-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peters, G.F. (1994). Institutional responsibility and chair training: The Michigan State Model. *ADFL Bulletin, 25*(3), 99-103.

Poole, M.S. (1985). Communication and organizational climates: Review, critique, and a new perspective. In R.D. McPhee & P.K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp.79-108). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rakos, R. (2001). The department chair: Antecedent and postcedent stimulus control. *Behavior and Social Issues, 11,* 31-48.

Redding, C. (1973). *Communication within the organization.* New York, NY: Industrial Communication Council.

Ricks, J., & Fraedrich, J. (1999). The paradox of Machiavellianism: Machiavellianism may make for productive sales but poor management reviews. *Journal of Business Ethics, 20,* 197-205.

Rothwell, J.D. (2004). *In mixed company: Communicating in small groups and teams.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Salacuse, J. (2005). The deal is done—Now what? *Negotiation* ,3-5.

Schauber, A. (2001). Effecting extension organizational change toward cultural diversity: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Extension, 39*(3), 1-7.

Seagren, A. (2000). The department chair as academic leader. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71,* 634-636.

Seedorf, R.G. (1991, April). *The transition of the university department chair: What must be left behind?* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Sergiovanni, T., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F., & Thurston, P. (1992). *Educational governance and administration.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Shedd, P. (2005). Reducing ambiguity, awkwardness in evaluating faculty. *Academic Leader, 21*(2), 5-8.

Singleton, B. (1987). Sources of consequences of role conflict and role ambiguity among department chairs. *Copstone Journal of Education, 7*(2), 39-50.

Small, D.A., Gelfand, M., Babcock, L., & Gettman, H. (2006). *Who goes to the bargaining table? Understanding gender variation in the initiation of negotiation.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Snow, J. (2002). Enhancing work climate to improve performance and retain valued employees. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 32*(7/8), 393-397.

Spangler, M.S. (1999). The practitioner's guide to midlevel management development. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 21-29.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

St. John, D. (1996). Forget the global communication climate for a minute: How's The weather inside your own organization? *Communication World, 13*(3), 24-25.

Stanton-Spicer, A., & Spicer, C. (1987). Socialization of the academic chairperson: A typology of communication dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 23,* 41-64.

Stodgill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Sundberg, M. (2001). Guest editorial: On being a department chair. *The American Biology Teacher, 63,* 306-307.

Teven, J., McCroskey, J., & Richmond, V. (2006). Communication correlates of perceived Machiavellianism of supervisors: Communication orientations and outcomes. *Communication Quarterly, 54*(2), 127-142.

The Pew Higher Education Roundtable, The Pew Charitable Trusts. Double agent. *Policy Perspectives 6*, no. 3 (February).

Thomas, J.R., & Schuh, J. (2004). Socializing new chairs. *New Directions for Higher Education, 126,* 11-26

Townsend, B. K., & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1996). *If I'd only known: Administrative preparation that could have made a difference.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York: NY.

Tracey,B., & Hinkin, T. (1998). *Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Van der Velde, M., Bossink, C., & Jansen, P. (2003). Gender differences in the influence of professional tenure on work attitudes. *Sex Roles, 49*(3/4), 153-162.

Verbeke, W., Volgering, M., & Hessels, M. (1998). Exploring the conceptual expansion within the field of organizational behavior: Organizational climate and organizational culture. *Journal of Management Studies, 25,* 303-329.

Weber, M. (1946). Bureaucracy. In H.H. Gerth & C.W. Mills (Eds. and Trans.), *Essays in sociology*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, R. (2001). Beggar, Psychologist, Mediator, Maid: The thankless job of a chairman. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 47,* 10-13.

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M.L., & Gmelch W. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70,* 80-106.

Appendix A
Pre-Notice & Cover Letters

POINT LOMA
NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

Department of
Communication and
Theatre

March 13, 2006

Dear Colleague,

In the next several days you will be receiving a survey that will provide the basis of my dissertation. Many of you may recall the experience of your own dissertation and how dependent you were on the goodwill of others.

As fellow faculty members you are in a unique position to contribute to academic research. My research focuses on faculty's perceptions of their current department chair's communication and leadership style. This survey will explore your perception of the communication and leadership behaviors your chair uses. In addition the survey will assess your job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

All responses to the survey will be anonymous and used for aggregate purposes only. No individual or institutional names will be recorded with the data. You will receive your survey shortly. Please consider filling out and returning the survey. Thank you for adding to academic research and scholarly activity. I appreciate your help in making my dissertation a reality!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Czech
Doctoral Candidate in Educational Leadership– University of San Diego
Assistant Professor Communication & Theatre
Point Loma Nazarene University
619-849-2315
kczech@ptloma.edu

POINT LOMA
NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

Department of
Communication and
Theatre

March 17, 2006

Dear Colleague,

Recently I sent you a letter indicating that you would be receiving a survey concerning department chair communication and leadership. This survey is part of my dissertation for the educational leadership doctoral program at the University of San Diego. I am writing to ask for your help in this study by completing this survey.

I am contacting you as part of a random sample of the Council of Independent Colleges faculty members. Over 400 faculty members were randomly selected from all academic domains.

The Department Chair Communication Inventory is a survey designed to investigate YOUR perceptions as a faculty member about your current department chair's communication and leadership style. As one of the most crucial relationships in the university, further insight into what makes effective chair-faculty relationships is needed. Your candid feedback will help provide these insights.

This survey is completely voluntary. If you choose to take the survey your name and institution will remain completely anonymous. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please return the completed questionnaire in the pre-paid postage envelope. You will also find a pre-paid post card to return separately to have your name removed from the mailing list, should a second mailing be necessary.

Many of you may recall relying on the generosity of others for your own dissertation. You can make a contribution to my educational development and our mutual vocation by completing this questionnaire. As a small token of appreciation a coffee single is included for you to enjoy while taking the questionnaire.

If you have any further questions or comments about this dissertation study, please contact me at 619-849-2315, kczech@ptloma.edu.

I truly appreciate your kindness in making my dissertation possible!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Czech
Assistant Professor of Communication
Point Loma Nazarene University

POINT LOMA
NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

Department of
Communication and
Theatre

March 30, 2006

Dear Colleague,

Recently I sent out a letter asking for your help with the research for my dissertation. As a randomly selected faculty member, your feedback on the Department Chair Communication Inventory is highly valued. This is a critical issue for all involved in higher education.

I realize that many of you are extremely busy and some may have been away at spring/Easter break. To make things more convenient I have enclosed the survey again, along with both a pre-paid envelope and post card. I would like to encourage you to fill out the enclosed survey concerning your perceptions about your department chair. The survey is completely anonymous, and no names or institutions will be identified with the survey information.

I cannot express my gratitude enough for your time and participation! I have also enclosed information about myself that may give you more insight into my dissertation project and answer any questions you have about me.

Thank you for your part in this process and your contribution to departmental leadership and communication.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Czech
Assistant Professor of Communication

3900 Lomaland Drive, San Diego, CA 92106
Tel (619) 849-2605 • Fax (619) 849-7015 • comstudies@ptloma.edu • www.ptloma.edu

Appendix B
Survey Instrument

Department Chair Communication Inventory

Section I: The statements below concern how your department chair and you communicate on the job. Please CIRCLE the number that best represents your perception of how your department chair communicates.

KEY: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral
4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. My chair tries to describe situations fairly without labeling them as good or bad.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My chair presents his or her feelings and perceptions without implying that a similar response is expected from me.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My chair attempts to explain situations clearly and without personal bias.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My chair defines problems so that they can be understood but does not insist that others agree.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I feel free to talk to my chair.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My chair defines problems and makes his or her faculty aware of them.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My chair allows me as much creativity as possible in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My chair allows flexibility on the job.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My chair is willing to try new ideas and to accept other points of view.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My chair understands the problems that I encounter in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My chair respects my feelings and values.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My chair listens to my problems with interest.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My chair does not try to make me feel inferior.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My chair participates in meetings with faculty without projecting his or her higher status or power.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My chair treats me with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My chair does not have hidden motives in dealing with me.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I feel that I can be honest and straightforward with my chair.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I feel that I can express my opinions and ideas honestly to my chair.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My chair criticizes my work without allowing me to explain.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My chair judges the actions of his or her faculty members.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My chair criticizes my work in the presence of others.	1	2	3	4	5
22. My chair tries to make me feel inadequate.	1	2	3	4	5
23. My chair makes it clear that he or she is in charge.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My chair believes that if a job is to be done right, he or she must oversee it or do it.	1	2	3	4	5
25. My chair cannot admit that he or she makes mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
26. My chair is dogmatic; it is useless for me to voice an opposing point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
27. My chair thinks that he or she is always right.	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
28. My chair is not interested in faculty personal problems.	1	2	3	4	5
29. My chair becomes involved in faculty conflicts.	1	2	3	4	5
30. My chair offers moral support during a personal crisis.	1	2	3	4	5
31. My chair tries to change other people's attitudes and behaviors to suit his or her own.	1	2	3	4	5
32. My chair believes that he or she must control how I do my work.	1	2	3	4	5
33. My chair needs to be in charge of the situation.	1	2	3	4	5
34. My chair tries to manipulate faculty to get what he or she wants or to make himself or herself look good.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I have to be careful when talking to my chair so that I will not be misinterpreted.	1	2	3	4	5
36. My chair twists and distorts what I say when I speak what is really on my mind.	1	2	3	4	5

Section II: This section of the survey asks for your description of your CHAIR'S leadership style.

KEY: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

	SD	D	N	A	SA
37. My chair uses power, rather than persuasion, to control events and people.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My chair seems to develop personal relationships based on those who have power.	1	2	3	4	5
39. My chair aligns him/herself with those who have influence in order to advance their own agenda.	1	2	3	4	5
40. My chair tries to control faculty by influencing departmental rewards, finances or promotions.	1	2	3	4	5
41. My chair reveals little about his/her self but is always trying to gain information about others.	1	2	3	4	5
42. My chair uses the faculty handbook that details how rules are to be followed as the best tool to deal with faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
43. My chair wants to be remembered for his/her ability to have accomplished objectives and to have produced specific results.	1	2	3	4	5
44. My chair insists that faculty have a clear job description, functions, and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
45. My chair makes sure the department functions efficiently and runs like clockwork, despite the personalities involved.	1	2	3	4	5
46. My chair utilizes hierarchical organization with clearly defined lines of authority in order to be effective.	1	2	3	4	5
47. My chair motivates people by purposely giving them more responsibility and authority to get things done.	1	2	3	4	5
48. My chair takes pleasure in the growth and self-development of the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
49. My chair judges his/her effectiveness in terms of the well-being of the lives of the faculty he/she has touched.	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
50. My chair gets things done by emphasizing planning, developing, communicating, and motivating.	1	2	3	4	5
51. My chair treats people in terms of their potential when determining their effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5

Section III: This section includes statements about how YOU feel about your university and your involvement in it. Circle the number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion.

KEY: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral
4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

	SD	D	N	A	SA
52. I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Communication seems good within this department.	1	2	3	4	5
54. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5
55. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5
56. My chair is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5
57. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5
58. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5
59. I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5
60. The goals of this department are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5
61. My chair shows too little interest in the feelings of the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
62. There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5
63. I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5
64. I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5
65. I like my chair.	1	2	3	4	5
66. I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5
67. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5
68. My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Department assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5

Section IV: This section asks questions about your organizational commitment. Circle the answer that best represents how YOU feel about your work environment.

KEY: 1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neutral
4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree

	SD	D	N	A	SA
70. I talk up this department to my friends as a great place to work.	1	2	3	4	5
71. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this department.	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
72. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave here.	1	2	3	4	5
73. There is not much to be gained by staying here indefinitely.	1	2	3	4	5
74. I could just as well be working for a different department at a different institution.	1	2	3	4	5
75. Deciding to work for this department was a definite mistake on my part	1	2	3	4	5
76. For me, this is the best of all possible departments to work for.	1	2	3	4	5
77. I am extremely glad I chose this department and institution to work for over others.	1	2	3	4	5

Section V: This section concerns the overall effectiveness and satisfaction of your chair.

78. Overall, how effective is your department chair in doing his/her job (regardless of your personal feelings about them)?

Not at All Extremely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

79. Overall, how satisfied are you in your personal relationship with your chair (regardless of their institutional effectiveness)?

Not at All Extremely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Section VI: Personal/Demographics

80. Your age: _____ years
81. Your sex: _____ male _____ female
82. What ethnic background do you most identify with (select one)?
_____ American Indian or Alaska Native _____ Hispanic
_____ Asian or Pacific Islander _____ White, non-Hispanic
_____ Black/African-American _____ Other
83. How long has your chair been in his/her present assignment? _____ years
84. Select the number of full-time faculty in your department:
_____ 5 or fewer _____ 6-10 _____ 11-15 _____ 16-20 _____ 21+
85. Select the Academic Domain that best represents your department:
_____ Humanities _____ Professional Studies
_____ Social Sciences _____ Natural Sciences

86. How long have you been at your current institution? _____ years
87. How long have you been involved in higher education? _____ years

Thank you for your time and participation!

Appendix C
Institution Names

Institution Names

Alvernia College
Benedict College
Bethel University
Champlain College
Drew University
Emerson College
Greenville College
Huntington College
Kentucky Wesleyan College
Lourdes College
Maryville College
Marywood University
Meredith College
Miles College
Mount St. Mary College
Nyack College
Olivet College
Regis University
Rider University
Simpson University
St. Ambrose University
St. Martin's University
St. Thomas University
University of Dallas
Westminster College
Willamette University