

379  
N81d  
NO. 980

AN ANALYSIS OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD ADMINISTRATORS IN  
AN URBAN JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
North Texas State University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Samuel Davis Birkner, B. A., M. Ed.

Denton, Texas

December, 1975

Birkner, Samuel D., An Analysis of Faculty Attitudes Toward Administrators in an Urban Junior College District. Doctor of Education (Higher Education), December, 1975, 137 pp., 40 tables, bibliography, 41 titles.

The problem of this study is to describe and analyze faculty attitudes toward administrators in an urban junior college district.

The purposes of this study are to ascertain the attitudes of junior college faculty toward campus-level administrative positions and to determine what relationship existed between general and specific measures of faculty attitude.

A semantic differential was utilized as a global index of faculty attitude toward administrators. Two additional indices thought to be related to this global index of faculty attitude were employed. These indices were degree of faculty-administrator interaction and the Faculty Attitude Survey. The Faculty Attitude Survey is a measure of faculty attitude toward specific conditions characteristic of educational institutions.

The full-time instructional faculty of an urban junior college district in the state of Texas comprised the subjects of the study.

Five exploratory questions were posited:

1. What are the attitudes that faculty have toward administrators?
2. How do these faculty attitudes relate to the type of position held by the administrator?
3. Do these faculty attitudes vary from campus to campus?
4. To what extent does the degree of faculty-administrator interaction affect faculty attitude toward administrators?
5. To what specific factors are these faculty attitudes related?

The most important conclusion is that the faculty in this urban junior college district viewed their administrators in a positive manner. This finding is essentially the converse of the conflict-riddled state of faculty-administrator relationships reported in the literature. Moreover, faculty morale was essentially positive in regard to specific working conditions. Only two of the seventeen Faculty Attitude Survey indices indicate serious dissatisfaction. These two factors are Adequacy of Salary and Administration of the Salary Schedule.

Faculty attitude toward the various administrative positions, with the exception of the position of President, did not favor one position as compared with another. Two of the three criterion groups viewed the position of President more positively than the other administrative positions.

The faculties on the two campuses did not differ significantly in attitude toward the positions of Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson and Dean of Instruction. The position of President was viewed in a significantly more positive fashion on one campus as compared to another.

Degree of interaction between faculty and administrators had some positive affect on faculty attitude toward administrators.

Faculty attitude toward administrators was related to specific conditions about which faculty were concerned.

It is recommended that a thorough and formalized procedure, free of rumor or "coffee-talk", be employed in assessing faculty morale. Participation from all relevant groups is deemed highly important in the planning and use of the data collected. Differential analyses of the data are recommended where different subgroups can be identified without jeopardizing the anonymity of the respondents.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Background and Significance	
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Exploratory Questions	
Procedures for Collecting the Data	
Treatment of the Data	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations of the Study	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	12
Faculty Evaluation of Administrators	
Faculty Morale In American Junior Colleges	
Selected Studies of Role Perception in the Junior College	
Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation in the Junior College	
III. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY . . . . .	21
Selection and Description of the Subjects	
Description of the Instruments	
Procedures for Analyzing the Data	
Treatment of the Data	
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	32
Statistical Analysis	
The Exploratory Questions	
The Faculty Attitude Survey Data	
Summary	
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	93
Summary of the Study	
Findings	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	

	Page
APPENDIX . . . . .	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	134

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients for the Six Semantic Differential Concepts . . .	24
II. Means and Standard Deviations for the Semantic Differential Concepts . . . . .	34
III. Summary of Analysis of Variance among the Mean Scores of Faculty Attitudes Toward Administrators of Campus A . . . . .	35
IV. Summary of Analysis of Variance among the Mean Scores of Faculty Attitudes Toward Administrators of Campus B . . . . .	36
V. Summary of Analysis of Variance among the Mean Scores of Faculty Attitudes Toward Administrators of the Combined Campuses . . . . .	37
VI. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitudes Toward the Position of Department Chairperson between the Two Campuses . . . . .	38
VII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitudes Toward the Position of Division Chairperson between the Two Campuses . . . . .	38
VIII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Dean of Instruction between the Two Campuses . . . . .	39
IX. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of President between the Two Campuses . . . . .	39
X. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Department Chairperson on Campus A among Semantic Differential Means and Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	40

Table	Page
XI. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Dean of Instruction for Campus A among Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	41
XIII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Dean of Instruction for Campus A among Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	42
XIII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of President on Campus A among Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	43
XIV. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Coordinator on Campus B among Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	44
XV. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Department Chairperson on Campus B among the Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	44
XVI. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Division Chairperson on Campus B among the Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	45
XVII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Dean of Instruction on Campus B among the Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	45
XVIII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of President on Campus B among the Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	46

Table	Page
XIX. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Department Chairperson on the Combined Campuses among the Semantic Differential Means of Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	46
XX. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Division Chairperson on the Combined Campuses among the Degree of Interaction Groups . . . . .	47
XXI. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of Dean of Instruction on the Combined Campuses among the Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups .	48
XXII. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Faculty Attitude Toward the Position of President for the Combined Campuses among the Semantic Differential Means of the Degree of Interaction Groups . . .	49
XXIII. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Group Factor I-- <u>Supervision and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	50
XXIV. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Sub-Category A-- <u>Communication with Administration and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	53
XXV. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Sub-Category B-- <u>Relations with Immediate Supervisor and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	55
XXVI. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Group Factor I-- <u>Self Integration and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	57
XXVII. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Sub-Category C-- <u>Identification with the Institution and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	60

Table	Page
XXVIII. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category D--Inter-personal Relations and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	62
XXIX. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category E--Personal Security and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	64
XXX. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Group Factor III--Institutional Environment and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	67
XXXI. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category F--Physical Working Condition and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	69
XXXII. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category G--Opportunities for Professional Growth and Development and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . .	71
XXXIII. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category H--Faculty Meetings and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	73
XXXIV. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category I--Teaching Load and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> .	74
XXXV. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category J--Non-Instructional Work Load and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	75
XXXVI. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Group Factor IV--Employment Rewards and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	78
XXXVII. <u>Coefficients of Correlation Between Faculty Attitude Survey Sub-Category K--of Fringe Benefits and Semantic Differential Concepts</u> . . . . .	79

Table	Page
XXXVIII. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Sub-Category L--Adequacy of Salary and Semantic Differential Concepts . . . . .	81
XXXIX. Coefficients of Correlation Between <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Sub-Category M--Administration of Salary Schedule and Semantic Differential Concepts. . . . .	83
XL. Means and Standard Deviations for the <u>Faculty Attitude Survey</u> Group Factor and Sub-Category Scores . . . . .	86

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Faculty-administrator conflict in the junior college has become a subject of serious concern. Lombardi (9) states that although the faculty-vs.-administration issue is not new to higher education, it has assumed serious proportions in the junior colleges in recent years. Weber's comments, among many others (2, 12, 13) reinforce the existence of this problem.

The main centers of faculty discontent are the public junior colleges and the new or "emerging" four-year colleges and universities. In fact, the case studies show that the greatest discontent and most visible tendency toward unionization are found at the junior college level (17, p. 10).

A certain amount of disagreement is healthy and to be expected in any organization; however, the current state of conflict in junior college faculty-administrator relations has passed beyond constructive limits. These conditions do not exist because faculty quarrel with an administrator's leadership role or his "right to lead." One of the three most desirable characteristics in a college president as seen by faculty was the ability to organize and lead (1).



Lahti postulates that the origin of poor administrative-faculty relationships did not occur by design.

In short, many of the poor administrative-faculty relationships have developed pragmatically or, conceivably, as historical accident. Whatever the origin, most educators agree that, in institutions where teacher-supervisory relationships are strained, the educational process and the product delivered to the student are likely to be inferior to the institution where strong professional relationships exist between teaching faculty and administrators (7, p.11).

Garrison (3) states that a preliminary national study of issues affecting junior college faculty pinpoints the chief issue as being the administrative context in which they work. In relation to himself, the faculty member tends to view administration as tradition-bound, confused in its aims, unimaginative, and too typically inflexible.

Garrison predicts that junior college faculty will organize to the degree that they feel poorly represented at all significant decision making levels. The Chicago City College teachers strike of 1966 is representative of this movement.

The main lessons to be learned by junior colleges nationally from our experience in Chicago are: (a) that the faculty's demand for a major voice in the determination of their working conditions can no longer be ignored, (b) that teachers are prepared to join a union and to strike if no other alternative is available to insure improvement in their working conditions and quality education for their students (14, p. 22).

A 1971 study by the National Education Association (10) reported that sixty-nine per cent of a sample of junior

college faculty believe they should strike under certain conditions.

### Background and Significance

To what expectations may the attitudes of junior college faculty be related? The most significant and apparently unmet expectation was to be directly involved in policy and decision making, especially those policies and decisions which governed the performance of faculty duties (2, 6, 11, 16). Weber (12) calls this the seeking of the fullest benefit of a "new professionalism." Weber continues by stating that faculty may be and are legitimately concerned with educational and administrative policies, personnel administration, economic issues, public issues that vitally affect the institution, and procedures for faculty representation. Litton's discussion (8, p. 23) on developing and releasing faculty potential lists four freedoms or "expectations" for faculty: "(1) freedom from want, (2) freedom from non-professional work and tasks, (3) freedom from students (uninterrupted study time), and (4) freedom from worry that what they are doing is not very important." Underwood's list (18) of faculty expectations includes adequate time, a reasonable work load, recognition and reward, and adequate resources.

Why is the relationship between faculty and administration in American junior colleges less than desirable?

Niland, writing on the condition of this relationship in California, states:

There was substantial evidence to support the conclusion that conflict was perceived as existing between teachers and administrators in California public junior colleges. The investigation produced findings that specified this struggle in terms of status as reflected in the perceived imbalance between the deference accorded administrative and teaching positions, in terms of values as they pertained to the purpose and functions as well as the details of administration of the junior college; in terms of the resource of salary, particularly as reflected in the differential between teacher and administrator salaries; and in terms of power as it related to the controlling of policy in areas of assumed competency.

What emerged as the central issue [emphasis mine] was this: The monopolization by administrators of the policy-making function violates the self-image of the junior college teacher as an expert who has the right . . . to be consulted when any decision is made affecting the conditions under which he works (11, p. 5692).

This same central issue or major conclusion is also reported by Weber (12) and by Walsh (16). Walsh elaborates further by stating that a major source of faculty-administration tension is the suppression of information about matters of faculty concern until too late for faculty opinion to be brought to bear. Additional reasons cited in the literature were dislike of administrative evaluation and undesirable personality and/or leadership characteristics (1). Underwood (18) delineated the problem in terms of conflicting organizational philosophies. Faculty were seen as preferring "theory y" and administrators were seen as preferring "theory x." "Theory y" assumes the following:

1. People don't hate work. It's as natural as rest or play.
2. They don't have to be forced or threatened. If they commit themselves to mutual objectives, they'll drive themselves more effectively than you can drive them.
3. But they'll commit themselves only to the extent they can see ways of satisfying their ego and development needs (15, p.122).

Theory "x" is essentially the converse of theory "y".

It is puzzling that such a state of conflict exists in view of the widely held belief that faculty morale and good administrator-faculty relations are deemed highly important.

The junior college president cannot ignore the logic that, to be successful, faculty-administrator relations must involve more than lip service to the principle of faculty participation in the governance of the college; and that this participation must include the principle that faculty should have a say in determining the means by which this participation shall take place (9, p. 14).

Faculty morale, as reported by Gould (4), is the most important part of an administrator's role in terms of both time and skill. Trustees consider the ability to maintain high morale among faculty and staff the third highest priority in selecting a president (1).

Walsh concludes:

Cold war between college administration and faculty is all too often a familiar condition of academic life. A faculty in revolt and an administration forced to retire to an authoritarian line-staff role reflects upon the efficacy of the educational program of the college. The unique role of the community college and the quality of its program cannot be achieved in an atmosphere of mutual distrust, suspicion and turmoil (16, p. 145).

### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to describe and analyze faculty attitudes toward administrators in an urban junior college district.

### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to ascertain the attitude of junior college faculty toward various administrative positions and to determine what relationship may have existed between general and specific measures of attitude.

### Exploratory Questions

1. What are the attitudes that faculty have toward administrators?
2. How do faculty attitudes relate to the type of position held by the administrators?
3. Do these faculty attitudes vary from campus to campus?
4. To what extent may the degree of faculty-administrator interaction affect faculty attitudes toward administrators?
5. To what specific factors may these faculty attitudes be related?

### Procedures for Collecting the Data

A global measure of faculty attitude was obtained utilizing the semantic differential technique for the following administrative positions: Coordinator, Department

Chairperson, Division Chairperson, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Development, and President. A specific measure of attitude was obtained from the Faculty Attitude Survey. Each respondent also indicated the extent of his interaction with the administrators he evaluated.

These instruments were administered to the faculty of an urban junior college district characterized as having a central administrative unit and two separate campuses. Each of these campuses had its own administrators, and it was the campus-level administrators that were the focus of this study. The instruments were mailed to the faculty on both campuses four weeks before the end of the fall semester of 1974. Returns in the study were obtained from 61.1 per cent of the total faculty.

#### Treatment of the Data

The statistical analyses that were utilized as appropriate in the treatment of the data were (1) mean and standard deviation, (2) one-way analysis of variance with Newman-Keuls' tests when making comparisons for significance, and (3) Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

#### Definition of Terms

Instructional Faculty.--A person employed by the junior college district on a full-time basis, assigned teaching responsibility as his primary function, and

not holding an administrative position as defined by the campus presidents and deans of instruction.

President.--This person is the chief executive and administrative officer of the college. The president supervises, coordinates and directs the work of the other administrative officers of the college. He is responsible for the total operation of the college.

Dean of Instruction.--This person is the chief instructional officer of the college. The dean of instruction is responsible for the total instructional program and is the administrative head of the instructional faculty. He reports directly to the chief administrative officer of the college.

Division Chairperson.--The division chairperson is an administrative officer whose primary duties involve the instructional function of the college. He is the administrative head of the instructional faculty in a respective division. This person coordinates the work of department chairpersons. He reports directly to the chief instructional officer of the college.

Department Chairperson.--The department chairperson is responsible directly to the division chairperson in whose division the departmental work is assigned. He is the instructional leader of the department and administrative assistant to the division chairperson.

Coordinator.--The coordinator acts as an instructional leader and advisor of a program and is responsible directly to the department chairperson.

Urban Junior College District.--A junior college which exists in an area of at least one hundred thousand population. It is characterized as having a district administration and several operating campuses, each with its own campus-level administrators.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to one urban junior college district in the state of Texas. It must also be stated that the faculty were not represented by any group or organization legally authorized to engage in professional negotiation on the faculty's behalf.

#### Summary

Faculty-administrator conflict in the American junior college has become a subject of serious concern. Several key points affecting faculty morale discussed in the literature included a role in policy-making, treatment by administration, and working conditions and economic remuneration. The problem of this study was to ascertain how the instructional faculty in an urban junior college district felt toward various administrative positions and to determine if those attitudes could be related to specific factors.



## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cohen, Arthur M. and John E. Rouche, Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President, ERIC Clearinghouse of Junior College Information, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
2. Garrison, Roger, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, A Preliminary National Appraisal, Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
3. \_\_\_\_\_, "The Teachers Professional Situation," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 15-18.
4. Gould, John Wesley, The Academic Deanship, Teachers College Press, New York, 1964.
5. Harris, Norman C., "On Being a Consultant," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 9-13.
6. Jones, Howard, "College Organization and Administration: Some Faculty Views," pp. 21-23, in Selected Papers, 47th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, February 27-March 3, Washington, D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
7. Lahti, Robert E., "Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (September, 1966) 9-12.
8. Litton, Maurice L., "Developing and Releasing Faculty Potential," pp. 22-26, in The Dimensions of the Dean's Tasks, Proceedings of the Conference for Newly Appointed Junior College Deans, First Appalachian State College, Boone, North Carolina, August 6-10, 1962 (Florida University, Gainesville; Florida State University, Tallahassee).
9. Lombardi, John, "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 9-14.

10. National Education Association, Research Division, "Here's What Junior College Faculties Think," Today's Education, LX (March, 1971), 67-68.
11. Niland, William Patrick, "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and Proposal for Resolution," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1964, in Dissertation Abstracts, XXV, 5691-5692.
12. Priest, Bill J., "Faculty Administrator Relationships," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1964), 4-8.
13. Report on the Annual Conference on the Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teaching, 5th, Bennett College, Millbrook, New York, June 12-17, 1967.
14. Swenson, Norman G. and Leon Novar, "Chicago City College Teachers Strike," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 19-22.
15. Townsend, Robert, Up the Organization, Greenwich Connecticut, Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1971.
16. Walsh, James P., "Encouraging Constructive Faculty-Administration Relationships," pp. 18-21, in Pauline F. Hunter and S. V. Martorana, Administering the Community College in a Changing World, Papers presented at the Annual Conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Buffalo, New York, 1966.
17. Weber, Arnold and others, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program, Washington D. C., American Association for Higher Education, 1967.
18. Underwood, David L., "College Organization and Administration: Some Faculty Views," pp. 19-20, in Selected Papers, 47th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, February 27-March 3, Washington, D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An extensive search for related literature was conducted utilizing the Education Index, Dissertation Abstracts, Datrix (Direct Access to Reference Information --a computerized search for dissertations published by University Microfilms), a Texas Information Service search of the ERIC files, and two separate bibliographical publications relating to the junior college field. Only two sources (6, 8) relating specifically to faculty evaluation of administrators were found.

This chapter contains a review of the limited literature relating specifically to faculty evaluation of administrators, faculty morale in American junior colleges, selected studies relating to role perceptions by administrators and faculty, and selected studies relating to faculty involvement in policy formulation.

#### Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

It was difficult to determine what the current "state of the art" was in regard to formalized evaluation of administrators by faculty. Kiernan (8), in 1967, suggested that faculty evaluation of administrators was not being used to any great extent, but its time had arrived. Hillway (6),

writing in 1973, did not indicate to what extent faculty evaluation of administrators was being formally carried out. He did mention that during the past fifty years little attention had been given to formal rating of academic administrators. Hillway notes that, "Some attempts to evaluate the work of administrators more carefully and fairly might seem to be in order " (6, p. 426). He continues:

It follows logically that administrators also may be helped in improving their work by obtaining ratings from the person with whom they deal most directly--the academic faculty . . . . There seems little reason to doubt the eventual acceptance in higher education of rating scales for academic administrators (6, p. 247).

#### Faculty Morale In American Junior Colleges

Richardson's study (12) contains a review of the literature on faculty morale dating back to 1938. The most pertinent findings confirmed the increasing importance of faculty morale as a concern of administrators and supervisors. Specific factors related to faculty morale included type of leadership style (democratic style preferred), degree of congruence between actual and expected administrative behavior, and particular aspects of personality and human relations.

Canavan (1), writing as a junior college faculty member, refuses to accept a serious dichotomy of interests or attitudes between administrators and faculty but does acknowledge that differences of opinion do exist. To

maintain faculty morale and prevent serious breeches between the administration and faculty Canavan suggests three practices: (1) swift communication to the faculty of administrative decisions affecting them; (2) cooperative formulation of policies and philosophies; and (3) departmental autonomy.

Niland studied faculty-administration conflict in California junior colleges. The questions in his study pertinent to the present one were

1. What evidence indicates a faculty-administration schism in California public junior colleges?
2. What are the specific areas of conflict?
3. Does the conflict result from anything more than the epidemiological phenomenon of a generalized feeling of discontent which seems currently to be a contagion in the teacher ranks?
4. What appear to be the causes of this conflict(11, p.16)?

Niland's findings pertinent to the present study include the following:

1. Eighty-one per cent of the full-time teachers surveyed (N:268) and 79 per cent of the administrators (N:85) believed that there was a conflict between administrators and faculty in California public junior colleges.
2. The responses to the direct question on the major cause of the conflict conformed to no pattern that might result in a realistic taxonomy. The variety of perceptions might be classified under general headings such as the time-honored "lack of communication", lack of perception on the part of the faculty that they are involved in the policy-making processes, inadequate understanding of the roles of administrators and teachers in the operation and direction of the organization. . . .
3. . . . that administrators and teachers perceive and interpret the same organizational facts differently, and in some instances there are broad variances in these perceptions.

4. The junior college teachers queried were generally satisfied with the institutions in which they worked . . . , manifested a high degree of enthusiasm and at the same time indicated that a morale problem existed. . . .
5. There was disagreement between administrators and teachers regarding class hour loads. . . .
6. . . . The differential between administrative and teacher salaries . . . did appear to be a source of conflict, since the higher salaries paid to all administrators was interpreted as a value judgement of the importance of the administrative over the teaching function.
7. Forty-seven per cent of the teachers reported dissatisfaction with the decision making process at the institutional level. . . . There was no evidence indicating that junior college teachers generally were involved in the formulation of college policy nor machinery existed for satisfactorily effecting this involvement.
8. The total group of teachers sampled was uneasy about the matter of academic freedom (pp. 83-87).

Epler delineates faculty-administration conflict in terms of stereotyping, different goals, different role expectations, lack of data, separate perspectives, communication and poor administration. Two types of conflict were found to exist--natural and aggravated. Poor administrative practices, lack of data, ambiguous goals and faulty communication tend to create aggravated conflict ( 4, pp. 21, 24).

#### Selected Studies of Role Perception in the Junior College

Lipscomb's study (9) of faculty attitudes regarding the stated role of Mississippi public junior colleges produced the finding that faculty morale was slightly better than

average to good for both the low and high acceptance (of the stated role) groups.

The purpose of Deloache's study was to determine if there were significant differences between faculty members and junior college presidents to written statements descriptive of the office of president. The findings and recommendations pertinent to the present study were

1. Faculty members and presidents differed significantly on every item in the questionnaire, but only in terms of the degree of importance each group attributed to the statements.
2. Junior college presidents have a greater expectation than faculty for the office of president.
3. Immediate attention should be given to the factors which cause faculty members and college presidents to place more importance on specific factors of the presidency.
4. Studies of this type should be extended to other educational institutions in other geographical areas. Such studies would provide data that could be useful in developing a better faculty and administrative esprit de corps.
5. There seems to be a general need in the area of the American two-year college to investigate faculty-administrative conflict and misunderstandings (2, pp. 95-96).

Verbeke's study (15) was concerned with the leadership behavior of the junior college academic deanship as perceived by the deans and by faculty. The findings pertinent to the present study included the following:

1. Presidents and faculty members, as total groups, did not agree as to the perceived and expected leader behavior of the academic deans on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.
2. The faculty members' perceptions and expectations of the academic deans' leader behavior differ

- significantly from those of the deans who rated themselves higher in all four comparisons.
3. The faculty members both perceived and expected more Consideration than Initiating Structure in the academic deans' leader behavior.
  4. The greatest discrepancies of perception and expectations of decanal behavior lay between the faculty group and the dean. Seemingly, a major role conflict facing the dean lies between him and his faculty. . . .

#### Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation in the Junior College

One of the most persistent conflict areas between junior college faculty and administration revolves around significant faculty involvement in decision and policy making. Fitzgerald's (5) study found that California public junior college instructors expressed a desire for more involvement in the determination of basic policy. Niland (11) reports that the perceptions of administrators are very different from faculty regarding the opportunity for involvement in policy-making. Additional studies reported by Niland (11) indicated (1) that junior college chief administrators attached a considerable degree of importance to faculty involvement in decision making and (2) faculty involvement was very lacking particularly in regard to the formulation of teacher personnel policies.

Richardson (13) states that faculty participation is a matter of recent concern to junior college educators and that two-year college administrators have for the most part



refused to share board-delegated powers with teaching faculty. Evidence is mounting that such administrative dominance will not go unchallenged.

The lack of faculty participation in decision making is in part due to lack of effective faculty organization. Faculty are now beginning to organize with written constitutions and other formalized guidelines. Vavoulis (14), among others (10; 13), discusses one form by which this type of organization for involvement in decision making has been implemented. Ikenberry, in a recent article on the subject, states that "the signs suggest that faculty members will continue to seek and to receive a significant role in institutional policy formation and decision making. The debate over whether faculty should share the power is no longer an issue" (7, p. 14).

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Canavan, Joseph P., "Compensations and Problems of Junior College Teaching," Junior College Journal, XXXII (May, 1962), 509-516.
2. Deloache, Dan Franklin, "Attitudes and Opinions of Faculty Members and Junior College Presidents Toward Selected Descriptions of the Office of College President," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1966.
3. Dunn, John W., Peter Jowise and Ralph Jentile, "Our Faculty Participates in Policy Development," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (December, 1966), 10-13.
4. Epler, Stephen M., "Faculty-Administration Relationships--Why the Conflict?" unpublished paper, University of California at Los Angeles, 1966 (ERIC).
5. Fitzgerald, James Sumner, Jr., "Faculty Views of the California Public Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1964.
6. Hillway, Tyrus, "Evaluating College and University Administrators," Intellect, CI, April, 1973, 426-427.
7. Ikenberry, S. O., "Governance and the Faculty," Junior College Journal, XLII (November, 1971), 12-15.
8. Kiernan, Irene R., "The New Style in College Administration," Junior College Journal, XXXVIII (September, 1968), 22-23.
9. Lipscomb, William P., Jr., "An Analysis of Faculty Attitudes in Relation to the Stated Role of Mississippi Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1965.

10. Mognis, Robert F., "The Advisory Council--Experiment in Democratic Cooperation," Junior College Journal, XXXI (July, 1961), 258-260.
11. Niland, William Patrick, "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal for Resolution," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
12. Richardson, Richard C., Jr., "Staff Morale: An Investigation Involving the Developing and Testing of a Differential Morale Attitude Inventory," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1963.
13. \_\_\_\_\_, "Policy Formulation in the Two-Year College: Renaissance or Revolution?" Junior College Journal, XXVII (March, 1967), 40-42.
14. Vavoulis, Alexander, "A Faculty Role in Academic Policy Making," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (August, 1964), 32-34.
15. Verbeke, Maurice George, "The Junior College Academic Dean's Leadership Behavior as viewed by Superiors and Faculty," abstract reprinted from Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII, Number 3, 1967.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter discusses the procedures of the study. The topics covered in this discussion include the selection and description of the subjects, description of the instruments, procedures for analyzing the data and treatment of the data.

#### Selection and Description of the Subjects

The instructional faculty of an urban junior college district in the state of Texas were asked to participate in the study. All of these faculty members were full-time employees of the college, holding teaching assignments, and were not holding any administrative position as defined by The campus Presidents and Deans of Instruction. The position of "Coordinator" was viewed as an administrative one on Campus B, but not, however, on Campus A. The number of faculty members who met the criteria for inclusion in the study was 138 on Campus B, and 109 on Campus A. A total of 152 questionnaires was returned--sixty-seven and eighty-five from Campus A and B respectively. This response represented a 61 per cent return rate for Campus A and a 61 per cent return for Campus B.

### Description of the Instruments

The instruments utilized in the study were a semantic differential, a measure of faculty-administrator interaction, and the Faculty Attitude Survey.

#### The Semantic Differential

A semantic differential was utilized as a measure of faculty attitude toward the campus-level administrative positions of President, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Development, Division Chairperson, Department Chairperson, and Coordinator.

Rationale.--The semantic differential was designed to measure objectively what meaning any given concept might have for persons in terms of dimensions which have repeatedly been empirically defined and factor analyzed. This technique of combining associations and scaling procedures yields an objective, reliable, valid and general method for measuring the connotative meaning of concepts (7). The subject is presented with a concept to be differentiated utilizing a set of bi-polar adjective scales. The subject indicates both the direction and intensity of the association on a seven-point scale. This technique is easily replicable, reliable, and valid as many studies have shown (3; 7). Osgood (7) reports test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .87 to .93, .83 to .91, and validity coefficients ranging from .74 to .82.

Method of construction.--The bipolar adjectives utilized in constructing the semantic differential were selected in a manner suggested by McCallon (6). This procedure consisted of (1) generating a list of at least 50 bi-polar adjectives believed to be evaluative in nature and related to the concept, (2) selecting a criterion group of junior college faculty to judge which bi-polar adjective pairs were considered to be most evaluative of the concept, and (3) constructing a semantic differential of twenty adjective pairs.

Evaluative bi-polar adjectives were utilized exclusively for each concept.

The findings of both of these studies support the notion that the evaluative factor of the semantic differential is an index of attitudes. It is, moreover, a method of attitude assessment that is relatively easy to administer and easy to score. Although it does not tap much of the content of an attitude in the denotative sense, . . . it does seem to provide an index to the location of the attitude along a general evaluative continuum (7, p. 195).

Fifty-seven bi-polar adjective pairs were selected from studies reported in Osgood (7), journal articles by Brown and Brown (3), Brown (2), a dissertation proposal by Ladenberger (5), suggestions from colleagues and from personal experience. Fifty-five faculty members were asked to rate the appropriateness of the bi-polar adjectives. Thirty-six faculty members returned the ratings which were used to select the twenty adjective pairs of the semantic differential.

Reliability.--The semantic differential for each of the concepts was administered to a sample of faculty members on two different occasions during a three week interval to establish reliability. The minimum coefficient for reliability was set at .60. Table I summarizes

TABLE I  
TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE  
SIX SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	N	r
Coordinator	6	.96
Department Chairperson	24	.89
Division Chairperson	24	.97
Dean of Student Development	6	.87
Dean of Instruction	24	.85
President	23	.73

the obtained reliability coefficients. Each of the concepts exceeded the standard set for reliability.

#### The Faculty Attitude Survey

This instrument was developed by Richardson and Blocker (1) as a measure of faculty attitudes toward specific conditions characteristic of educational institutions. The FAS represents a unique attempt to establish certain empirically demonstrated categories consisting of clusters of

statements all related to the same concept. Scores are obtained for four group factors and thirteen sub-categories. These factors and sub-categories are as follows:

Group Factor I--Supervision.--This factor is associated with the attitudes of faculty members toward the overall effectiveness of administrative processes. It consists of two sub-categories.

Sub-category A: Communication with administration relates primarily to the freedom with which information travels up and down the administrative structure. At the same time, attitudes of fairness, consistency, competence, and effectiveness of administration beyond the immediate supervisor level are tapped.

Sub-category B: Relations with immediate supervisor refers to the attitudes of staff members toward the fairness, consistency, competence, and effectiveness of immediate supervisors.

Group Factor II--Self Integration.--This factor involves the image that the faculty member has of himself in relation to his colleagues and the institution, as well as the degree of respect with which he views his colleagues. There are three sub-categories comprising this group factor.



Sub-category C: Identification with the institution concerns the expressed attitude of staff members toward their pride and interest in the college.

Sub-category D: Interpersonal relations has to do with staff member's concept of the degree to which he is oriented to his role as it relates to the institution and to his colleagues.

Sub-category E: Personal security relates to feelings of self-satisfaction and security expressed by the staff member with respect to his position in the institution.

Group Factor III--Institutional Environment---Institutional environment refers to the conditions under which a faculty member works.

Sub-category F: Physical working conditions includes attitudes toward buildings, grounds, equipment, and other physical aspects of the job situation.

Sub-category G: Opportunities for professional growth and advancement concerns faculty attitudes toward professional growth opportunities and advancement possibilities as members of the college staff.

Sub-category H: Faculty meetings involves attitudes toward the value and importance of faculty and committee meetings.

Sub-category I: Teaching load refers to such conditions as class size and amount of unassigned time, as well as attitude toward general teaching load.

Sub-category J: Non-instructional work load is related to attitudes toward non-teaching activities such as extra-curricular assignments, record keeping and other clerical detail.

Group Factor IV--Employment Rewards.--This factor concerns itself with the attitudes of faculty members toward the fairness of administration and the general adequacy of salary and fringe benefits. Three sub-categories are included within this factor.

Sub-category K: Adequacy of fringe benefits summarizes faculty attitudes with respect to benefits such as sick leave, retirement, and tenure.

Sub-category L: Adequacy of salary refers to attitudes concerning the adequacy of remuneration.

Sub-category M: Administration of salary schedule involves attitudes toward the fairness and consistency with which the salary schedule is administered (9).

Reliability coefficients, as reported by Richardson, range from .51 to .80 (10). Because the categories were descriptive in nature and not intended for predictive use

on an individual basis, these coefficients were considered to be acceptable. Since the development of these original reliability coefficients the FAS has been factor analyzed. The results of this analysis have led to a refinement and strengthening of the internal consistency of the factors and sub-categories.

A factor analysis of the individual items of the Faculty Attitude Survey confirmed the existence of differential, reasonable, unique categories or dimensions of faculty morale. Five of the original twelve categories were preserved without alteration. The remaining seven underwent varying degrees of change ranging from complete disappearance to minor revision.

Reassignment of items occurred with respect to most categories. The resultant thirteen category instrument can be subsumed under the four major group factors identified in a previous study.

The use of this instrument by research personnel and college administrators alike should provide a major advance in the evaluation of faculty morale in the educational setting (8, p. 93).

#### Measure of Faculty-Administrator Interaction

To ascertain whether faculty attitudes toward administrators were a function of the amount of personal contact with the administrator each respondent was asked to indicate "degree of interaction." A five-point scale ranging from "A Great Deal" to "None" was utilized for this purpose.

#### Procedures for Analyzing the Data

The intent of this study was to describe the attitudes of faculty members toward administrators and to ascertain

Whether these attitudes were related to two categories of specific factors. The two categories were faculty attitudes toward specific concerns as measured by the Faculty Attitude Survey and degree of faculty-administrator interaction as measured by the degree-of-interaction scale.

#### Treatment of the Data

A mean and standard deviation were computed for each of the semantic differential concepts and the Faculty Attitude Survey scores. This treatment was applied for each of the two campuses separately and for the combined sample.

One-way analysis of variance and Newman-Keuls' tests were used in making the following comparisons: (1) between administrative positions on the same campus and for the combined sample, (2) between the same administrative position on the different campuses, and (3) between the degree of faculty-administrator interaction and the semantic differential concepts. Tests of significance were computed for these relationships to the .05 level.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used when comparing semantic differential scores with Faculty Attitude Survey scores. Levels of significance for these coefficients were reported for the .01 and .05 levels.

The .05 level of significance was set as the minimum level for ascribing significance to any of the findings.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Blocker, Clyde E. and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Human Relations are Important," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (April, 1964), 19-22.
2. Brown, M. A., "What Kind of Leaders do Faculty Want?" College Management, VIII (January, 1973), 25-26+.
3. Brown, Stanley B. and L. Barbara Brown, "A Semantic Differential Approach to the Delineation of Scientific Values Possessed by Professors of Science and Humanities," Journal of Research in Science Teaching, IX, pt. 4 (1972), 345-351.
4. Cohen, Arthur M. and John E. Rouche, Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President, ERIC Clearinghouse of Junior College Information, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
5. Ladenberger, Peggy, "An Analysis of Self-Actualizing Dimensions of Top and Middle Management Personnel," unpublished dissertation proposal, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas November 4, 1969.
6. McCallon, Earl, Telephone conversation regarding a procedure for constructing a semantic differential, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, December 12, 1973.
7. Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Chicago, and London, 1967.
8. Richardson, Richard C., Jr., and Clyde E. Blocker, "An Item Factorization of the Faculty Attitude Survey," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXIV (Summer, 1964), 89-93.

9. \_\_\_\_\_,  
Manual for the Faculty Attitude Survey,  
Form Z, 1965.
10. Richardson, Richard C., Jr. Staff Morale: An Investi-  
gation Involving the Developing and Testing of  
a Differential Morale Attitude Inventory, un-  
published doctoral dissertation, The University  
at Austin, 1963.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter presents an analysis of the data in terms of statistical analysis of the data, the findings in relation to the exploratory questions, and a summary.

An analysis of the data was made to determine the attitudes of a selected group of junior college faculty toward various administrative positions and to describe how these attitudes were related to specific attitudinal factors and to the degree of faculty-administrator interaction.

#### Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses of the data were made for each campus separately and for the combined sample. The mean and standard deviation were computed for the semantic differential concepts (administrative positions) and for the Faculty Attitude Survey scores.

One way analysis of variance was utilized in making the following comparisons: (1) between administrative positions on the same campus and for the combined sample (2) between the same administrative position on each different campus and (3) between the degree of faculty-administrator interaction and administrative positions as measured

by the semantic differential. If a significant F-ratio was found, Newman-Keuls' tests were applied to specify where this significance occurred.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed for determining relationships between attitude toward administrative positions and Faculty Attitude Survey scores.

### The Exploratory Questions

#### Exploratory Question 1

What are the attitudes that faculty have toward administrators?

Table II summarizes the data by campus and for the combined sample for the semantic differentials utilized in measuring general faculty attitude toward administrators.

Each of the administrative positions was viewed by faculty in a positive direction. In every case, whether viewed by campus or by the combined campuses, the means for each administrative position exceeded the hypothetical mean score of 80. This hypothetical mean was based on a rank of 4 being given for each of the 20 adjective-pairs making up the semantic differential. The mean score exceeded 100 for each of the administrative positions. The faculty in this junior college district had moderately positive attitudes toward their administrators.



TABLE II

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Mean			Standard Deviation		
	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator +		(N=24) 109.70			21.05	
Department Chairperson	(N=67) 110.34	(N=84) 106.67	(N=151) 108.30	22.33	26.47	24.71
Division Chairperson	(N=64) 104.46	(N=82) 107.64	(N=146) 106.25	21.70	23.32	22.60
Dean of Instruction	(N=66)* 109.27	(N=82) 106.73	(N=148) 107.86	20.00	25.71	23.30
President	(N=66) 121.34	(N=80) 107.75	(N=146) 113.89	12.33	23.00	20.06

\* Represents merged data for Dean of Instruction and Dean of Student Development.

+ Coordinator viewed as administrative position on Campus B only.

Exploratory Question II

How do these attitudes relate to the type of position held by the administrators?

This question was treated statistically to determine if faculty attitude differed significantly among the various administrative positions. Several expectations were posited in regard to this question. One of these expectations was that those administrative positions closer to the faculty member himself (Coordinator or Department Chairperson) would be viewed in a significantly more positive manner than those further removed (Dean of Instruction or President). The second expectation was that distance from the faculty member would have had a salutary attitudinal effect. Table III summarizes the data for Campus A.

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE MEAN SCORES  
OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD ADMINISTRATORS  
OF CAMPUS A

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	9980.34	3	3326.78	8.74 *
Within	98513.11	259	380.35	
Total	108493.46	262		

\* Significant at .001 level

An analysis of the data in Table III revealed that for Campus A significant faculty attitudinal differences ( $p < .001$ ) existed toward the various administrative positions. Application of Newman-Keuls' tests found that differences significant at the .01 level existed between the President-Division Chairperson, President-Dean of Instruction and President-Department Chairperson.

Neither of the two previously mentioned expectations was consistently verified by the findings. The position of President on Campus A was viewed more positively than the other administrative positions; however, the second ranked position by mean score was that of Department Chairperson.

Table IV summarizes the data for Campus B.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE MEAN SCORES  
OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD ADMINISTRATORS ON  
CAMPUS B

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	222.60	4	55.65	.09
Within	207803.12	347	598.85	
Total	208025.72	351		

The obtained F-ratio was not statistically significant. Faculty attitude toward the administrative positions on Campus B did not differ significantly among these positions.

The first and second ranked positions by mean scores (see Table II) were Coordinator and President respectively. This analysis supports the previous one that proximity of administrative position to the faculty member had no consistent effect on faculty attitude toward those positions.

The data for the Combined Campuses are summarized in Table V.

TABLE V

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE MEAN SCORES  
OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD ADMINISTRATORS FOR  
THE COMBINED CAMPUSES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	4863.78	3	1621.26	3.13*
Within	303908.36	587	517.73	
Total	308772.15	590		

\*Significant at .05 level.

The obtained F-ratio was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). Application of the Newman-Keuls' tests specified this significance as existing at the .01 level between

the President-Division Chairperson and the President-Department Chairperson.

Exploratory Question 3

Will these attitudes vary from campus to campus?

Tables VI - IX summarize the data for this question.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE  
TOWARD THE POSITION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON  
BETWEEN THE TWO CAMPUSES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	500.56	1	500.56	.81
Within	91119.42	149	611.53	
Total	91619.98	150		

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE  
TOWARD THE POSITION OF DIVISION CHAIRPERSON  
BETWEEN THE TWO CAMPUSES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	362.94	1	362.94	.70
Within	73728.68	144	512.00	
Total	74091.62	145		

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE  
TOWARD THE POSITION OF DEAN OF INSTRUCTION  
BETWEEN THE TWO CAMPUSES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	236.10	1	236.10	.43
Within	79595.18	146	545.17	
Total	79831.29	147		

TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE  
TOWARD THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT BETWEEN THE  
TWO CAMPUSES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	6687.47	1	6687.47	18.63*
Within	51677.98	144	358.87	
Total	58365.45			

\* Significant at .001 level.

Analysis of the data summarized in Tables VI - IX reveal that only the attitudinal mean scores for the position

of President were significantly different ( $p < .001$ ) between the campuses.

#### Exploratory Question 4

To what extent may the degree of faculty-administrator interaction affect faculty attitude toward administrators?

Each respondent was asked to indicate his degree of interaction with each of the administrators he evaluated on a five point scale ranging from "None" to "A Great Deal." For purposes of analysis each of the five degrees of interaction was considered as a separate group. Means for each of these interaction groups were computed and compared with every other group, utilizing one-way analysis of variance. If the F-ratio was significant, Newman-Keuls' tests were applied to specify where these significant differences existed.

Tables X - XIII summarize the data for Campus A.

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON ON CAMPUS A  
AMONG SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS  
AND DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	1882.84	2	941.42	1.91
Within	31049.47	63	492.84	
Total	32932.31	65		

The F-ratios were statistically significant for the position of Division Chairperson, Dean of Instruction, and President.

Table XI summarizes the data for Division Chairperson on Campus A.

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD THE POSITION OF DEAN OF INSTRUCTION FOR CAMPUS A AMONG SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	6442.31	4	1610.57	6.18*
Within	15635.22	60	260.58	
Total	22077.53	64		

\*significant at .001 level

For the position of Division Chairperson on Campus A application of Newman-Keuls' tests specified that those faculty members who indicated that they had had "Much" or "A Great Deal" of interaction were more positive in attitude ( $p=.05$ ) than those faculty members who experienced "Little" interaction.

Table XII summarizes the data for the position of Dean of Instruction on Campus A.



TABLE XII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF DEAN OF INSTRUCTION FOR CAMPUS A AMONG  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE  
DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	6442.31	4	1610.57	6.18*
Within	15635.22	60	260.58	
Total	22077.53	64		

\* significant at .001 level.

This data represents a merging of the data for Dean of Instruction and Dean of Student Development. The Dean of Student Development had responsibility for an instructional department and was, therefore, included in the study. These data were merged with those for the Dean of Instruction as the number of faculty members in this department was very small (N=11).

Significant differences in attitude among the interaction groups were found to exist beyond the .001 level. Application of the Newman-Keuls' tests specified this difference as occurring between those faculty members in the "Some-None" (p=.01), "Some-Little" (p=.05), "Much-None" (p=.01), "A Great Deal-None" (p=.05) and "Little-None" (p=.05) comparison groups. The amount of contact between

the faculty member and the chief academic administrator had a positive affect on faculty attitude toward this administrative position.

Table XIII summarizes the data for the position of President on Campus A.

TABLE XIII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT ON CAMPUS A AMONG SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	1876.65	4	469.16	3.53*
Within	7967.40	60	132.79	
Total	9844.06			

\* significant at .05 level.

The attitudinal means among the interaction groups differed significantly ( $p < .05$ ). Application of the Newman-Keuls' tests specified this difference as occurring between two sets of interaction groups. These groups were "A Great Deal-Little" and "Some-Little." According to this analysis, the degree of interaction did have a positive effect on faculty attitude toward the position of President on Campus A.

Tables XIV - XVIII summarize the data for Campus B.

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF COORDINATOR ON CAMPUS B AMONG SEMANTIC  
DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF  
INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	6.80	1	6.80	.01
Within	7534.94	18	418.60	
Total	7541.75			

TABLE XV

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON ON CAMPUS B BETWEEN  
THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE  
OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	1857.02	2	928.51	1.39
Within	53189.84	80	664.87	
Total	55046.86	82		

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF DIVISION CHAIRPERSON ON CAMPUS B AMONG  
THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF  
INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	778.65	3	259.55	.47
Within	42498.33	77	551.92	
Total	43276.98	80		

TABLE XVII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF DEAN OF INSTRUCTION ON CAMPUS B BETWEEN  
THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE  
OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	810.55	2	405.27	.60
Within	51243.12	77	665.49	
Total	52053.68	79		

TABLE XVIII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT ON CAMPUS B AMONG THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	870.86	3	290.28	.52
Within	42406.11	77	550.72	
Total	43276.98	80		

The obtained F-ratios were not statistically significant for any of the administrative positions. Apparently, the degree of faculty-administrator interaction was not related to faculty attitude toward administrators on Campus B.

Table XIX summarizes the data for the position of Department Chairperson for the Combined Campuses.

TABLE XIX

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD THE POSITION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON ON THE COMBINED CAMPUSES BETWEEN THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	3102.61	2	1551.30	2.65
Within	85200.60	146	583.56	
Total	88303.22	148		

The obtained F-ratio was not statistically significant for the position of Department Chairperson. Faculty attitude toward this position was not related to the degree of interaction.

Table XX summarizes the data for the position of Division Chairperson on the Combined Campuses.

TABLE XX

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD THE POSITION OF DIVISION CHAIRPERSON ON THE COMBINED CAMPUSES AMONG THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	4895.05	3	1631.68	3.33*
Within	68428.69	140	488.77	
Total	73323.75	143		

\*significant at .05 level.

The obtained F-ratio was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). The means for the interaction groups "Much-Little" differed at the .05 level. Faculty attitude toward this position was enhanced by the degree of interaction.

Table XXI summarizes the data for the position of Dean of Instruction.

TABLE XXI

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD  
THE POSITION OF DEAN OF INSTRUCTION ON THE COMBINED  
CAMPUSES AMONG THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF  
THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	5789.24	4	1447.31	3.03*
Within	67235.63	141	476.84	
Total	73024.87	145		

\*Significant at .05 level.

The obtained F-ratio was significant at the .05 level. Newman-Keuls' tests specified this difference as occurring for the "Some-None" ( $p=.01$ ) interaction groups. There appeared to be some slight relationship between degree of interaction and faculty attitude toward this position.

Table XXII summarizes the data for the position of the President.

The obtained F-ratio was not statistically significant. The degree of interaction was not related to faculty attitude toward this position for the Combined Campuses.

Table XXII is presented on the following page.

TABLE XXII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT FOR THE COMBINED CAMPUSES AMONG THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEANS OF THE DEGREE OF INTERACTION GROUPS

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between	3182.13	4	795.53	2.03
Within	54341.68	139	390.94	
Total	57523.82	143		

Exploratory Question 5

To what specific factors may these faculty attitudes be related?

Each respondent was asked to complete the fifty-seven item Faculty Attitude Survey as a measure of attitude toward specific factors of faculty concern. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed as an index of relationship between global attitude toward administrators and the thirteen sub-categories and four group factors of the Faculty Attitude Survey. Statistically significant correlations in the range of .40 to .59 were interpreted as being related to faculty attitude to a "moderate degree," those correlations exceeding this range to "a high degree," and those correlations below this range to a "slight degree."



Table XXIII summarizes the data for Group Factor I--  
Supervision.

TABLE XXIII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
GROUP FACTOR I--SUPERVISION AND SEMANTIC  
DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.65**	
Department Chairperson	.65**	.48**	.55**
Division Chairperson	.47**	.58**	.52**
Dean of Instruction	.26*+	.65**	.51**
President	.51**	.60**	.58**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\* significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This factor is concerned with the overall effective-  
ness of administrative processes. The following are selected  
items which comprise this factor:

1. The administration keeps us informed about college plans and developments.
7. The administration tends to ignore our suggestions and complaints.
13. The administration often fails to give clear-cut instructions.
56. The administration generally encourages coordination between departments.

4. My immediate supervisor does a poor job of organizing our part of the educational program.
100. My immediate supervisor has usually been as fair as possible in his dealings with me (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was .65 ( $p=.01$ ). Forty-two per cent of the variance in faculty attitude was accounted for by this factor.

Supervision was related to a high degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .65( $p=.01$ )for Campus A, .48 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .55 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 42 per cent for Campus A, 23 per cent for Campus B and 30 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Supervision was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson to a high degree for Campus A and to a moderate degree for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .47 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .58 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .52 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 22 per cent for Campus A, 33 per cent for Campus B, and 27 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Supervision was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .26 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .65 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .51 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance accounted for by this factor was 6 per cent for Campus A, 42 per cent for Campus B, and 26 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Supervision was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction to a high degree for Campus B, to a moderate degree for Campus A, and to a slight degree for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .51 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .60 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .58 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance accounted for by this factor was 26 per cent for Campus A, 36 per cent for Campus B, and 33 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Supervision was related to faculty attitude toward the position of President to a high degree for Campus B, and to a moderate degree for Campus A and the Combined Campuses.

Table XXIV summarizes the data for Sub-category A--  
Communication with Administration.

This sub-category related primarily to the flow of information within the administrative structure. The following are selected items from this sub-category:

19. The administration keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know.
22. I believe that the present grievance or adjustment procedure gives a person a fair opportunity to get a problem settled.
16. My immediate supervisor really tries to get

- our ideas about improvements.
28. My immediate supervisor is usually willing to listen to my point of view (1).

TABLE XXIV

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
 SUB-CATEGORY A--COMMUNICATION WITH ADMINISTRATION AND  
 SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.56**	
Department Chairperson	.43**	.24**	.33**
Division Chairperson	.50**	.49**	.48**
Dean of Instruction	.25**+	.61**	.49**
President	.52**	.60**	.58**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was .56 ( $p=.01$ ) and the variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 31 per cent. Communication with Administration was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .43 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .24 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .33 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The

variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 18 per cent for Campus A, 5 per cent for Campus B, and 10 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Communication with Administration was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson to a moderate degree for Campus A and to a slight degree for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .50 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .49 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B and .48 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 25 per cent for Campus A, 24 per cent for Campus B, and 23 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Communication with Administration was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .61 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .49 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 6 per cent for Campuses A, 37 per cent for Campus B, and 24 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Communication with Administration was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction to a high degree for Campus B, to a slight degree for Campus A, and to a moderate degree for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .52 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .60 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .58 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 27 per cent for Campus A, 36 per cent for Campus B, and 33 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Communication with Administration was related to a moderate degree for Campus A and the Combined Campuses and to a high degree for Campus B to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

Table XXV summarizes the data for Sub-category B--Relations with Immediate Supervisor.

TABLE XXV

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY B--RELATIONS WITH IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.57**	
Department Chairperson	.79**	.72**	.75**
Division Chairperson	.28*	.52**	.42**
Dean of Instruction	.19+	.48**	.38**
President	.34**	.39**	.38**

\*significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category refers to the competence, fairness and consistency of immediate supervisors. The following are selected items from this sub-category:

34. When I do good work, credit is given in most instances.
40. My immediate supervisor is not very friendly toward me.
52. My immediate supervisor lets us know exactly what is expected of us (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was .57 ( $p=.01$ ). This sub-category accounted for 32 per cent of the variance in faculty attitude. Relations with Immediate Supervisor was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .28 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .52 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .42 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 7 per cent for Campus A, 27 per cent for Campus B, and 17 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Relations with Immediate Supervisor was related to a moderate degree for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and to a slight degree for Campus A to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .19 for Campus A, .48 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B and .38 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for was 3 per cent for Campus A, 23 per cent for Campus B, and 14 per cent for the Combined Campuses.

Relations with Immediate Supervisor was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B to a moderate degree and to a slight degree for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .34(p=.01) for Campus A, .39 (p=.01) for Campus B, and .38 (p=.01) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 11 per cent for Campus A, 15 per cent for Campus B, and 14 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was only slightly related to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

Table XXVI summarizes the data for Group Factor II--Self-Integration.

TABLE XXVI

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
GROUP FACTOR I--SELF-INTEGRATION AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.07	
Department Chairperson	.36**	.30**	.34**
Division Chairperson	.32**	.40**	.36**
Dean of Instruction	.13+	.56**	.41**
President	.39**	.41**	.43**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.



This factor refers to the image a faculty member had of himself in relation to his colleagues and the institution, including the respect that was accorded to his colleagues. The following are selected items from the Faculty Attitude Survey which comprise this factor:

2. I have a great deal of interest in this college and its future.
8. A few of my colleagues seem to believe that they are running the institution.
14. The longer you work for this college, the more you feel you belong (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was .07 and was not statistically significant. This factor was not related to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .36 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .30 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .34 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 12 per cent for Campus A, 9 per cent for Campus B, and 11 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Self-Integration was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .40 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .36 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this factor was 10 per cent for Campus A, 16 per cent for Campus B, and 12 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Self-Integration was

related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson for Campus B and to a slight degree for Campus A and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .13 for Campus A, .56 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .41 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 1 per cent for Campus A, 31 per cent for Campus B, and 16 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Self-Integration was highly related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B and only slightly related for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .39 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .41 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .43 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 15 per cent for Campus A, 16 per cent for Campus B, and 18 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Self-Integration was moderately related to faculty attitude toward the position of President for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and to a slight degree for Campus A.

Table XXVII summarizes the data for Sub-category C--Identification with the Institution.

TABLE XXVII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
 SUB-CATEGORY C--IDENTIFICATION WITH THE INSTITUTION  
 AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		-.31	
Department Chairperson	.26*	.03	.12
Division Chairperson	.22	.10	.14
Dean of Instruction	.14+	.33**	.28**
President	.33**	.25*	.30**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This category is concerned with the pride and interest staff members had in their college. The following items comprise this category:

2. I have a great deal of interest in this college and its future.
20. I am proud to be a part of the educational program of this community (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was not statistically significant. This sub-category was not related to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .26 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .03 for Campus B, and .12 for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson for Campus A.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were not statistically significant. This sub-category was not related to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .14 for Campus A, .33 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .28 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 1 per cent for Campus A, 10 per cent for Campus B, and 7 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was found to relate to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction on Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .33 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .30 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 10 per cent for Campus A, 6 per cent for Campus B, and 9 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Identification with the Institution was slightly related to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

Table XXVIII summarizes the data for Sub-category D--  
Interpersonal Relations.

TABLE XXVIII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY D--INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.17	
Department Chairperson	.35**	.32**	.34**
Division Chairperson	.30*	.35**	.32**
Dean of Instruction	.13+	.46**	.34**
President	.30*	.31**	.33**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category is defined as "the staff member's concept of the degree to which he was oriented to his role as it related to the institution and to his colleagues" (1, p. 3).

The following are selected items from this sub-category:

26. Sometimes I feel that my work counts for very little in the college program.
44. I feel that I know how I fit in with the total program in this college.
54. Some of my colleagues place personal advancement above the welfare of the institution (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was not statistically significant. This sub-category was not related to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .35 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B and .34 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 12 per cent for Campus A, 10 per cent for Campus B, and 11 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .30 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .35 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 9 per cent for Campus A, 12 per cent for Campus B, and 10 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Interpersonal Relations was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .13 for Campus A, .46 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .34 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 1 per cent for Campus A, 21 per cent for Campus B, and 11 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Interpersonal Relations was related

to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction to a moderate degree for Campus B and to a slight degree for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .30 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .31 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .33 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 9 per cent for Campus A, 9 per cent for Campus B, and 10 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

Table XXIX summarizes the data for Sub-category E--Personal Security.

TABLE XXIX

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY E--PERSONAL SECURITY AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.05	
Department Chairperson	.25*	.25*	.26**
Division Chairperson	.26*	.41**	.34**
Dean of Instruction	.05+	.54**	.39**
President	.40**	.42**	.44**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category concerns the faculty member's feelings of security and self-satisfaction with respect to his position in the institution. The following are selected items from this sub-category:

38. I am doing the kind of work in this college that I can do best.
50. Local pressure groups have too much influence on administration decisions (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was not statistically significant. This sub-category was not related to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .26 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 6 per cent for Campus A, Campus B, and the Combined Campuses. Personal Security was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .26 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .41 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .34 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 6 per cent for Campus A, 16 per cent variance for the Campus B, and 11 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson to a moderate degree for Campus B



and to a slight degree for Campus A, and also for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .05 for Campus A, .54 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .39 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was less than 1 per cent for Campus A, 29 per cent for Campus B, and 15 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Personal Security was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction to a moderate degree for Campus B and only slightly related for the the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .40 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .42 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .44 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 16 per cent for Campus A, 17 per cent for Campus B, and 19 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Personal Security was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

The next factor which was examined was Group Factor III--Institutional Environment. This factor concerns the faculty member's working conditions. The following are selected items which comprise this factor:

3. In general, I have enough modern equipment to teach effectively.
53. The students in this college are interested in learning.
9. Faculty meetings, committee meetings, and similar activities take up too much of my time.

11. The size of the classes I work with is satisfactory for effective teaching.
33. The record keeping and clerical detail connected with my work tend to be very burdensome (1).

Table XXX summarizes the data for Group Factor III--  
Institutional Environment.

TABLE XXX

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
GROUP FACTOR III--INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT  
AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.31	
Department Chairperson	.27*	.27*	.28**
Division Chairperson	.37**	.44**	.40**
Dean of Instruction	.12+	.50**	.38**
President	.25*	.43**	.41**

\*significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

The correlation for the position of Coordinator was not statistically significant. This factor was not related to faculty attitude toward this position.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .27 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .27 ( $p=.05$ ) for

Campus B, and .28 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 7 per cent for all three groups. This factor was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .37 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .44 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .40 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 13 per cent for Campus A, 19 per cent for Campus B, and 16 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Institutional Environment was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and to a slight degree for Campus A.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .12 for Campus A, .50 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .38 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 1 per cent for Campus A, 25 per cent for Campus B, and 14 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Institutional Environment related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction to a moderate degree for Campus B and to a slight degree for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .43 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .41 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campus. The variance in faculty

attitude accounted for by this factor was 6 per cent for Campus A, 18 per cent for Campus B and 16 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This factor was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of President for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and to a slight degree for Campus A.

Table XXXI summarizes the data for Sub-category F--  
Physical Working Conditions.

TABLE XXXI

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY F--PHYSICAL WORKING CONDITIONS AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.51*	
Department Chairperson	-.06	-.05	-.03
Division Chairperson	.06	.09	.07
Dean of Instruction	.04+	.17	.14
President	.16	.17	.23*

\*significant at .05 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category concerns faculty attitude toward physical aspects of the working environment such as buildings

and equipment. The following are selected items from this category:

17. Some of the physical conditions here actually interfere with my work.
39. The condition of the buildings and grounds makes this a pleasant place to work (1).

Only two correlations were statistically significant for this sub-category -- .51 ( $p=.05$ ) for the position of Coordinator on Campus B and .23 ( $p=.05$ ) for the position of President for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 26 per cent for the position of Coordinator and 5 per cent for the position of President. Physical Working Conditions, then, was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator for Campus B and to a slight degree to the position of President on the Combined Campuses.

The next sub-category which was examined was Sub-category G--Opportunities for Professional Growth. The following are selected items from this sub-category:

5. There is good opportunity for advancement in this college.
21. My professional advancement is not encouraged in this institution.
29. The staff development program in this college helps me to do a better job of teaching (1).

Table XXXII summarizes the data for Sub-category G--Opportunities for Professional Growth.

TABLE XXXII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
 SUB-CATEGORY G--OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND  
 DEVELOPMENT AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.35	
Department Chairperson	.42**	.37**	.39**
Division Chairperson	.44**	.46**	.45**
Dean of Instruction	.21+	.55**	.43**
President	.29**	.49**	.41**

\* significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was not statistically significant. Faculty attitude was not related to this sub-category.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .42 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .37 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .39 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 17 per cent for Campus A, 13 per cent for Campus B, and 15 per cent for the Combined Campuses.

This sub-category was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson to a moderate degree for Campus A and to a slight degree for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .44 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .46 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .45 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 19 per cent for Campus A, 21 per cent for Campus B, and 20 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Opportunities for Professional Growth and Development was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .21 for Campus A, .55 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .43 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 4 per cent for Campus A, 30 per cent for Campus B, and 18 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Opportunities for Professional Growth and Development was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction to a moderate degree for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .29 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .49 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .41 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 8 per cent

for Campus A, 24 per cent for Campus B, and 16 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Opportunities for Professional Growth and Advancement was related to faculty attitude toward the position of President to a moderate degree for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and to a slight degree for Campus A.

Table XXXIII summarizes the data for Sub-category H--Faculty Meetings.

TABLE XXXIII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY H--FACULTY MEETINGS AND SEMANTIC  
DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		-.27	
Department Chairperson	-.02	-.09	-.06
Division Chairperson	.14	.04	.09
Dean of Instruction	-.12+	.12	.02
President	.04	.22	.14

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category refers to the value of faculty and committee meetings. The following are selected items from this sub-category:



9. Faculty meetings, committee meetings, and similar activities take up too much of my time.
23. The meetings we have are justified and worth-while with rare exceptions (1).

None of the correlations were statistically significant. This sub-category was not related to faculty attitude toward administrators.

Table XXXIV summarizes the data for Sub-category I--  
Teaching Load.

TABLE XXXIV

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY I--TEACHING LOAD AND SEMANTIC  
DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.05	
Department Chairperson	.05	.13	.12
Division Chairperson	-.06	.27*	.13
Dean of Instruction	.06+	.21	.17
President	-.05	.01	.06

\* significant at .05 level.

+ includes data for Dean of Student Development.

Teaching Load refers to size of classes, unassigned time, and semester hour load. Selected items from this sub-category follow:

27. I believe that I could do a better job  
if I had more unassigned time.
45. I think my teaching load is about right (1).

Only one correlation was statistically significant-- that being for the position of Division Chairperson on Campus B ( $r=.27$ ;  $p=.05$ ). Teaching Load was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson on Campus B.

Table XXXV summarizes the data for Sub-category J--  
Non-Instructional Work Load.

TABLE XXXV

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY J--NON-INSTRUCTIONAL WORK LOAD  
AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concepts	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.18	
Department Chairperson	.07	.24*	.18
Division Chairperson	.18	.32**	.25**
Dean of Instruction	.03+	.25*	.18
President	.11	.24*	.23*

\*significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category was illustrated by the following items:

15. I am often bothered by unexpected extra assignments.
47. Some of my colleagues try to avoid their fair share of extracurricular activities (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was not statistically significant. This sub-category was not related to faculty attitude toward this position.

For the position of Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were .07 for Campus A, .24 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .18 for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was less than 1 per cent for Campus A, 5 per cent for Campus B and 3 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Non-Instructional Work Load was related to faculty attitude toward the position of Department Chairperson to a slight degree for Campus B.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .18 for Campus A, .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .25 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 3 per cent for Campus A, 10 per cent for Campus B and 6 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Non-Instructional Work Load was related to a slight degree to attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .03 for Campus A, .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .18 for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude

accounted for by this sub-category was less than 1 per cent for Campus A, 6 per cent for Campus B, and 3 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Non-Instructional Work Load was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .11 for Campus A, .24 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .23 ( $p=.05$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 1 per cent for Campus A, 5 per cent for Campus B, and 5 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Non-Instructional Work Load was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B and for the Combined Campuses.

The next group factor which was examined was Group Factor IV--Employment Rewards. This factor referred to the general adequacy of salary and fringe benefits. The following are some selected items from this factor:

6. Compared with other colleges our retirement program is satisfactory.
12. It is difficult to live comfortably on the salary I receive.
18. I think that the salary schedule is administered fairly and objectively (1).

Table XXXVI summarizes the data for Group Factor IV--Employment Rewards.

TABLE XXXVI

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
GROUP FACTOR IV--EMPLOYMENT REWARDS AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.16	
Department Chairperson	-.01	.14	.08
Division Chairperson	.29*	.34**	.32**
Dean of Instruction	.24+	.37**	.32**
President	.25*	.41**	.34**

\*significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

For the positions of Coordinator and Department Chairperson the obtained correlations were not statistically significant, and therefore had no relationship to faculty attitude toward these positions.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .29 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .34 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 8 per cent for Campus A, 11 per cent for Campus B, and 10 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Employment Rewards was

related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses. For the position of President the obtained correlations were .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .41 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .34 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this factor was 6 per cent for Campus A, 16 per cent for Campus B, and 11 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This factor was moderately related to faculty attitude toward the position of President for Campus B and only slightly related for Campus A and the Combined Campuses.

Table XXXVII summarizes the data for Sub-category K--  
Adequacy of Fringe Benefits.

TABLE XXXVII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY K--ADEQUACY OF FRINGE BENEFITS  
AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		-.03	
Department Chairperson	-.17	.10	-.003
Division Chairperson	.05	.27*	.17
Dean of Instruction	.12+	.30**	.23*
President	.09	.32**	.25**

\*significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

The following are selected items from this sub-category:

24. Tenure policy in this institution is satisfactory in nearly all its aspects.
32. Compared with most colleges our sick leave and other benefits are good (1).

The obtained correlations for the position of Coordinator and Department Chairperson were not statistically significant. Adequacy of Fringe Benefits was not related to faculty attitude toward these administrative positions.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .05 for Campus A, .27 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .17 for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was less than 1 per cent for Campus A, 7 per cent for Campus B, and 2 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Only the correlation for Campus B was statistically significant. A slight degree of relationship existed between this sub-category and faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .12 for Campus A, .30 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B and .23 ( $p=.05$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 1 per cent for Campus A, 9 per cent for Campus B, and 5 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Only the correlations for Campus B and the Combined Campuses were statistically significant. Adequacy of Fringe Benefits was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .09 for Campus A, .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .25 ( $=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was less than 1 per cent for Campus A, 10 per cent for Campus B, and 6 per cent for the Combined Campuses. The correlations were not statistically significant for Campus A. Adequacy of Fringe Benefits was slightly related, however, to faculty attitude toward the position of President for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

Table XXXVIII summarizes the data for Sub-category L--Adequacy of Salary.

TABLE XXXVIII

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY L--ADEQUACY OF SALARY AND  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.009	
Department Chairperson	.12	.04	.06
Division Chairperson	.39**	.28*	.33**
Dean of Instruction	.28*+	.10	.16
President	.28*	.26*	.22*

\*significant at the .05 level.

\*\*significant at the .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.



The following are selected items from this sub-category:

12. It is difficulty for me to live comfortably on the salary I receive.
30. In my opinion the salaries in our college are lower than the salaries in most other colleges (1).

The correlations for the positions Coordinator and Department Chairperson were not statistically significant.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .39 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .28 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .33 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 15 per cent for Campus A, 7 per cent for Campus B, and 10 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Adequacy of Salary was slightly related to faculty attitude toward the administrative position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .28 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .10 for Campus B, and .16 for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 7 per cent for Campus A, 1 per cent for Campus B, and 2 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Adequacy of Salary was slightly related to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus A.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .28 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .26 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .22 ( $p=.05$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 7 per cent

for Campus A, 6 per cent for Campus B, and 4 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Adequacy of Salary was slightly related to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

Table XXXIX summarizes the data for Sub-category M--Administration of Salary Schedule.

TABLE XXXIX

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
SUB-CATEGORY M--ADMINISTRATION OF SALARY SCHEDULE  
AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

Concept	Campus A	Campus B	Combined Campuses
Coordinator		.39	
Department Chairperson	.13	.17	.15
Division Chairperson	.38**	.25*	.30**
Dean of Instruction	.22+	.40**	.32**
President	.30*	.36**	.31**

\*significant at .05 level.

\*\*significant at .01 level.

+includes data for Dean of Student Development.

This sub-category referred to the fairness and consistency with which the salary schedule was administered. The following are selected items from this sub-category:

36. I am satisfied with the way salary matters are handled.

51. The method for determining salary increases is satisfactory (1).

For the position of Coordinator the obtained correlation was not statistically significant.

Administration of Salary Schedule was not related to faculty attitude toward the position of Coordinator.

The correlations for the position of Department Chairperson were not statistically significant.

For the position of Division Chairperson the obtained correlations were .38 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus A, .25 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus B, and .30 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 14 per cent for Campus A, 6 per cent for Campus B, and 9 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Administration of Salary Schedule was slightly related to faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson.

For the position of Dean of Instruction the obtained correlations were .22 for Campus A, .40 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B and .32 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in faculty attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 4 per cent for Campus A, 16 per cent for Campus B and 16 per cent for the Combined Campuses. This sub-category was related to a moderate degree to faculty attitude toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B and to a slight degree for the Combined Campuses.

For the position of President the obtained correlations were .30 ( $p=.05$ ) for Campus A, .36 ( $p=.01$ ) for Campus B, and .31 ( $p=.01$ ) for the Combined Campuses. The variance in attitude accounted for by this sub-category was 9 per cent for Campus A, 12 per cent for Campus B, and 9 per cent for the Combined Campuses. Administration of Salary Schedule was related to a slight degree to faculty attitude toward the position of President.

#### The Faculty Attitude Survey Data

Table XL which is presented on the following page (86) summarizes the data for the Faculty Attitude Survey. The Faculty Attitude Survey was scored on a three point scale ranging from 0 (unfavorable response) to 2 (favorable response). According to Richardson (1) group factor and sub-category scores above 1.00 indicate a favorable attitude. Those scores below 1.00 indicate a negative attitude.

On the basis of this interpretative norm faculty attitude was generally favorable in forty-one of fifty-one indices in regard to the specific conditions measured by the Faculty Attitude Survey.

Ten out of the fifty-one indices had mean scores of less than 1.00 These indices were Sub-categories A, I, J, and L for Campus B; Group Factor IV for Campus B and Sub-categories L and M for all groups. Specifically, those areas

TABLE XI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY GROUP FACTOR AND SUB-CATEGORY SCORES

	Campus A		Campus B		Combined Campuses	
	M(N=66)	SD	M(N=78)	SD	M(N=144)	SD
Faculty Attitude Survey Group Factor (GF) and / or Sub-category						
Group Factor I--Supervision	1.30	.47	1.14	.52	1.21	.51
SC A--Communication with Administration	1.18	.53	.98	.60	1.07	.57
SC B--Relations with Immediate Supervisor	1.52	.57	1.40	.61	1.46	.59
Group Factor II--Integration	1.48	.38	1.35	.43	1.41	.41
SC C--Identification with the Institution	1.91	.24	1.84	.31	1.87	.28
SC D--Interpersonal Relations	1.30	.57	1.14	.60	1.21	.59
SC E--Personal Security	1.44	.41	1.29	.53	1.36	.48
Group Factor III--Institutional Environment	1.24	.28	1.13	.37	1.18	.33
SC F--Physical Working Conditions	1.75	.41	1.56	.48	1.65	.46
SC G--Opportunities for Professional Growth and Development	1.12	.47	1.07	.56	1.09	.52
SC H--Faculty Meetings	1.09	.83	1.10	.81	1.10	.82
SC I--Teaching Load	1.20	.57	.99	.68	1.09	.64
SC J--Non-Instructional Work Load	1.11	.54	.98	.54	1.04	.54
Group Factor IV--Employment Rewards	1.00	.44	.98	.43	.99	.54
SC K--Adequacy of Fringe Benefits	1.34	.46	1.27	.45	1.31	.46
SC L--Adequacy of Salary	.50	.61	.57	.68	.54	.65
SC M--Administration of Salary Schedule	.64	.68	.65	.67	.65	.67

on Campus B which reflect negative attitudes were in regard to Communication with Administration, Teaching Load, Non-Instructional Work Load and Employment Rewards.

Sub-category L-Adequacy of Salary and Sub-category M-Administration of Salary Schedule reflected the sharpest degree of negative faculty attitude for all three groups.

#### Summary

The faculty in this junior college district regarded their administrators in a positive fashion.

The data were analyzed to determine if faculty attitude varied significantly among the various administrative positions. Statistically significant attitudinal differences were found to exist among the administrative positions on Campus A and for the Combined Campuses. There were no statistically significant differences for the mean scores among the administrative positions on Campus B. It was also noted that attitudinal ratings of administrators by faculty were not related in a consistent fashion to the proximity of the administrative position to the faculty member.

A comparison of attitudinal ratings for similar administrative positions between Campus A and B revealed that the position of President was viewed in a significantly ( $p .001$ ) more positive manner on Campus A.

An analysis was made between faculty attitude toward the administrative positions and degree of faculty-administrator

interaction. For Campus A degree of interaction was found to have had a positive affect on faculty attitude toward the position of Division Chairperson, Dean of Instruction and President. Degree of interaction was not significantly related to faculty attitude toward administrators on Campus B. For the Combined Campuses degree of interaction was found to have had a slightly positive affect on faculty attitude toward two positions: Division Chairperson and Dean of Instruction.

Correlations between global attitude toward administrators as measured by the semantic differential and specific measures of faculty concern as measured by the Faculty Attitude Survey were computed.

Faculty Attitude Survey Group Factor I--Supervision and Sub-category A--Communication with Administration were related in all cases to faculty attitude toward the administrative positions.

For Sub-category B--Relations with Immediate Supervisor the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Coordinator, Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, and Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and for the position of President for all groups.

Group Factor II--Self-Integration was related to faculty attitude toward all of the administrative positions with the exception of the positions of Coordinator on Campus B and Dean of Instruction on Campus A.

For Sub-category C--Identification with the Institution the data indicated that relationships existed toward the administrative positions of Department Chairperson for Campus A, Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses, and President for all three groups.

For Sub-category D--Interpersonal Relations the data indicated that relationships existed toward the positions of Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, and President for all three groups and for the position of Dean of Instruction on Campus B.

For Sub-category E--Personal Security the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, and President across all three groups and the Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For Group Factor III--Institutional Environment the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, and President for all three groups and toward the position of Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For Sub-category F--Physical Working Conditions the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Coordinator on Campus B and President on the Combined Campuses.

For Sub-category G--Opportunities for Professional Growth the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions



of Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, and President for all three groups and for the Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For Sub-category H--Faculty Meetings the data indicated that no relationship existed for any of the administrative positions.

For Sub-category I--Teaching Load the data indicated that a relationship existed for the position of Division Chairperson on Campus B.

For Sub-category J--Non-Instructional Work Load the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Department Chairperson on Campus B, Division Chairperson for Campus B and the Combined Campuses, Dean of Instruction for Campus B, and President for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For Group Factor IV--Employment Rewards the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Division Chairperson and Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and for the position of President across all three groups.

For Sub-category K--Adequacy of Fringe Benefits the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Division Chairperson, Dean of Instruction, and President for Campus B and the Combined Campuses.

For Sub-category L--Adequacy of Salary the data indicated significant relationships for the positions of Division Chairperson, Dean of Instruction for Campus A and President for all three groups.

For Sub-category M--Administration of Salary Schedule the data indicated that relationships existed for the positions of Division Chairperson and Dean of Instruction for Campus B and the Combined Campuses and the position of President across all three groups.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Richardson, Richard C., Jr., and Clyde E. Blocker,  
Manual for the Faculty Attitude Survey, Form Z,  
1965.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary of the Study

The purposes of this study are to ascertain the attitudes of junior college faculty toward campus-level administrators in an urban junior college district and to determine what relationship may have existed between general and specific measures of attitude.

A general measure of faculty attitude was obtained utilizing a semantic differential instrument. Two additional types of indices thought to be related to general attitude were also obtained. These indices are degree of faculty-administrator interaction and faculty attitude toward specific factors characteristic of educational institutions.

The subjects of this study were the full-time faculty of an urban junior college district. Participation in the study was obtained from 61.1 per cent of the 247 faculty members who met the criteria for inclusion in the study.

Data for the study were obtained from the use of the following instruments: a semantic differential, a degree-of-interaction scale, and the Faculty Attitude Survey.

Means were computed for each of the campus-level administrative positions by campus and for the combined sample. These mean scores were compared with one another, utilizing one-way analysis of variance, to determine if significant differences existed among the administrative positions on the same campus and between the same position on each of the two campuses. Relationship between degree of faculty-administrator interaction and faculty attitude toward administrators was analyzed utilizing one-way analysis of variance. Significant F-ratios were treated with Newman-Keuls' tests to specify where the significance occurred. Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for determining relationship between general attitude toward administrators and the Faculty Attitude Survey scores.

### Findings

Analyses of the data of this study resulted in the following findings.

The faculty in this urban junior college district had moderately positive attitudes toward their administrators.

The faculty on Campus A, while viewing all of their administrators in a positive fashion, were significantly more positive in attitude toward the position of President. Faculty attitude toward administrators on Campus B did not differ significantly among the administrative positions.

When Campus A and Campus B were considered as one group, faculty attitude toward the position of President was

significantly more positive when compared to the positions of Division Chairperson and Department Chairperson.

Attitudinal ratings of administrators by faculty were not related in any consistent pattern to the proximity of the position to the faculty member.

Attitudinal ratings of the various administrative positions from Campus A were compared to those from Campus B. On the basis of these comparisons, only the attitudinal ratings for the position of President differed significantly. While both faculties viewed this position positively, the faculty on Campus A held a significantly more positive attitude than the faculty on Campus B.

Degree of faculty-administrator interaction had a variable relationship to faculty attitude toward administrators. For Campus A this interaction had a positive relationship to faculty attitude toward the positions of Division Chairperson, Dean of Instruction, and President. For Campus B, degree of interaction was not related to faculty attitude toward any of the administrative positions. For the Combined Campuses degree of faculty-administrator interaction was related to faculty attitude toward the positions of Division Chairperson and Dean of Instruction.

A correlational analysis was made between the general measures of faculty attitude toward administrators and the scores on the seventeen factor Faculty Attitude Survey. Sixteen of these factors were found to have had a relationship

to faculty attitude toward administrators. These relationships were variable, each of the sixteen factors being related to different combinations of faculty attitude toward the administrative positions. On the basis of these data the finding was that specific conditions about which faculty were concerned were related to how the faculty viewed their administrators.

Analysis of the Faculty Attitude Survey data revealed that the faculty were generally satisfied with specific working conditions. Only two of the seventeen Faculty Attitude Survey indices--Adequacy of Salary and Administration of Salary Schedule--indicated serious faculty dissatisfaction.

Faculty administrator relationships in the American junior college were characterized in the literature as being in a serious state of conflict. The findings of this study reflect essentially the converse of this situation as described in the literature. Faculty morale in this urban junior college district was found to be positive in regard to faculty attitude toward administrators and in regard to specific working conditions.

## Conclusions

In view of the findings of this investigation, the following conclusions are presented. These conclusions should be viewed with some caution as they are based on the returns of only 61 per cent of the faculty in this urban junior college district.

1. The campus-level administrators in this urban junior college district were viewed in a positive manner by the faculty.

2. Faculty attitude toward the various administrative positions, with the exception of the position of President, did not favor one position as compared to another.

3. Faculty attitude toward the administrative position of President was held in higher esteem by the faculty as compared to the other administrative positions in two of the three criterion groups.

4. Proximity of administrative position to the faculty member has no consistent effect on faculty attitudinal ratings of administrators.

5. The faculties on Campus A and Campus B did not differ significantly in attitude toward the positions of Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, and Dean of Instruction.

6. The faculty on Campus A were significantly more positive in attitude toward the administrative position of President than were the faculty on Campus B.



7. The degree of interaction between faculty and administrators affects faculty attitude toward administrators.

8. Faculty attitude toward administrators was related to specific conditions about which faculty were concerned.

### Recommendations

In view of the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. As faculty morale is generally considered to be highly important in achieving the mission of the junior college, assessment of morale should be conducted on a regular basis.

2. When an assessment of faculty morale is conducted in an educational setting, a formal and systematic procedure should be employed.

3. Measures of morale should be as free as possible from all innuendo, rumor, or "coffee talk."

4. Full participation and support should be sought from all relevant persons.

5. Procedural factors important in the assessment of faculty morale include the involvement of all relevant groups in the design of the assessment, protection of the anonymity of respondents, a clear statement as to the rationale for conducting the assessment, and an explanation as to how the data are to be used.

6. Instruments used for conducting the assessment should be carefully constructed and tested for reliability.

7. Assessment of morale should provide for differential analyses where different subgroups, such as campuses, divisions, and departments can be identified.

APPENDIX A  
SAMPLE OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleagues:

I am requesting your participation in what I hope will be a positive and significant effort toward a comprehensive analysis of faculty morale in the Tarrant County Junior College District.

This is my dissertation study, true enough; however, I hope you will agree that the study has a great deal of positive potential for all of us.

The faculty officers on both campuses have been appraised of the nature of the study. The Presidents and Deans of Instruction on both campuses and the Chancellor have expressed their support and approval for the conduct of the study.

Your participation is crucial! Any study is valid only to the extent that it is representative of the group and/or concepts under consideration. In this case, the group is you--the full-time teaching faculty of Tarrant County Junior College District; and the concept is faculty morale.

Your anonymity is absolutely guaranteed. The campus on which you teach is the only identifying information needed.

Please complete the instruments promptly and completely and return in the envelope provided.

I do appreciate your time and support!

Sincerely yours,

Sam D. Birkner  
Counselor & Associate  
Professor of Psychology  
South Campus

## DIRECTIONS

In responding to the following set of inventories you are asked to:

1. Respond to each of the administrative positions in relation to the individual currently holding that position.
2. Please make your judgements on the basis of how you feel toward these administrative positions.
3. If the administrator holds more than one position (i.e. "Department Chairperson" and "Division Chairperson"), please evaluate this person for each position held.
4. For each of the four administrative positions to be evaluated you will find the title of the position and beneath it a set of scales. These scales are to be utilized in the following manner:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your "x" mark as follows:

Fair X :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    Unfair

Or

Fair \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    X :    Unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale, you should place your "x" mark as follows:

Strong \_\_\_ :    X :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    Weak

Or

Strong \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    \_\_\_ :    X :    \_\_\_ :    Weak

If the concept (administrative position) seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but not really neutral), then you should place your "x" mark as follows:

Active \_\_\_: \_\_\_: X: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: Passive

Or

Active \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: X: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: Passive

The direction toward which you mark, of course, will depend upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale to be equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is not relevant to the concept, then you should place your "x" mark in the middle space:

Safe \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: X: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: Dangerous

IMPORTANT:

(1) Place your "x" mark in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries.

\_\_\_: X: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_: \_\_\_X \_\_\_:

This

Not this

(2) Be sure you mark each of the 20 scales for each of the four administrative positions--do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one "x" mark on a single scale.

To protect your anonymity, do not identify yourself.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Self-Accepting	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Self-Depreciating
Insincere	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Sincere
Honest	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Dishonest
Close-Minded	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Open-Minded
Fair	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unfair
Unintelligent	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Intelligent
Appreciative	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unappreciative
Authoritarian	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Democratic
Tolerant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Intolerant
Dissonant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Harmonious
Pleasant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unpleasant
Unenthusiastic	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Enthusiastic
Courteous	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Rude
Hesitant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Assured
Social	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unsocial
Insensitive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Sensitive
Persuasive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Nonpersuasive
Destructive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Constructive
Optimistic	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Pessimistic
Passive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Aggressive

\* If applicable

Self-Accepting	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Self-Depreciating
Insincere	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Sincere
Honest	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Dishonest
Close-Minded	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Open-Minded
Fair	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unfair
Unintelligent	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Intelligent
Appreciative	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unappreciative
Authoritarian	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Democratic
Tolerant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Intolerant
Dissonant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Harmonious
Pleasant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unpleasant
Unenthusiastic	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Enthusiastic
Courteous	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Rude
Hesitant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Assured
Social	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unsocial
Insensitive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Sensitive
Persuasive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Nonpersuasive
Destructive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Constructive
Optimistic	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Pessimistic
Passive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Aggressive

DIVISION CHAIRPERSON

Self-Accepting 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Self-Depreciating  
 Insincere 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Sincere  
 Honest 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Dishonest  
 Close-Minded 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Open-Minded  
 Fair 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Unfair  
 Unintelligent 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Intelligent  
 Appreciative 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Unappreciative  
 Authoritarian 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Democratic  
 Tolerant 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Intolerant  
 Dissonant 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Harmonious  
 Pleasant 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Unpleasant  
 Unenthusiastic 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Enthusiastic  
 Courteous 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Rude  
 Hesitant 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Assured  
 Social 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Unsocial  
 Insensitive 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Sensitive  
 Persuasive 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Nonpersuasive  
 Destructive 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Constructive  
 Optimistic 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Pessimistic  
 Passive 1.\_\_\_\_: 2.\_\_\_\_: 3.\_\_\_\_: 4.\_\_\_\_: 5.\_\_\_\_: 6.\_\_\_\_: 7.\_\_\_\_: Aggressive



Self-Accepting	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Self-Depreciating
Insincere	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Sincere
Honest	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Dishonest
Close-Minded	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Open-Minded
Fair	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unfair
Unintelligent	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Intelligent
Appreciative	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unappreciative
Authoritarian	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Democratic
Tolerant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Intolerant
Dissonant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Harmonious
Pleasant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unpleasant
Unenthusiastic	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Enthusiastic
Courteous	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Rude
Hesitant	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Assured
Social	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Unsocial
Insensitive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Sensitive
Persuasive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Nonpersuasive
Destructive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Constructive
Optimistic	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Pessimistic
Passive	1. ___:	2. ___:	3. ___:	4. ___:	5. ___:	6. ___:	7. ___:	Aggressive

Self-Accepting	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Self-Depreciating
Insincere	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Sincere
Honest	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Dishonest
Close-Minded	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Open-Minded
Fair	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Unfair
Unintelligent	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Intelligent
Appreciative	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Unappreciative
Authoritarian	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Democratic
Tolerant	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Intolerant
Dissonant	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Harmonious
Pleasant	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Unpleasant
Unenthusiastic	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Enthusiastic
Courteous	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Rude
Hesitant	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Assured
Social	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Unsocial
Insensitive	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Sensitive
Persuasive	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Nonpersuasive
Destructive	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Constructive
Optimistic	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Pessimistic
Passive	1.____:	2.____:	3.____:	4.____:	5.____:	6.____:	7.____:	Aggressive

How much contact have you had with these administrators on either an individual or small group basis? Please circle your answer.

*Coodinator	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Little	None
Department Chairperson	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Little	None
Division Chairperson	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Little	None
Dean of Instruction	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Little	None
President	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Little	None

\*If applicable



to any statement. If you wish to change an answer, erase cleanly. Use a soft lead pencil in marking your answer sheet. Please mark the answer spaces so as to completely fill the space (--).

Please do not mark outside the space (ex.: ' ' ' '). Please do not make any extraneous marks on the answer sheet. Please note that the answer spaces on the answer sheet progress across the page from right to left.

A-Agree

U-Undecided

D-Disagree

1. The administration keeps us informed about college plans and developments.
2. I have a great deal of interest in this college and its future.
3. In general, I have enough modern equipment to teach effectively.
4. My immediate supervisor does a poor job of organizing our part of the educational program.
5. There is good opportunity for advancement in this college.
6. Compared with other colleges, our retirement program is satisfactory.
7. The administration tends to ignore our suggestions and complaints.
8. A few of my colleagues seem to believe that they are running the institution.
9. Faculty meetings, committee meetings, and similar activities take up too much of my time.
10. My immediate supervisor has usually been as fair as possible in his dealings with me.
11. The size of the classes I work with is satisfactory for effective teaching.
12. It is difficult for me to live comfortably on the salary I receive.
13. The administration often fails to give clear cut instructions.
14. The longer you work for this college, the more you feel you belong.
15. I am often bothered by unexpected extra assignments.
16. My immediate supervisor really tries to bet our ideas about improvements.

17. Some of the physical conditions here actually interfere with my work.
18. I think that the salary schedule is administered fairly and objectively.
19. The administration keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know.
20. I am proud to be a part of the educational program of this community.
21. My professional advancement is not encouraged in this institution.
22. I believe that the present grievances or adjustment procedure gives a person a fair opportunity to get a problem settled.
23. The meetings we have are justified and worthwhile with rare exceptions.
24. Tenure policy in this institution is satisfactory in nearly all respects.
25. The administration has a tendency to play favorites.
26. Sometimes I feel that my work counts for very little in the college program.
27. I believe that I could do a better job if I had more unassigned time.
28. My immediate supervisor is usually willing to listen to my point of view.
29. The staff development program in this college helps me to do a better job of teaching.
30. In my opinion, the salaries in our college are lower than the salaries in most other colleges.
31. I have to depend upon the grapevine as my source of information.
32. Compared with most colleges, our sick leave and other benefits are good.
33. The record keeping and clerical detail connected with my work tend to be very burdensome.

34. When I do good work, credit is given in most instances.
35. There is good opportunity for professional growth in this college.
36. I am satisfied with the way salary matters are handled.
37. The administration does a poor job of handling complaints and suggestions.
38. I am doing the kind of work in this college that I can do best.
39. The condition of the buildings and grounds makes this a pleasant place to work.
40. My immediate supervisor is not very friendly toward me.
41. If I were some place other than this college, I would have more opportunity for advancement.
42. I'm satisfied with the way our retirement program is handled.
43. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone in the administrative offices.
44. I feel that I know how I fit in with the total program in this college.
45. I think my teaching load is about right.
46. The administration does everything possible to see that we are fairly treated.
47. Some of my colleagues try to avoid their fair share of extracurricular activities.
48. I would not want to take extended sick leave for fear I might not be reinstated.
49. With practically no exceptions, I understand the policies, rules and regulations under which I work.
50. Local pressure groups have too much influence on administrative decisions.
51. The method for determining salary increases is satisfactory.



52. My immediate supervisor lets us know exactly what is expected of us.
53. The students in this college are interested in learning.
54. Some of my colleagues place personal advancement above the welfare of the institution.
55. I'm satisfied with the way our sick leave and benefit program is handled.
56. The administration generally encourages coordination between departments.
57. Filling in this inventory can be a worthwhile way of letting the administration know what faculty members think.

APPENDIX B  
MANUAL FOR THE FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY  
(FORM Z)

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.  
Clyde E. Blocker

The concept of faculty morale relates to the attitudes held by the faculty members of a given institution toward the environment within which they work. Administrators consider the evaluation of morale important even though it has not been proven that high morale is necessarily related to productivity. The most common method of evaluating faculty morale is through the face-to-face relationships that inevitably occur in an institution. Size of the faculty and the element of threat, actual or implied, can combine to make such soundings unreliable.

Most attempts to evaluate staff morale through some sort of attitude survey fall into one of the two categories. Either a collection of statements is used to yield a single generalized indication of morale level, or each item within a group is used as an indication of attitude toward a specific condition, for example, adequacy of salary. The former approach fails to provide specific information so that corrective measures may be taken, the latter is notoriously unreliable since it is based on a single measure.

The Faculty Attitude Survey represents a unique attempt to establish certain empirically demonstrated categories consisting of clusters of statements all related to the same concept. In this way differential measure of morale was constructed that could be used to identify specific areas detrimental to staff job satisfaction. At the same time, the fact that a cluster of items was identified for each category meant that several measures were available creating a more reliable group score.

The detailed development of the Faculty Attitude Survey is described in the references listed for this report. The following information is designed to aid in the scoring and interpretation of the most refined version of the Survey, Form Z. It should be noted that the categories described are the result of an item factor analysis of the responses from six junior colleges.

#### GROUP FACTORS AND SUB-CATEGORIES OF THE INVENTORY

A study completed by Richardson and Block (1963) revealed the existence of four group factors relating to the area of faculty morale. An item analysis, Richardson and Blocker (1965), further identified sub-categories within each of the major groups. The group factors with their related sub-categories are described on the following pages.

GROUP FACTOR I--SUPERVISION

This factor is associated with the attitudes of faculty members toward the overall effectiveness of administrative processes. It consists of two sub-categories.

Sub-category A: Communication with Administration relates primarily to the freedom with which information travels up and down the administrative structure. At the same time, attitudes of fairness, consistency, competence and effectiveness of administration beyond the immediate supervisor level are tapped.

Sub-category B: Relations with Immediate Supervisor refers to the attitudes of staff members toward the fairness, consistency, competence and effectiveness of immediate supervisors.

GROUP FACTOR II--SELF INTEGRATION

This factor involves the image that a faculty member has of himself in relation to his colleagues and the institution, as well as the degree of respect with which he views his colleagues. There are three sub-categories comprising this group factor.

Sub-category C: Identification with the Institution concerns the expressed attitude of staff members toward their pride and interest in the college.

Sub-category D: Interpersonal Relations has to do with the staff member's concept of the degree to which he is oriented to his role as it relates to the institution

and to his colleagues.

Sub-category E: Personal Security relates to feelings of self-satisfaction and security expressed by the staff member with respect to his position in the institution.

#### GROUP FACTOR III--INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

This factor is the second largest of the four consisting of seventeen items and five sub-categories. Institutional environment refers to the conditions under which a faculty member works.

Sub-category F: Physical Working Conditions includes attitudes toward buildings, grounds, equipment, and other physical aspects of the job situation.

Sub-category G: Opportunities for Professional Growth and Advancement concerns faculty attitudes toward professional growth opportunities and advancement possibilities as members of the college staff.

Sub-category H: Faculty Meetings involves attitudes toward the value and importance of faculty and committee meetings.

Sub-category I: Teaching Load refers to such conditions as class size, amount of unassigned time, as well as attitudes toward non-teaching activities such as extra-curricular assignments, record keeping, and other clerical detail.

#### GROUP FACTOR IV--EMPLOYMENT REWARDS

This factor concerns itself with the attitudes of faculty members toward the fairness of administration and

the general adequacy of salary and fringe benefits. Three sub-categories are included within this factor.

Sub-category K: Adequacy of Fringe Benefits summarizes faculty attitudes with respect to benefits such as sick leave retirement, and tenure.

Sub-category L: Adequacy of Salary refers to attitudes concerning the adequacy of remuneration.

Sub-category M: Administration of Salary Schedule involves attitudes toward the fairness and consistency with which the salary schedule is administered.

#### ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING

Directions for administering the Survey are contained in the cover sheet for each inventory. Best results will be obtained when staff members are convinced that some use will be made of the results. The answer sheet should contain as a minimum the teaching department or division of the respondent since results are most useful when presented so as to demonstrate contrasts within the organizational framework of the institution as well as between the various areas of morale.

The instrument is scored on a three point scale with the desired response being given a value of two. The undecided response in each case is scored as one, while the unfavorable response is valued at zero. To reduce the possibility of a response set, both negative and positive

items have been included. Thus, either the agree or the disagree answer might be scored as two depending upon the nature of the statement. In presenting results, scores should be tabulated for each sub-category, and group factor composites above one indicate areas of relatively higher morale, while scores below one reveal areas needing attention.

The group factors and sub-categories are listed below with the number of each item from the inventory that belongs to the respective grouping. An "A" after the item indicates that this is the two point response. Similarly, a "D" follows those items where this is the two point response. While it is possible to program this instrument for machine scoring, where small numbers are involved, the easiest method is to construct thirteen templates, one for each sub-category. Combined scores for each teaching division when divided by the number of instructors involved in the number of items on the sub-category will yield scores that may be compared. Item 57 on the inventory is a reaction statement that may be examined independently to give some idea of the rapport that exists between those administering the inventory and those taking it.

## GROUP FACTOR I - SUPERVISION

Sub-Category A	Statements	Two Point Response
Communication with Administration	1	A
	7	D
	13	D
	19	D
	22	A
	25	D
	31	D
	37	D
	43	A
	46	A
	49	A
56	A	

Sub-Category B	Statements	Two Point Response
Relations with Immediate Supervisor	4	D
	10	A
	16	A
	28	A
	34	A
	40	D
	52	A



## GROUP FACTOR II - SELF INTEGRATION

Sub-Category C	Statements	Two Point Response
Identification with the Institution	2 20	A A

Sub-Category D	Statements	Two Point Response
Interpersonal Relations	8 26 44 54	D D A D

Sub-Category E	Statements	Two Point Response
Personal Security	14 38 50	A A D

## GROUP FACTOR III - INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Sub-Category F	Statements	Two Point Response
Physical Working Conditions	3 17 39	A D A

Sub-Category G	Statements	Two Point Response
Professional Growth and Advancement	5 21 29 35 41 43	A D A A D A

Sub-Category H	Statements	Two Point Response
Faculty Meetings	9 23	D A

Sub-Category I	Statements	Two Point Response
Teaching Load	11 27 45	A D A

Sub-Category J	Statements	Two Point Response
Non-Instructional Work Load	15	D
	33	D
	47	D

## GROUP FACTOR IV - EMPLOYMENT REWARDS

Sub-Category K	Statements	Two Point Response
Adequacy of Fringe Benefits	6	A
	24	A
	32	A
	42	A
	48	D
	55	A

Sub-Category L	Statements	Two Point Response
Adequacy of Salary	12	D
	30	D

Sub-Category M	Statements	Two Point Response
Administration of Salary Schedule	18	A
	36	A
	51	A

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baehr, Melany E. and R. Renck, "The Definition and Measurement of Employee Morale," Administration Science Quarterly, 1950, 3, 157-184.
- Hansen, M. Duane, A Study of the Relationship Between Faculty Morale and Influence Structure in Five Selected Junior Colleges, Austin: University of Texas, 1964.
- Richardson, R. C., Jr. and Clyde E. Blocker, "Note on the Application of Factor Analysis to the Study of Faculty Morale," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 208-212.
- Richardson, R. C., Jr. and Clyde E. Blocker, "An Item Factorization of the Faculty Attitude Survey," Journal of Experimental Education, 1966.

FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.  
Clyde E. Blocker

Form Z



Mark only response for each statement. Do not omit any items. Remember, there is no "right" or "wrong" response to any statement. If you wish to change an answer, erase cleanly. Record any criticisms or suggestions on the back of the answer sheet.

A - Agree

U - Undecided

D - Disagree

1. The administration keeps us informed about college plans and developments. 1. \_\_\_
2. I have a great deal of interest in this college and its future. 2. \_\_\_
3. In general, I have enough modern equipment to teach effectively. 3. \_\_\_
4. My immediate supervisor does a poor job of organizing our part of the educational program. 4. \_\_\_
5. There is good opportunity for advancement in this college. 5. \_\_\_
6. Compared with other colleges, our retirement program is satisfactory. 6. \_\_\_
7. The administration tends to ignore our suggestions and complaints. 7. \_\_\_
8. A few of my colleagues seem to believe that they are running the institution. 8. \_\_\_
9. Faculty meetings, committee meetings, and similar activities take up too much of my time. 9. \_\_\_
10. My immediate supervisor has usually been as fair as possible in his dealings with me. 10. \_\_\_
11. The size of the classes I work with is satisfactory for effective teaching. 11. \_\_\_
12. It is difficult for me to live comfortably on the salary I receive. 12. \_\_\_
13. The administration often fails to give clear cut instructions. 13. \_\_\_
14. The longer you work for this college, the more you feel you belong. 14. \_\_\_
15. I am often bothered by unexpected extra assignments. 15. \_\_\_
16. My immediate supervisor really tries to get our ideas about improvemtns. 16. \_\_\_



A - Agree

U - Undecided

D - Disagree

17. Some of the physical conditions here actually interfere with my work. 17. \_\_\_
18. I think that the salary schedule is administered fairly and objectively. 18. \_\_\_
19. The administration keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know. 19. \_\_\_
20. I am proud to be a part of the educational program of this community. 20. \_\_\_
21. My professional advancement is not encouraged in this institution. 21. \_\_\_
22. I believe that the present grievances or adjustment procedure gives a person a fair opportunity to get a problem settled. 22. \_\_\_
23. The meetings we have are justified and worthwhile with rare exceptions. 23. \_\_\_
24. Tenure policy in this institution is satisfactory in nearly all respects. 24. \_\_\_
25. The administration has a tendency to play favorites. 25. \_\_\_
26. Sometimes I feel that my work counts for very little in the college program. 26. \_\_\_
27. I believe that I could do a better job if I had more unassigned time. 27. \_\_\_
28. My immediate supervisor is usually willing to listen to my point of view. 28. \_\_\_
29. The staff development program in this college helps me to do a better job of teaching. 29. \_\_\_
30. In my opinion, the salaries in our college are lower than the salaries in most other colleges. 30. \_\_\_
31. I have to depend upon the grapevine as my source of information. 31. \_\_\_
32. Compared with most colleges, our sick leave and other benefits are good. 32. \_\_\_

A - Agree

U - Undecided

D - Disagree

33. The record keeping and clerical detail connected with my work tend to be very burdensome. 33. \_\_\_
34. When I do good work, credit is given in most instances. 34. \_\_\_
35. There is good opportunity for professional growth in this college. 35. \_\_\_
36. I am satisfied with the way salary matters are handled. 36. \_\_\_
37. The administration does a poor job of handling complaints and suggestions. 37. \_\_\_
38. I am doing the kind of work in this college that I can do best. 38. \_\_\_
39. The condition of the buildings and grounds makes this a pleasant place to work. 39. \_\_\_
40. My immediate supervisor is not very friendly toward us. 40. \_\_\_
41. If I were some place other than this college, I would have more opportunity for advancement. 41. \_\_\_
42. I'm satisfied with the way our retirement program is handled. 42. \_\_\_
43. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone in the administrative offices. 43. \_\_\_
44. I feel that I know how I fit in with the total program in this college. 44. \_\_\_
45. I think my teaching load is about right. 45. \_\_\_
46. The administration does everything possible to see that we are fairly treated. 46. \_\_\_
47. Some of my colleagues try to avoid their fair share of extra curricular activities. 47. \_\_\_
48. I would not want to take extended sick leave for fear I might not be reinstated. 48. \_\_\_
49. With practically no exceptions, I understand the policies, rules, and regulations under which I work. 49. \_\_\_

A - Agree

U - Undecided

D - Disagree

50. Local pressure groups have too much influence on administrative decisions. 50. \_\_\_
51. The method for determining salary increases is satisfactory. 51. \_\_\_
52. My immediate supervisor lets us know exactly what is expected of us. 52. \_\_\_
53. The students in this college are interested in learning. 53. \_\_\_
54. Some of my colleagues place personal advancement above the welfare of the institution. 54. \_\_\_
55. I'm satisfied with the way our sick leave and benefits program is handled. 55. \_\_\_
56. The administration generally encourages coordination between departments. 56. \_\_\_
57. Filling in this inventory can be a worthwhile way of letting the administration know what faculty members think. 57. \_\_\_

3835 Green Pond Road  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18017  
Telephone 215-865-5351

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.  
President

APPENDIX C

December 26, 1973

Dear Mr. Birkner:

This will acknowledge your letter of December 14. Enclosed you will find the materials you have requested. You have my approval to use the Staff Morale Inventory in your study in any way that seems pertinent. I would appreciate it if you would forward to me a copy of your results.

Sincerely,

  
Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

RCR:rb  
Enc.

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Cohen, Arthur M. and John E. Rouche, Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President, ERIC Clearinghouse of Junior College Information, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Garrison, Roger, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, A Preliminary National Appraisal, Washington, D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Gould John Wesley, The Academic Deanship, Teachers College Press, New York, 1964.
- Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Chicago and London, 1967.
- Townsend, Robert, Up the Organization, Greenwich, Conn., Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1971.
- Weber, Arnold and others, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program, Washington D.C., American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

### Convention and Conference Reports

- Jones, Howard, "College Organization and Administration: Some Faculty Views," pp. 21-23, in Selected Papers, 47th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, February 27-March 3, Washington D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Litton, Maurice L., "Developing and Releasing Faculty Potential," pp. 22-26, in The Dimensions of the Dean's Tasks, Proceedings of the Conference for Newly Appointed Junior College Deans, First Appalachian State College, Boone, North Carolina, August 6-10, 1962 (Florida University, Gainesville; Florida State University, Tallahassee).

Report on the Annual Conference on the Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teaching, 5th, Bennett College, Millbrook, New York, June 12-17, 1967.

Walsh, James P., "Encouraging Constructive Faculty-Administration Relationships," pp. 18-21, in Pauline F. Hunter and S. V. Martorana, Administering the Community College in a Changing World, Papers presented at the Annual Conference on the University Council for Educational Administration, Buffalo, New York, 1966.

Underwood, David L., "College Organization and Administration: Some Faculty Views," pp. 19-20, in Selected Papers, 47th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, February 27-March 3, Washington D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

#### Articles

Blocker, Clyde E. and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Human Relations are Important," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (April, 1964), 19-22.

Brown, M. A., "What Kind of Leaders do Faculty Want?" College Management, VIII (January, 1973), 25-26+.

Brown, Stanley B., and L. Barbara Brown, "A Semantic Differential Approach to the Delineation of Scientific Values Possessed by Professors of Science and Humanities," Journal of Research in Science Teaching, IX, pt. 4 (1972), 345-351.

Canavan, Joseph P., "Compensations and Problems of Junior College Teaching," Junior College Journal, XXXII (May, 1962), 509-516.

Dunn, John W., Peter Jowise, and Ralph Jentile, "Our Faculty Participates in Policy Development," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (December, 1966), 10-13.

Garrison, Roger, "The Teacher's Professional Situation," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 15-18.

Harris, Norman C., "On Being a Consultant," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 9-13.

Hillway, Tyrus, "Evaluating College and University Administrators," Intellect, CI (April, 1973), 426-427.

- Ikenberry, S. O. "Governance and the Faculty," Junior College Journal, XLII (November, 1971), 12-15.
- Kiernan, Irene R., "The New Style in College Administration," Junior College Journal, XXXVIII (September, 1968), 22.23.
- Lahti, Robert E., "A Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (September, 1966), 9-12.
- Lombardi, John, "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 9-14.
- Mognis, Robert F., "The Advisory Council--Experiment in Democratic Cooperation," Junior College Journal, XXXI (July, 1961), 258-260.
- National Education Association, Research Division, "Here's What Junior College Faculties Think," Today's Education, LX (March, 1971), 67-68.
- Niland, William Patrick, "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and Proposal for Resolution," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1964, in Dissertation Abstracts, XXV, 5691-5692.
- Priest, Bill J., "Faculty Administrator Relationships," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1964), 4-8.
- Richardson, Richard C., Jr., "Policy Formulation in the Two-Year College: Renaissance or Revolution?" Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 40-42.
- Richardson, Richard C., Jr., and Clyde E. Blocker, "An Item Factorization of the Faculty Attitude Survey," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXIV (Summer, 1964) 89-93.
- Swenson, Norman G. and Leon Novar, "Chicago City College Teachers Strike," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 19-22.
- Vavoulis, Alexander, "A Faculty Role in Academic Policy Making," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (August, 1964), 32-34.
- Verbeke, Maurice George, "The Junior College Academic Dean's Leadership Behavior as Viewed by Supervisors and Faculty," Abstract reprinted from Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3, 1967.

## Manuals and Other Sources

McCallon, Earl, Telephone conversation regarding a procedure for constructing a semantic differential, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, December 12, 1973.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr., and Clyde E. Blocker, Manual for the Faculty Attitude Survey, Form Z, 1965.

## Unpublished Material

Deloache, Dan Franklin, Attitude and Opinions of Faculty Members and Junior College Presidents Toward Selected Descriptions of the Office of College President, unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1966.

Epler, Stephen M. "Faculty-Administration Relationships --Why the Conflict?" unpublished paper, University of California at Los Angeles, 1966. (ERIC).

Fitzgerald, James Summer, Jr., "Faculty Views of California Public Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1964.

Ladenberger, Peggy, "An Analysis of Self-Actualizing Dimensions of Top and Middle Management Personnel," unpublished dissertation proposal, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, November 4, 1969.

Lipscomb, William P., Jr., "An Analysis of Faculty Attitude In Relation to the Stated Role of Mississippi Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1965.

Niland, William Patrick, "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal for Resolution", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964,

Richardson, Richard C., Jr., "Staff Morale: An Investigation Involving the Developing and Testing of a Differential Morale Attitude Inventory", unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1963.