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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today, more than ever before, educators are becoming aware of the need for developing a theoretical approach to organizational administration. This new movement is an attempt to provide for better interaction between the organization and its administrative structure. Evidence of this movement in physical education is the adoption of administrative theory as a part of the "body of knowledge projects" of the Western Conference of Physical Education Directors and the American Academy of Physical Education.

The late Professor Arthur Daniels of Indiana University in his opening remarks at the second general session of the 1964 meeting of the Western Conference said:

If we are to gain greater recognition in the academic world, we must follow a pathway similar to that traversed by other disciplines. This means a greatly expanded program of scholarly research and development in which the body of knowledge in physical education is defined as nearly as possible in terms of its fundamental nature and its relationships with other disciplines.¹

Whatever the specific reasoning for incorporating

administrative theory into the body of knowledge of physical education, the final value it serves must be determined by the contribution it makes to the organization's effectiveness in attaining its goals. This study was undertaken to analyze the development of administrative theory in related disciplines in order that it might be applied to administration in physical education. Specifically, this study will attempt to identify different methods of administrative leadership that might be evidenced in physical education organizations. As one of the types of evaluative information in the total appraisal program, this interpretation of findings can provide for more complete realization of the inter-relatedness that exists within the organizations surveyed in this study.

Statement of the problem

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the types of administrative leadership which exists within undergraduate physical education departments representing institutions of higher education in Ohio.

In lieu of physical education's concern for administrative theory, this study will attempt to relate theoretical dimensions developed by administrative theorists to physical education organizations. No attempt will be made to develop a new theory, but, instead to suggest that present theories can be adapted.
Among the major questions this study will attempt to answer are these:

1. What type of administrative leadership will result in most effective organizational performance?

2. What is administrative theory?

3. Is administrative theory, as it applies generally to education and specifically to physical education, similar to all organizations?

4. Are there perceptual differences between administrators and members of the faculty with regard to the components of administrative theory in physical education organizations?

5. Can background information regarding physical education administrators and faculty be associated with a particular administrative style, i.e., authoritative or participative?

6. Can the results of this study, when distributed to the participating organizations, enable them to function more effectively?

A concept of administrative theory that is conceived as being closely related to administration in all organizations has been formulated. Research methods to determine the degree to which physical educators understand and demonstrate the application of this theoretical approach to organizational administration have been used. From these, interpretive information concerning present status and future needs for
organizational and leadership effectiveness can be determined.

Basic assumptions

1. Administrative theories can be traced historically. From these, it is possible to assume that administrative theory is "general enough" to be applicable to all organizations.

2. The term "theory" is allusive; however, many writers have conceptualized as to its sociological and psychological implications in relationship to organizational behavior. To this extent, these theories can be identified.

3. Methods of leadership resulting in the most effective organizational performance will reflect "participative group" governance.

4. Physical education administrators are concerned with administrative leadership which will result in the most effective performance. They are aware of many components which constitute administrative theory. They have failed, however, almost without exception, to identify these dimensions into a theoretical perspective.

5. It is possible to identify various administrative leadership styles in physical education departments within institutions of higher education. In addition, various organizational characteristics will be discovered which will relate to a particular administrative style.
Sub-assumptions

A number of sub-assumptions can be made with regard to basic assumption five. They are:

1. Comparative administrative differences exist among physical education organizations.

2. Background information regarding physical education administrators and faculty will be discovered and found to be related to a particular administrative style.

3. The manner in which physical education administrators perceive their organizational and leadership traits will be significantly different from that of the faculty.

4. There will be significant differences between the administrative system now in use and that which administrators and members of the faculty would like to be using.

Definition of terms

The essential terms have been defined in a variety of ways by different authors. For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will be used:

Administration. "The necessary activities of those individuals (executives) in an organization who are charged with ordering, forwarding and facilitating the associated efforts of a group of individuals brought together to realize certain defined purposes."¹

Theory. "A set of assumptions from which a set of empirical laws (principles) may be derived."¹

Administrative theory. An administrative concept, influenced by behavioral scientists, concerned with the behavior of human beings in a social organization. Its chief concern is with "the dynamics of human activity, not the mechanics of organization."²

Organization. A group of people functioning through the concerted efforts of its membership. For the purpose of this study, the organization will be the undergraduate physical education departments in institutions of higher education throughout the state of Ohio.

Faculty. Members of the undergraduate physical education department who teach in the service and/or professional program.

Leadership. "The interpersonal influence, exercised in situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals."³


Leader. "The member of the organization formally charged with responsibility for the organization's accomplishment."¹ This person is designated as the department chairman.

Department chairman. The administrative head of the undergraduate physical education service and professional program.

Limitations of the study

It is the intent of this study to improve the quality of administration in physical education. While it is recognized that an organization is composed of many facets, this study will be concerned only with the departmental chairman's role in a formal setting.

This study will not attempt to develop new theories of organizational behavior. Instead, it will draw from related areas such as business, industrial management, public administration, educational administration, and the behavioral sciences in order to make application to the administration of physical education.

This study is limited to twenty undergraduate physical education departments in institutions of higher education in the state of Ohio.

This study is limited to full time faculty. It does not include graduate assistants. Members of athletic coaching staffs will be considered as full time faculty if a portion of their responsibilities relate to the physical education instructional program.

This study is limited to those departments whose chairman has been at the present administrative position for at least one year prior to this study.

Departments with less than three faculty members will be excluded in order to protect the respondent from being identified by his department chairman.

Significance of the study

Many scientific investigations concerning administrative theory within organizations have been made in the fields of business and industry, public administration, educational administration, and the behavioral sciences. Physical education administrators, however, have been guilty of the "cultural lag" by failing to analyze and make application for these findings.

Today, as physical education administrators are becoming aware of this "void," it is felt an analytical study such as this will have value in filling the "gap" along with the few other investigations in this field which have dared to study administration from a behavioral science orientation rather than the classical, "scientific management"
approach characterized by emphasis on budget, curriculum, equipment and facilities, office organization, professional organizations, publicity and public relations, and staff selection and utilization. While it is recognized that each of the preceding are vital in the operation of the physical education organization, it is felt that the manner in which the administrator relates to his faculty within the organization is equal to the task-oriented process, if not more important.

The developing behavioral science approach to administration offers the physical education administrator an opportunity for theoretical study to determine how to best manage the functioning of his organization.

It is felt the research tool used in this study to measure the manner in which physical education administrators relate their position to meeting the organization's needs will provide information that will be valuable to all administrators in the future. It will enable conclusions to be advanced regarding the type of administrative leadership which appears to result in most effective performance.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize administrative developments throughout the twentieth century which have led to a commonality of administrative behavior applicable to all organizations. Specifically, it is concerned with concepts, theories, research designs, and research findings which enable one to discover, organize, and relate abstract knowledge concerning administrative behavior to the administration of physical education in institutions of higher education.

Studies of administrative organization tend to be grouped at different ends of a continuum. At one end is the traditional framework of job-content, job-structure, and job-relationships—the mechanistic, task-oriented, engineering approach to the problem. At the other end is the human behavioral orientation concerned with the dynamics of the organization, i.e., leadership, motivation, communication, decision-making, goal setting, and control.

In order to appreciate and understand the recent incorporation of administrative theory into the body of knowledge in physical education, the literature in public
administration, business and industrial management, the behavioral sciences, professional education, and physical education has been examined.

The literature is reviewed as it relates to four of the five basic assumptions.

**Basic assumption number 1**

Administrative theories can be traced historically. From these, it is possible to formulate an administrative theory that is "general enough" to be applicable to all organizations.

**Early Administration**

In the late 1800's the term "administration" began to emerge from its parochial meaning in the United States. To set the tone for administrative study during the twentieth century, Woodrow Wilson, professor of history at Bryn Mawr College, wrote an article in which he attempted to distinguish between politics and administration. He said

1. administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although policies set the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices.1

Wilson was greatly concerned that special interest groups might manipulate public officeholders and thus prevent them

---

from serving the general welfare. While Wilson described this article as a "semi-popular introduction to administrative studies,"¹ it, along with subsequent articles, addresses, notes and books, describe with remarkable accuracy essential areas of concern in administration still studied today.

Wilson early recognized the major areas of concern in administration. Leadership, organizational theory, decision-making, delegation of authority, and responsibility are but a few examples. His interest in the relationship of policies and administration, administration and law, formal and informal organization, and the role of public opinion in administration are equally significant.²

---

1900-1925—Period of Efficiency

Most of the writing published early in the twentieth century applied principally to governmental and industrial organizations. Writers such as Frederick Taylor,³ the father of the scientific movement, and Henri Fayol⁴ made scientific analyses of administration in industry. From their analyses evolved principles such as those relating to time-motion, piece-rate, and span of control. Taylor and Fayol stressed

---


institutional processes and concern for production, but tended to ignore human relationships and manifested no concern for the people involved in the administrative process except as components of the man-hour work units. It is of interest to physical educators to note that Taylor first saw the value of analysis of motion, the importance of methodological training, and the worth of time-study while playing tennis in 1881.

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick attempted to develop more precisely Taylor and Fayol's principles of formal organization. Gulick reiterated five of Fayol's elements of administration in answer to what he thought the work of the chief executive (president) of the United States should be. He prepared this list under the acronym, POSDCoRB, to counteract administration and management's losing specific content. His administrative functions were planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.

---

1Ralph E. Jordan, "Love in Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (March, 1968), 382.


In 1913 the National Society for the Study of Education published a yearbook devoted to efficient education. In this publication, Franklin Bobbitt applied Taylor's scientific principles of management to school administration.

Between 1900 and 1925 practically no aspect of American life escaped the application of the principles of scientific management. Its great attractiveness for American industry and public school administration resulted in increased production and greater economy. The image of these structures, however, were characterized as "organizations without people." Thus, this era was to give rise to the human relations era.

1925-1950—Human Relations Era

The sources of revolt against what had become traditional administration and management theory were varied, and there certainly was not unanimous agreement among the revolting factions; however, the human relations movement was initiated in hopes of producing a general point of view.


2Ibid., pp. 7-96.

designed to emphasize as its basis the relationships between people.

Mary Parker Follett was the first exponent of human relations in administration. She contended that "the fundamental problems of any enterprise is the building and maintenance of dynamic, yet harmonious human relationships."\(^1\)

The Hawthorne experiments of the Western Electric Company, initiated in 1923 and concluded in 1932, represented the most significant event of this ideological revolution in organization theory.\(^2\) It had been assumed in industrial administration that wages and physical working conditions were the chief factors in employee motivation and productivity. These experiments were conducted to thoroughly test this assumption. Roethlisberger and Dickson stated their central findings as follows:

It became clear to the investigators that the limits of human collaboration are determined far more by the informal than the formal organization of the plant. Collaboration is not wholly a matter of logical organization. It presupposes social codes, conventions, traditions, and routine or customary ways of responding to situations. Without such basic codes


or conventions, effective work relations are not possible.\textsuperscript{1}

As a result of the Hawthorne experiments, industrial social psychology received major impetus in that informal work groups could affect productivity positively or negatively depending upon the relationship of the informal norms to the goals of the organization.

In 1937 Chester Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, prepared eight lectures for the Lowell Institute in Boston. These lectures, revised and expanded, became *The Functions of the Executive*,\textsuperscript{2} a classic in administrative literature. Barnard expounded on the theory of cooperation and organization and on the functions of executives in formal organizations. His views were the most definitive to this time in the sense that they "sought and achieved a remarkable synthesis of economic and psychosociological views of organization and administration."\textsuperscript{3}

The following summarizes his views:

Organization, simple or complex, is always an impersonal system of coordinated human efforts; always there is purpose as the coordinating and unifying


principle; always there is the indispensable ability to communicate, always the necessity for personal willingness, and for the effectiveness and efficiency in maintaining the integrity of purpose and the continuity of contributions.\(^1\)

Barnard's conceptual scheme of administrative behavior within a social science framework remains as a basis for administrative theorists.

Herbert Simon extended the work of Follett by analyzing some of the psychological and sociological aspects of administration and that of Barnard by developing basis ideas on equilibrium, decision-making, communication, and authority. Simon's book on administrative behavior in 1947 constituted an important landmark on the road to a "science of administration."\(^2\) In a passage introducing the second edition of this book on administrative behavior in 1957, he noted:

I suppose that I might claim some kind of prophetic gift in having incorporated in the title and subtitle three of the most currently fashionable words in social science—"behavior," "decision-making" and "organization."\(^3\)

While Follett, Barnard, and Simon were writing extensively outside the field of education, Arthur B. Moehlman,

\(^{1}\)Barnard, op. cit., pp. 94-95.


\(^{3}\)Ibid., 2nd ed. (1957), p. IX.
professor of educational administration at The University of Michigan, in 1940, devoted one-half of his book, *School Administration*,\(^1\) to a consideration of the school in light of its social environment.

In 1946 the National Society for the Study of Education published a yearbook entitled *Changing Conceptions in Educational Administration*.\(^2\) The writers for the National Society for the Study of Education's 1964 yearbook said, in describing the 1946 edition, "the 1946 yearbook did not point the way to the future; rather, it marked the end of an era in educational administration."\(^3\)

1950–Present—From Practical to Theoretical Analysis

In growing recognition that persons in administrative positions needed to know more about organizational functioning than interpersonal expectations, morale, or group cohesiveness, a new concept, administrative theory, was introduced. Whereas the human relations approach focused on


interpersonal interaction and sentiments in organizational contexts, "the context itself usually was 'assumed' as given in the system and was therefore seldom the subject of inquiry."\(^1\) In this current phase, more attention is given to the distribution of power, leadership behavior, decision-making, communication, and role-behavior—all of which can more appropriately be considered to be properties of the organization than of the membership. "The phrase that has come to dominate the field today, though no more appropriate than those of other periods, is administrative theory."\(^2\)

The first evidence of this multi-disciplinary approach to the study of administration was demonstrated in the writings of Barnard and Simon and given impetus in 1948 when Dwight Waldo published The Administrative State.\(^3\)

The systematic study of educational administration, as a social process, was initiated in 1947 with the establishment of the National Conference for Professors of Educational Administration. In 1950, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration centers, supported by the W. W. Kellogg Foundation, became important mechanisms for encouraging sociologists, psychologists, and others to study

\(^1\) Lane, Corwin, and Monahan, op. cit., p. 20.

\(^2\) Ibid.

administration. In 1956, the University Council for Educational Administration was established and in November, 1957, it sponsored a seminar devoted to the role of theory in educational administration. The seminar was designed to facilitate an exchange of ideas between social scientists and educational administrators. Resulting from the seminar, was the publication, *Administrative Theory in Education*,\(^1\) which included various theories of administration, most of which were borrowed from basic disciplines and adopted to the study of educational administration. This book, along with Coladarci and Getzels' *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration*\(^2\) and Campbell and Gregg's *Administrative Behavior*\(^3\) provided important impetus to the application of the behavioral sciences to educational administration.

In 1962, the University of Alberta initiated a conference to more closely define educational administration within the social science framework. Two years later the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration


\(^3\)Roald P. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (eds.), *Administrative Behavior in Education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).
was established at the University of Oregon for the same purpose. As a result of the Center's initial staff conference, the book, Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences, was written.

In summation of the developmental stages of this new movement, Cullinan observed two different approaches.

In the first approach the production of concepts was largely through some form of inductive reasoning that stemmed from intuitive reasoning and empirical findings about the phenomena studied. . . . Another way of addressing phenomena was through the orderly pursuit of knowledge from theoretical formulations. A large proportion of theorizing in educational administration was based on theories borrowed or adapted from other areas.

A General Administrative Theory

The first article in the initial publication of Administrative Science Quarterly in 1956 was written by Edward Litchfield, who was then Dean of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University. Entitled "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," Litchfield maintained:

The most serious indictment which must be made of present thought is that it has failed to achieve a level of generalization enabling it to systemize

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\]Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Perspectives on Educational Administration, op. cit.

and explain administrative phenomena which occur in related fields. . . . We seem to be saying that there is business administration and hospital administration and public administration; that there is military administration, hotel administration, and school administration. But there is no administration.¹

In addition to Litchfield, there are others who contend that a general theory of administration does exist. Talcott Parsons, Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, developed some ingredients of a general theory of formal organizations. They are: (1) the levels in the hierarchy of control and responsibility in systems of organization, (2) the analysis of external relations of organizations to the situations in which they function, and (3) the variation in the types of organizations. Parsons said:

These three problem areas are closely interdependent. It would not be useful to deal with them entirely independently; it will be necessary to interweave them.²

John Walton, Professor of Educational Administration at Johns Hopkins University, 1959, maintained that "administration is basically the same in all organizations whether they be educational, industrial, governmental, military, or


Chris Argyris, Professor of Industrial Administration at Yale University, said:

It is my hypothesis that the present organizational strategies developed and used by administrators (be they industrial, religious, educational, governmental, or trade unions) lead to human and organizational decay. It is also my hypothesis that this need not be so.

This hypothesis has support from several sources. . . . If we strip away the skin surface properties that we have given to both of them, we will find at their core they are highly similar. . . . Organizations have existed side by side for years.

**Conclusion**

The administrative theory movement in educational administration had its beginning outside the field of education. It was not recognized by educational administrators until the early 1950's. Since that time, due to the influence of the behavioral scientists, administrative theory has become "general enough" to be applicable to all organizations.

**Basic assumption number 2**

The term "theory" is allusive; however, many writers have conceptualized as to its sociological and psychological implications relating to organizational behavior.

---


Need for Theory

Traditionally, educational administrators have been concerned with the technical aspects of organization; with such administrative taxonomies as Gulick's POSDCoRB. It was not until the late 1940's that they became aware of the role of theory and the contribution behavioral scientists can make to a better understanding of educational administration. In 1957, following a seminar sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration, intensified efforts were made to provide theoretical foundations using the behavioral analysis approach. At this seminar, Griffith stated:

An adequate theory must be concerned with the dynamics of human activity, not the mechanics of organization. While administrators must take account of finance, buildings, busses, and the like, these must be considered in their proper perspective; they are of secondary importance in determining how people behave in the educational system.1

Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell stated, with reference to the interaction of administrative theory, research, and practice, that:

... the focus of both scholarly and practical effort in administration must be not so much on techniques and prescriptions as on conceptualizations and theories—not on simple directions to be

followed but on complex relationships to be understood.\textsuperscript{1}

The need for theoretical dimensions in administration is not meant to curtail study in the task-oriented areas. Instead, it is intended to point to the need for a better understanding of the dynamics of human activity. Educational administrators, for too many years, have been "naked empiricists" failing to analyze the theoretical dimensions of organizations as social institutions.

**What is Theory?**

Presently, there is no generally accepted definition or use of the term "theory." Many writers, however, have conceptualized as to the nature of theory. Einstein indicated that theory is an endeavor to understand reality.\textsuperscript{2} Dewey referred to theory as a systematic tool of inquiry.\textsuperscript{3} Mort and Ross state that "theory . . . is the best and most accurate mental picture of how an organism works, taking into consideration and reconciling all pertinent known facts and phenomena."\textsuperscript{4} Brown and Cassidy contend that theory is "used


to mean a systematic statement of facts and principles and the formulation of apparent relationships which have been verified, to some degree."¹

Throughout this study Griffiths' concept of theory will be employed. "A theory is essentially a set of assumptions from which a set of empirical laws (principles) may be derived."²

Theories of Administration

A number of theories of administration have been proposed during the past twenty years. March and Simon have categorized these theories into three groups: (1) theories of conflict, (2) theories of motivation, and (3) theories of decision-making.³ Theories appropriate to each of these categories are reviewed herein and, in addition, three additional groups of theories are proposed and developed.

March and Simon's categorizations

Theories of conflict.—These include role conflict, personality conflict, and role-personality conflict.


²Griffiths, Administrative Theory, loc. cit.

Getzels' theory suggests that administration may be conceived structurally as a hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships whereby behavior is a function of both the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions of a social system. The nomothetic consists of the institution, role, and expectation; the idiographic consists of the individual, his personality, and his need-disposition. A given act is conceived as deriving simultaneously from both the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. Thus, behavior in an organization is a function of a given institutional role defined by the expectations attached to it, and the personality of the particular role incumbent defined by his need-dispositions.

Theories of motivation.—The needs, drives, and motives of individuals are considered in these theories. Bernard first provided a systematic framework for discussing the human motivations that are involved in the "decision to belong." His sub-categories ranged from such tangible incentives as money, things, and physical conditions to the most tangible which he called the "condition of communion," or comradeship, social integration, solidarity, and mutual support in personal attitudes.

2 Cambell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 187.
Simon further elaborated on Barnard's work by discussing what takes place at the organizational boundaries—the nature of the decisions that human beings make to join or to leave the organization. Simon stated:

Individuals are willing to accept organization membership when their activity in the organization contributes, directly or indirectly, to their own personal goals. . . . The members of any organization . . . contribute to the organization in return for inducements that the organization offers. . . . If the sum of the contributions is sufficient, in quantity and kind, to supply the necessary quantity and kinds of inducements, the organization survives and grows; otherwise, it shrinks and ultimately disappears unless an equilibrium is reached.1

McGregor contended that too many business organizations conduct their affairs in accordance with a traditional view of direction and control based on task achievement only, with no real recognition of the importance of satisfying individual needs for self-development and growth.2

Likert contended that if the individual is to be motivated, the organization's objectives must be of significance and "that his own particular task contributes in an indispensable manner to the organization's achievement of its objectives."3

Lonsdale stated that the most particular aspect of maintaining the organization in dynamic equilibrium is by

1Simon, op. cit., pp. 110-111.


satisfying the personal and social needs of the participants. This is done through the integration of task-achievement and needs-satisfaction.\(^1\)

Theories of decision-making.--In these theories man is considered as a rational being with certain limitations. Griffiths' theory of administration centers around decision-making. He stated "the central function of administration is directing and controlling the decision-making process."\(^2\)

In practically any discussion of the process of decision-making, steps similar to the following will be presented and described: (1) Recognize, define, and limit the problem, (2) Analyze and evaluate the problem. (3) Establish criteria or standards by which a solution will be evaluated or judged as acceptable and adequate to the need. (4) Collect data. (5) Formulate and select the preferred solution or solutions. Test them in advance. (6) Put into effect the preferred solution.\(^3\)

In utilizing the preceding procedure, Griffiths discussed six limits within which decision-makers must operate. They are: definition of purpose, criterion of rationality, conditions of employment, lines of formal authority, relevant information provided, and time limits.\(^4\)

---


\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 132-133.

\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 140-143.
Additional theories

In addition to March and Simon's classification of theories, the following are suggested: Presthus' Weberistic bureaucratic model,¹ Katz and Kahn's open-systems theory,² and Likert's theory of interaction-influence on organizational behavior.³

Bureaucracy.—Presthus documented the trend of bureaucratic structure in our society; toward bigness and the ever increasing inclusion of all areas of modern life: society (as a whole), big organizations, and individuals.⁴ Much of his work is predicated on Weber's theory of bureaucracy.⁵

Weber described a bureaucracy as having the following characteristics:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictional areas, regularly ordered by rules, policies, regulations, and by-laws.
2. Principles of office hierarchy and levels of graded authority that ensure a firmly ordered system of super and subordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones.

³Likert, op. cit., pp. 178-191.
⁴Presthus, loc. cit.
3. Management of the modern office is based upon written documents, which are preserved in their original form.

4. The management of the office follows general rules.1

Presthus, reflecting upon the bureaucracy, stated:

Members are expected to be loyal to the organization, to behave consistently and rationally according to technical and professional criteria, and to defer to the authority of the organization's leaders. The social and psychological basis of this accommodation is the major concern of this book.2

Presthus' theory deals largely with the behavior of man within an organizational context and is concerned with conflict and motivation produced within organizations. However, unlike Weber, he discusses man as a rational being.

Open-system theory.—In 1967, two psychologists from the University of Michigan, Katz and Kahn, authored The Social Psychology of Organization.3 The purpose of this writing was partly in effort to provide a more general theoretical system for some of the same issues Likert considered in New Patterns of Management,4 i.e., problems of morale and motivation, productivity and effectiveness, power and control, and leadership and change processes in large

---

1Ibid., pp. 196-198.

2Presthus, op. cit., p. 7.

3Katz and Kahn, op. cit.

4Likert, op. cit.
scale organizations. In their attempt to extend the description and explanation of organizational process, they shifted from an earlier emphasis on traditional concepts of industrial psychology and interpersonal relations to open-system constructs.

Griffiths, in discussing systems theory as a model to investigate the problem of change in organization, stated:

A system is simply defined as a complex of elements in mutual interaction. Systems may be opened or closed. An open system is related to and exchanges matter with its environment, while a closed system is not related to nor does it exchange matter with its environment. Further, a closed system is characterized by an increase in entropy, while open systems tend toward the steady state.¹

Open-system theory is designed to counteract the tendency which has led to a disregard of differing organizational environments and the nature of organizational dependency on environment. Further, it is designed to guard against an overconcentration on principles of internal functioning, with consequent failure to develop and understand the process of feedback which is essential for survival.²

Interaction-influence theory.—In 1961, Rensis Likert, Director, Institute for Social Research and Professor of


Psychology and Sociology, the University of Michigan, concerned with the problems of organizing human resources and activity, proposed a theory of organization based upon management principles and practices of the most effective managers in American business and government. The focus of this theory relates largely to business enterprises. However, by Likert's own admission, "people interested in other kinds of institutions . . . should experience no difficulty in applying the general principles of the theory to their organization."¹

Likert stated his theory as follows:

Every organization is a human enterprise whose success depends upon the coordinated efforts of its members. It has several important characteristics and processes. It has a structure. It has observational and measurement processes. . . . It has communication processes. . . . It has action sources to carry out decisions. . . . It has attitudinal dimensions and motivational characteristics. . . .

These processes are interrelated and interdependent. Their nature is determined by the organizational theory used and the kinds of motivational forces harnessed by the organization. . . .

These interdependent motivations and processes constitute an over-all system which coordinates, integrates, and guides the activities of the organization and all its members. Its quality determines the organization's capacity to achieve effective communication, to make sound decisions, and to motivate, influence, and coordinate the activities of its members. The better the over-all system is and the better it functions, the greater will be the power of the organization. For easy reference,

¹Likert, op. cit., p. v.
this system will be referred to as the interaction-influence system.¹

Likert's theory involves a linking process of supportive relationships whereby the individual, in all interaction and relationships with the organization, in light of his background, values, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.²

Conclusion

This assumption is the result of an attempt to depict the place of theory in the scientific study of administration. Since the scientific study of administration proceeds on several levels, different classification systems were offered as a means of organizing the various administrative theories. From these, one can derive a better understanding of the sociological and psychological implications relating to organizational behavior.

Basic assumption. Number 3

Methods of leadership resulting in the most effective organizational performance will reflect "participative group" governance.

The trend in America, in our schools, homes, and communities, is toward giving the individual greater

¹Ibid., pp. 178-179
²Ibid., p. 103.
freedom and initiative. No longer is our nation's populace willing to accept direct, unexplained orders. We are a nation desirous of participating increasingly in decisions which affect our being.

These fundamental changes in American society create expectations among members of all organizations as to how they should be treated. Expectations profoundly effect one's attitude, since attitudes depend upon the extent to which our experiences meet our expectations. If our experiences fall short of expectations, unfavorable attitudes occur. When our experiences are better than our expectations, we tend to have favorable attitudes. Warren Bennis' *Changing Organizations*\(^1\) approaches the problem of change in organizational behavior. Foremost of his views is the decline of bureaucracy and the rise of democracy. He contends bureaucratic forms of organization are becoming less effective and democratic forms more effective. This form of governance is not permissive or laissez faire, but a system of values which include:

1. Full and free communication, regardless of rank and power.
2. A reliance on consensus, rather than on the more customary forms of coercion or compromise, to manage conflict.
3. The idea that influence is based on technical competence and knowledge rather than on the vagaries of personal whims or prerogatives of power.

4. An atmosphere that permits and even encourages emotional expression as well as task-oriented acts.

5. A basically human bias, one which accepts the inevitability of conflict between the organization and the individual but which is willing to come with and mediate this conflict on rational grounds.¹

In addition to Bennis, many writers, correspondingly, have advanced views regarding this important, difficult, and controversial problem: how to best organize and lead a group of individuals toward achieving desired objectives. Historically, the majority of these were in the direction of a scientific management orientation with the major emphasis on task-oriented processes. These classic organization theories with their machine concepts were concerned almost exclusively with attempting to develop principles of organizational functioning as if production input and methods of processing were the only variables. However, the human parts in the system and the mobilization of their energies in prescribed patterns represents a factor which cannot be ignored.² Thus, this chapter reviews the literature relating to the human factor as it specifically relates to the leader and the group's influence on organizational performance.

¹Ibid., p. 19.
²Katz and Kahn, op. cit., pp. 32-33.
Leadership and Organizational Performance

The concept of leadership has an ambiguous status in organizational practice, as it does in organizational theory. "Leadership is not a familiar, everyday idea, as readily available to common sense as to social science. It is a slippery phenomenon that eludes them both."¹ The concept of leadership among social scientists provides no close agreement on conceptual definition or even on the theoretical significance of leadership processes.² Writers, such as Stogdill,³ Bass,⁴ Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik,⁵ Petrullo and Bass,⁶ Mooney,⁷ Lipham,⁸ Halpin,⁹ and Fiedler,¹⁰

²Katz and Kahn, op. cit., pp. 300-301.
⁵Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik, op. cit.
⁹Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, pp. 81-130.
have acknowledged this unsatisfactory state of affairs and have attempted to interpret these differences by proposing some schema or paradigm which encompasses them. Although these writings represent diverse approaches to the study of leadership, their findings have illuminated the study and practice of leadership in administration.

While numerous leadership dimensions have been identified, i.e., leadership tactics, leadership components, and leadership types, it is felt that a great increase in our understanding of the leadership phenomena will be made if we abandon the notion of leadership as a trait and concentrate upon an analysis of the behavior of leaders in organizations.

**Range of leadership behaviors**

Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik presented a continuum or range of possible leadership behaviors available to a manager. Each type of action is related to the degree of authority used by the boss and to the amount of freedom available to his subordinates in reaching decisions. The continuum ranges from the "boss-centered leadership" with the boss making decisions and analyzing them to the "subordinate-centered leadership" where the manager permits subordinates to function within limits defined by superiors.¹

Likert presented a similar approach to leadership behavior through his "profile of organizational characteristics."¹ The profile is organized as though there are four discrete types of leadership behavior (exploitative authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participative group) which fall at points on the suggested continuum. Using this profile, it is possible to determine the type of leadership behavior evidence within an organizational structure.

In addition to the preceding, the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University developed a Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to measure how specific leaders differ in leadership style, and whether these differences were related significantly to independent criteria of the leader's effectiveness and efficiency.²

Research on leader behavior

Numerous studies indicate that those leaders who involve the group in the governance of the organizations tend to be more effective with respect to productivity, job satisfaction, motivation, turnover, absence, and similar measurements than those where authority is vested at the top.

¹Likert, op. cit., pp. 223-233.

²John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, Leader Behavior Description (Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, 1950).
Researchers at The University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research have conducted numerous studies designed to discover the organizational structure and the principles and methods of leadership which result in the best performance. The general design of most of the studies has been to measure and examine the kinds of leadership and related variables employed by the best units in an organization in contrast to those used by the poorest. These studies involved various business, industrial, and public concerns and today are extending into educational institutions.

Studies comparing high and low producing groups found supervisors behaving differently. These studies found:
(1) Supervisors with best records of performance focus their primary attention on human aspects of their subordinates' problems and are endeavoring to build effective work groups with high performance goals.¹ (2) Supervisors with general rather than close supervision were more often associated with a high rather than a low level of productivity.² (3) Employees in high-productivity sections had no more favorable attitudes toward the company than those in low-producing sections,³ but these employees have less absence.

¹Likert, op. cit., p. 7.
²Ibid., p. 9.
and less turnover. Supervisors who make the men feel free to discuss problems with them have appreciably less absence from their work than do supervisors who display the opposite behavior. Interaction and stimulation from supervisors and peers was necessary to achieve high performance.

Studies performed by Argyris, March and Simon, McGregor, Tannenbaum, Bennis, Likert, and Katz and Kahn


2 Ibid.


5 March and Simon, loc. cit.

6 McGregor, loc. cit.


8 Bennis, op. cit.


10 Katz and Kahn, op. cit.
indicate that leaders who provide experiences which are felt by their subordinates as being supportive and contributing to their sense of personal worth and importance are more effective. Members of organizations want appreciation, recognition, influence, a feeling of accomplishment, and a feeling that people who are important to them believe in them and respect them.¹

Social scientists at The Ohio State University developed and used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to determine how leaders differ in their leadership styles. In short, it was found that, while there were differences in styles, the most successful leaders were the ones who furthered group maintenance and group achievement.²

The pattern of results in the preceding studies suggest a general leadership principle. Likert calls it the "principle of supportive relationships."³ This principle states that the leadership of the organization must be such that each member of the organization views his experience as supportive and one "which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance."⁴ In general, this principle

¹Likert, New Patterns, p. 102.
²Halpin, Theory and Research, pp. 91-96.
³Likert, New Patterns, p. 103.
implies that the supportive leader is sensitive to the needs and feelings of the membership; he respects and trusts the membership; he is receptive to their ideas and suggestions; and he has a sincere interest in the welfare of the membership.

Group Processes and Organizational Performance

Research in organizations is yielding increasing evidence that formal involvement of members through participative governance is resulting in greater productivity and increasing the job satisfactions of its members.¹

Experiments suggest that a high level of production can be achieved in different ways; there need not be just "one best way." Traditional approaches, characterized by control vested at the top, have been effective, "although these methods may have social and psychological consequences that could eventually impede performance." The participative approach, which runs counter to the traditional approach by giving the organization's membership an opportunity to interact-influence (to become formally involved in the exercise of control), is particularly effective in creating an environment that is rewarding psychologically. Furthermore, it is possible that the positive effect on

¹Tannenbaum, Social Psychology, p. 94.
organizational performance of this approach may be more apparent in the long run than in the short.¹

Organizations are faced with the problem of creating for their membership opportunities for obtaining maximum expression and, simultaneously, obtaining maximum satisfaction for the demands of the organization. The pivotal problem is the relationship of the individual and his fulfillment to the demands and constraints of some supra-individual entity. This results in an uneasy balance between individual and organizational needs, between freedom and authority.²

Organizational and group theories are concerned with this duality. Chester Barnard saw the requirements of efficiency (personnel relations) and effectiveness (productivity) as the prime task of the effective manager;³ E. Wight Bakke, the "fusion process";⁴ Harold J. Leavitt, the "pyramids and people";⁵ Chris Argyris, the conflict between the restricted nature of the formal organization and

²Bennis, op. cit., pp. 64-65.
³Barnard, op. cit.
the individual "self-actualization";\(^1\) Jacob W. Getzels, the hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships;\(^2\) and Douglas McGregor, "theory X" and "theory Y" stressing either the organization's or the individual's goals.\(^3\)

Fulfilling, simultaneously, these seemingly incompatible demands, presents administrators with a formidable challenge. "Effective leadership depends primarily on mediating between the individual and the organization in such a manner that both can obtain maximum satisfaction."\(^4\) Likert's "interaction-influence theory"\(^5\) allows both the individual and the organization to obtain satisfaction; the individual because of his participative behavior and the organization because of the increase in productivity.

**Concepts of participative group governance**

The basic concepts of participative group governance involves the administrator's (1) use of the principle of supportive relationships, (2) use of group decision-making, and (3) high performance goals for the organization.

**Principle of supportive relationships.** This principle points to a dimension essential for the success of

\(^1\)Argyris, *Personality and Organization*.

\(^2\)Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process.

\(^3\)McGregor, *loc. cit.*

\(^4\)Bennis, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

every organization; namely, that the mission of the organization be seen by its members as genuinely important and one's own particular task contributing, in an indispensable manner, to the organization's achievement of its objectives.\(^1\)

In support of this, are the famous Hawthorne studies of the 1930's.\(^2\) The most striking result of the original Hawthorne study was the shift from opposition to the objectives of the company to greater acceptance of these objectives when the goals of the informal work groups became consistent with those of the organization.

Work groups which have high peer-group loyalty and common goals appear to be effective in achieving their goals.\(^3\) If, on the other hand, the character of management causes them to reject the objectives of the organization and set goals at variance with these objectives, the goals they establish can have strikingly adverse effects upon productivity.\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 103.

\(^2\)Roethlisberger and Dickson, op. cit., and Elton Mayo, The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1933).


\(^4\)A. Zaleznick, C. R. Christenson, and F. J. Roethlisberger, The Motivation, Productivity, and Satisfac­tion of Workers: A Predictive Study (Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1958).
Group decision-making. Traditional organization structures did not use a group form of organization but, instead, a man-to-man model of interaction, i.e., superior to subordinate. In this model, authority and responsibility is vested at the top. "The entire process—stating policy, issuing orders, checking, controlling, etc.,—involves man-to-man interaction at every hierarchical level."\(^1\)

Participative group governance, in contrast, uses an overlapping form of organization with persons who are members of more than one group linked together throughout the organization. Likert calls this "linking pins."\(^2\) In this model, authority and responsibility are distributed throughout the organization. The interaction and decision-making relies on group participation.

Lewin, and his associates, proposed that those persons who are to be affected by decisions should be more fully involved in the process of defining the problem, developing alternatives, and making the choice.\(^3\) They found in experiments and field studies that many groups (such as teachers) want more opportunity to participate in making decisions that affect their activities. Further, by

---

\(^1\)Likert, Human Organization, p. 50.

\(^2\)Likert, New Patterns, p. 113.

\(^3\)Lewin, "Group Decision,"
allowing groups an opportunity to participate, administra-
tors not only get more cooperation in implementing the choices that are made but also may get better quality decisions.¹

Likert, in a study of 31 geographically selected departments varying in size from 15 to 50 employees, determined the relation of productivity to the average amount of influence actually exercised by various hierarchial levels. The men in the high producing departments, in con-
trast to the men in the low, felt that more influence is exercised at every hierarchial level. They perceived the amount of influence exerted by each level in the organiza-
tion, including theirs, to be greater than did the men in low producing departments.²

High performance aspirations. The third concept influencing organizational effectiveness deals with performance goals. Studies show that employees rather generally want stable employment, job security, opportuni-
ties for promotion, and satisfactory compensation.³

Participative group governance provides mechanisms through group decision-making and multiple-overlapping group structure which enable members of the organization to set

¹Ibid.

²Likert, New Patterns, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

high-level goals to satisfy their own needs.¹

Studies of participative group governance concepts

Numerous studies in support of the three concepts of participative group governance have been conducted to test their effect on organizational performance.

In 1948, Coch and French experimented with the Harwood Corporation in an attempt to reduce existing grievances among its employees and to increase productivity. The results showed that the experimental group, subject to participative group governance, increased in productivity while aggression toward management decreased markedly, turnover dropped to a minimum level, and a sense of identification with the work and the organization increased.²

In 1962, The University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research conducted an experiment with the Weldon Company. Changes in the management systems were made in the direction of participative group governance. The specifics involved in this change are reported in a book edited by Marrow, Bowers, and Seashore.³ In two years, the index of

¹Likert, Human Organization, p. 51.


productivity had increased by 25 per cent.¹

Likert, in his studies, has observed that managers who apply the principle of supportive relationships well and who have high performance goals are more likely to have better sales units than those who display the opposite behavior. Further, when levels of direct, hierarchial pressure for production is high in relation to the amount of individual's supportive behavior, adverse effects are felt by the organization.² Managers with supportive attitude toward their men and who endeavor to build them into well-knit groups obtain an appreciably higher productivity than those who have a threatening attitude and rely on a man-to-man pattern of supervision.³

Cartwright and Zander's editing of Group Dynamics: Research and Theory demonstrated that the greater the loyalty of the members of a group toward the group, the greater is the motivation among the members to achieve the goals of the group, and the greater is the probability that the group will achieve its goals. If the performance goals are low, they will restrict production; if they are high, they will achieve outstanding performance.⁴

¹Likert, Human Organization, p. 37.
²Ibid., pp. 54-55.
³Likert, New Patterns, pp. 119-120.
Conclusion

This assumption has been written in support of participative group governance as it relates to organizational structure and methods of leadership. This can be accomplished by incorporating Likert's interaction-influence theory. The operation of this theory in a model organization would result in the following:

1. Each member loyal to his own work group, to his leader, and to the organization as a whole.
2. Members skilled in their respective roles.
3. Overlapping groups linking the organization together with each member having an influence on the total organization.
4. The values and objectives of the entire organization reflect those of its membership.
5. Members motivated to maximally aid the organization in the accomplishment of its objectives.
6. The membership, especially the leaders, would be sensitive to the reactions and behavior of other members.
7. The communication process of the organization would be efficient.
8. Every member would be able to exert influence on the decisions and actions of the organization.¹

The nearer organizations approach this theoretical ideal, the better will be the communication, decision-making, and motivation processes of the organization,² and, therefore, the more effective the organization will be.

²Ibid., p. 183.
Physical education administrators are concerned with administrative leadership which will result in the most effective performance. They are aware of many concepts which constitute administrative theory. They have failed, however, almost without exception, to identify these dimensions into a theoretical perspective.

Today, physical educators are recognizing the importance of utilizing an inter-disciplinarian approach to the study and practice of administration. Evidence of this is the incorporation of administrative theory into the "body of knowledge" projects of the Western Conference of Physical Education Directors and The American Academy of Physical Education. Unfortunately, physical educators have borrowed these theoretical concepts from the behavioral scientists without a thorough understanding of their operational meanings or consequences. We are, according to Zeigler, to be regarded as "parasites" despite the fact that hundreds of administrative studies are undertaken each academic year.¹ These studies have failed, or neglected, to relate general theoretical propositions basic to administrative theory. Until physical education researchers begin "pure" or "applied" research in this area, they will remain

"floundering in a theoretical cloud" in quest of understanding and direction.

Development of Administrative Thought in Physical Education

Until the academic year of 1966-67, there is little evidence to indicate that physical educators are aware of administrative theory based upon this search of the literature. Spaeth concluded, following an extensive and intensive search of the literature:

There is an almost total lack of theoretical orientation in the design of research and interpretation of the findings in the sample of administrative research in physical education and athletics reviewed in this investigation.¹

Zeigler and Paton concluded:

Up to the present there has been no evidence to indicate that administrators of physical education and/or intercollegiate athletics, either in practice or in administration courses, are concerned with the theoretical aspects of administration.²

Although the concept, administrative theory, does not appear in the literature prior to 1966 labeled as such, it cannot be assumed that such noted authors of organization


and administration textbooks in physical education as Brownell, Bucher, Duncan, Esslinger, Forsythe, French, Howard, Hughes, Masonbrink, Means, Nash, Scott, Vernier, Voltmer, Williams, Zeigler, and others were not concerned with this concept. McGraw contends:

Leaders such as Brownell, Scott, Nash, Forsythe, and Esslinger have postulated propositions to indicate what they considered to be the best organizational structure and operational procedures in administration. The beliefs of these writers may well have been deeply imbedded in their own personal experiences and common sense reasoning, but let us not discard them indiscriminately simply because they do not adhere to criteria set forth by Thompson, Halpin, Griffiths, and the modern administrative theorists.¹

This chapter supports McGraw in questioning Zeigler and Paton's contention that physical educators were not concerned with administrative theory prior to 1966 by analyzing the various eras in the development of administration in physical education.

Early physical education administration

In 1922, Jesse Feiring Williams authored The Organization and Administration of Physical Education² which was the initial effort in the development of administrative thought in physical education. Williams

¹Lynn W. McGraw, "Reactions to Theoretical Propositions and Implications for the Practice of Administration," The Academy Papers, pp. 56-57.

listed its purposes:

- to help set standards, to help state the facts that are scientific and demonstrated, to suggest tests and guides that can be used, and to report favorable progress in this field.¹

The first chapters dealt with principles by which physical educators of that period could be guided in decision-making. Williams' aims for physical education generally and administration specifically were expressed through principles "which should agree fundamentally with the tenets of general theory." In discussing the organization of a department of physical education, Williams stated:

> The president, superintendent, or board of trustees or directors should attempt to arrive at an understanding of what they want the department to mean and contribute to the life of the school.³

Further, he contended that it is "theoretically undesirable if the school principal is to determine the character, extent, and kind of work given without involving the teachers."⁴ This is in accordance with Likert's interaction-influence theory.⁵ This also agrees with Catheryn Seckler-Hudson's "principles or guides of administration"

---

¹Ibid., p. viii.
²Ibid., p. 12.
³Ibid., p. 74.
⁴Ibid., pp. 74-75.
⁵Likert, New Patterns, pp. 178-179.
some of which state:

1. Authority commensurate with responsibility should be delegated and located as close as possible to the point where operations occur and decisions need to be made.
2. Unity of command and purpose should permeate the organization.
3. Effective coordination of all individual and group efforts within the organization should be achieved.1

The writings of Likert and Seckler-Hudson are considered to be instrumental in the development of administrative theory.

In 1931, Williams and Clifford Lee Brownell authored Health and Physical Education for Public School Administrators,2 in which they provide guides and standards for school administrators in determining policies and practices for health and physical education. The authors outlined a plan for the organization of health and physical education departments whereby no administrator would pass judgment over the head of a person responsible for that specific concern.3 One of Seckler-Hudson's "ten commandments of good organization" states that "orders should never be given to subordinates over the head of a responsible executive."4

3Ibid., p. 4.
4Seckler-Hudson, op. cit., pp. 44-54.
In 1932, William Leonard Hughes authored *The Administration of Health and Physical Education for Men in Colleges and Universities* in which he determined and evaluated standards and policies in the administration of health and physical education. In summarizing the implications of his findings, he stated:

There should be a close coordination of campus sanitation, health services, hygiene teaching, required physical education, and athletic activities, by the organization of one administrative unit.\(^1\)

This relates directly to the concept Likert refers to as the "linking pin" pattern of organizational structure.\(^3\)

Hughes, in a subsequent text, lists six principles of administration: central responsibility, division and definition of duties, delegation of authority and responsibility, integrality and adaption, administrative participation, and human welfare.\(^4\) These principles coincide with those established by Hudson, are in agreement with Likert's interaction-influence theory, and relates to

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 164.

\(^3\)Likert, *New Patterns*, pp. 113-115.

Harvey Sherman's "mutable principles of organization."\(^1\) Therefore, Hughes' principles should be considered to be a part of present-day administrative theory.

Spaeth refers to this era of administrative thought as that of the teaching of "principles of administration."\(^2\) It is unfortunate that Zeigler and Paton, reflected by their statement concerning administrative theory in physical education, "... the sad fact is that neither physical education nor intercollegiate athletics as an enterprise within higher education is even remotely aware of this development,"\(^3\) have failed to identify these principles as a part of the administrative theory concept. Accepting Griffiths' definition of theory as "essentially a set of assumptions from which a set of empirical laws (principles) may be derived,"\(^4\) the principles developed by the previously mentioned physical educators should, then, be considered as integral facets of administrative theory even though they were written outside of a theoretical context.

Human relations and democratic administration

The human relations era of administrative thought in physical education began in the 1950's. Closely associated

\(^2\)Spaeth, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
\(^3\)Zeigler and Paton, *loc. cit.*
with this approach was the emphasis on democratic administration. Forsythe and Duncan, with reference to staff leadership, characterize this approach as follows:

In order for leadership to be effective, it must be based upon democratic procedures. Autocratic leadership has no place in physical education in a democratic society. It is necessary to delegate authority and responsibility to various persons, but all staff members should have a voice in determining policies and procedures . . . The administrator . . . should strive to develop democratic leadership that recognizes every staff member as an individual of importance and a valuable member of the team. Every person associated with the department should have a feeling of belonging and be given the opportunity to develop qualities of good leadership.¹

Similar views were expressed in the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation's Developing Democratic Human Relations,² in Kozman's Group Process in Physical Education,³ in Bucher's Administration of School Health and Physical Education Programs,⁴ in Hughes, French, and Lehsten's Administration of Physical Education for


Schools and Colleges, in Howard and Masonbrink's *Administration of Physical Education*, in Williams, Brownell, and Vernier's *The Administration of Health Education and Physical Education*, and in Voltmer and Esslinger's *The Organization and Administration of Physical Education*.

During the human relations and democratic administration era, physical education literature showed evidence of many components of the present administrative theory, i.e., delegation of authority and responsibility, integration and adaptation of vested interest groups, group participation in decision-making, staff motivation, and inter-personal communication. This era, with emphasis on inter-personal interaction and sentiments in organizational contexts, was characteristic of the reaction against the traditional or classical era of administration which neglected the relationship between people in the accomplishment of

---


organizational objectives. The human relations and democratic administration approach tended, however, "to over-emphasize the informal as contrasted with the formal aspects of the organization." ¹

Recognition of administrative theory in physical education

In the 1950's, educational administrators, influenced by the behavioral scientists' efforts in industrial management, began applying socio-psychological tenets to educational administration. Their aim was to provide a better understanding of the interaction between the organization and the administrative structure.

Initial evidence of the need for developing administrative theoretical frameworks in physical education began in the late 1950's. Zeigler, in 1959, stated, "We could use a great deal of research that would contribute to fundamental theory and practice in our field." ² In support of theoretical development, Brown and Cassidy's Theory in Physical Education: A Guide to Program Change identifies four areas of concern in the composition of physical education theory: (1) the scientific philosophical foundations, (2) the program foundations, (3) the program, and (4) the process.

¹ Spaeth, op. cit., p. 16.
Of particular importance to administration is "Part IV: The Process" in which the authors use social science resources in relating to the process of planned change, an area of considerable concern in the present development of administrative thought. The emphasis is on the democratic group process for identifying, planning, and solving problems.\(^1\) The authors conclude the book by stating, "We . . . feel that our accomplishment in attempting to describe program theory in physical education is a progress report. There is yet much to be done."\(^2\) While this book does not, necessarily, relate to administrative theory, it has created an awareness among physical educators of the need for developing and applying theoretical constructs.

Physical educators, recognizing the unprecedented advancement of knowledge, began a movement in the early 1960's toward strengthening the foundations of physical education as an area of research and scholarly effort; a movement toward acceptance as an academic discipline. \(^3\) Quest devoted a monograph to "the nature of a discipline." Numerous articles appeared in physical education publications, notably: Henry's "Physical Education: An Academic .

---

\(^1\)Brown and Cassidy, op. cit., pp. 223-236.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 234.

\(^3\)"The Nature of a Discipline," Quest, Monograph IX (December, 1967).
Discipline,¹ Duncan's "Quo Vadis?,"² Daniels' "Scientific Foundations of Physical Education--Developing Plans and Subject Matter Areas,"³ and Fraleigh's "Toward a Conceptual Model of the Academic Subject Matter of Physical Education as a Discipline."⁴ In addition, various professional organizations began devoting efforts toward defining physical education's body of knowledge. The National Interpretation Conference in 1961 at East Lansing, Michigan, sponsored by the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the National College Physical Education Association for Men, the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, and the Athletic Institute, met for this purpose. In 1962, The American Academy of Physical Education designed a continuing "body of knowledge project" for this purpose. In the same year, the Western Conference of Physical


Education Directors devoted a portion of their meeting to the "discipline." Resulting from the Western Conference's 1965 meeting, five subject matter areas of specialization were considered relevant to physical education's body of knowledge. In 1966, this group chose six specific areas of specialization. These were: (1) Exercise Physiology, (2) Biomechanics, (3) Motor Learning and Sports Psychology, (4) Sociology of Sport Education, (5) History, Philosophy, and Comparative Physical Education and Sport, and (6) Administrative Theory.\(^1\) Zeigler and McCristal, discussing physical education's disciplinary status, stated:

There has been considerable debate as to what these areas (of specialization)\(^2\) are—or should be. For example, it can well be argued that administrative theory is not basic to our discipline—if it is indeed a discipline or whatever it may be named. Conversely, it can be stated that the managing of organizations within our field is becoming so complex that pure and applied research in this developing social science may be unwarranted.\(^3\)

The various ramifications of physical education as an academic discipline, for the purpose of this study, is important only in that administrative theory in physical education is an outgrowth, at least in part, of this scholarly movement.

\(^1\)Zeigler and McCristal, op. cit., p. 82.

\(^2\)Words in parenthesis were added for clarification.

\(^3\)Ibid.
Administrative Theory in Physical Education

During the 1966-67 year at Chicago, San Diego, and Las Vegas, presentations were made concerning whether administrative theory should be "pure" as opposed to "applied" research. A comprehensive assessment of administrative theory was presented at the Western Conference of Physical Education Director's meeting in December, 1966. At the December, 1966, meeting of the National College Physical Education Association for Men, Zeigler and Paton presented a paper, "Administrative Theory as a Basis for Practice in Intercollegiate Athletics." They describe athletics as "big business within big education" with its administrators lacking the academic preparation necessary to provide administrative leadership. In concluding, the authors suggest the following progression for improvement:

1. Establish the best possible criteria as goals for the professional preparation of physical education and athletic administrators.
2. Survey and describe accurately what is taking place in management and training programs in business administration, educational administration, and public administration (and other related fields).
3. Survey and describe accurately current practices regarding the professional preparation of physical education and athletic directors.
4. Make a comparative analysis between the programs in related fields and the programs in physical education and athletics.

---

1Zeigler, "Theoretical Propositions," p. 41.
2Zeigler and Paton, op. cit., pp. 131-139.
3Ibid., p. 133.
5. Provide for continuing administrative research relative to theory and practice. . . .

Further, they suggest that "every effort should be made now to restructure our efforts so that we may offer sound administrative theory as a basis for practice in physical education and athletics." 2

Zeigler, in conjunction with Spaeth and Paton, presented a paper, "Theory and Research in the Administration of Physical Education," 3 at the AAHPER Convention in 1967. The authors traced the development of administrative theory in related disciplines as supporting evidence of the need for a "theory movement" in physical education administration. In their conclusion, they state that if professional preparation for administrative leadership is to progress on an academically sound basis, definite and positive steps must be taken in the very near future. 4 Charts and diagrams are used in support of the steps they recommend for the future. These steps are the same as those reported previously by Zeigler and Paton. 5 They state their main

---

1Ibid., pp. 138-139.
2Ibid., p. 139.
3Earle F. Zeigler, Marcia J. Spaeth, and Garth A. Paton, "Theory and Research in the Administration of Physical Education" (paper read at the AAHPER Convention, Las Vegas, Nevada, March 11, 1967).
4Ibid., p. 16.
5Zeigler and Paton, op. cit., pp. 138-139.
conclusion as follows:…

... every effort should be made now to restructure our efforts so that we may offer sound administrative theory as a basis for practice in physical education and athletics at all levels of our educational system.¹

In 1967, Spaeth completed an investigation designed to "analyze administrative research in physical education and athletics in relation to current approaches to behavioral research in educational administration."² Using a research paradigm developed by Andrew W. Halpin as an organizational framework,³ research studies in physical education and athletic administration from 1940-1966 were analyzed with respect to the paradigm. Noteworthy among Spaeth's conclusions were:

1. The behavioral approach to research in educational administration, as reviewed in this study, is equally relevant to the administration of physical education and athletics. This approach focused on the interaction between people rather than on the technical aspects of administration.

2. There is an almost total lack of theoretical orientation in the design of research and interpretations of the findings in the sample of administration research in physical education and athletics reviewed in this investigation.

3. The administration research in physical education and athletics reviewed in this investigation lacked the methodological rigor necessary

²Spaeth, op. cit., p. 1.
³Halpin, Theory and Research, pp. 42-77.
for contribution to the development of scientific knowledge about administration.  

While Spaeth's investigation is the first doctoral dissertation devoted specifically to administrative theory in physical education, studies done previously by Small,  

2  

Beeman,  

3  

and Burkhart  

4  

relate to present-day concepts of administrative theory. For the purpose of this study, Small's investigation of the working relationships between and among men and women's physical education staffs in selected colleges and universities is particularly significant. Individual staff members responded to questions in the areas of group structure, group feeling, goal direction, participation, productivity, and communication. On the basis of her data, Small drew the following conclusions:

1. Respondents seemed to express their opinions and attitudes as individuals more readily than they did as members of staff groups.
2. Tradition continues to be a prominent factor in the organization of most college physical education departments. The departments or schools they represent, tend to perpetuate

1Spaeth, op. cit., pp. 144-146.


the practice of segregating men and women, making improvement in the mutual understanding difficult.

3. Directors of departments are prone to assume major responsibilities for group action. Staff members and their leaders need more experience in meeting and solving problems as groups.

4. There are no significant differences between staff relationship problems of men and those of women.

5. Improvement in and satisfaction with the work of physical education departments tends to concentrate at the top of the prestige scale and to decrease with each lower position in the academic hierarchy.

6. Failure of men and women to achieve satisfactory working relationships seems to be more to lack of encouragement, opportunity, and guidance, than to unwillingness on the part of the individuals to work together.¹

Since the completion of Spaeth's investigation, Penny recently completed a study designed to analyze the meanings attached to selected concepts in administrative theory and research by practicing administrators in physical education, graduate faculty teaching administration courses in physical education, and professors of educational administration, all within the Big Ten Universities.² Using a form of the Osgood Semantic Differential, Penny concluded that the previously mentioned administrators associate different meanings to the concept typically found in the

¹Small, op. cit. (author's abstract), pp. 2-3.

literature relating to administrative theory and research. In addition to Penny's study, Paton is currently investigating the present status of administrative theory in graduate courses within the field of physical education.

In March, 1968, at the 39th Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Physical Education, Zeigler presented a paper, "Theoretical Propositions for the Administration of Physical Education and Athletics." A similar paper, under the same title, appeared later in The Academy Papers. The author, after tracing the development of administrative theory in physical education, offers characteristics of and sources for administrative theory developed outside of physical education. He concludes by presenting some general and specific propositions that might apply to physical education. While many of these reflect total absurdity, they do point the way for physical education's quest of increasing its body of knowledge through a behavioral science approach to administration.

1Ibid. (author's abstract), p. 2.
3Earle F. Zeigler, "Theoretical Propositions for the Administration of Physical Education and Athletics" (paper read at the 39th Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Physical Education, St. Louis, Missouri, March 28, 1968).
Conclusion

An extensive development of administrative thought relating to organizational administration has taken place during the twentieth century. Specifically, in physical education, these eras have been identified as the era of principles, the human relations and democratic administration era, and the era of administrative theory and scientific research. Throughout each, physical educators have been concerned with the administrative leadership which would result in the most effective performance.

While a "new movement" has permeated the study of physical education, notably, administrative theory, it is presumptuous to offer the contention that physical educators, historically, were not concerned with the theoretical aspects of administration. This is true only in that the term "theory" was not specifically identified.

Proponents of administrative theory are not offering this as a panacea for the solving of all administrative problems. Nor should they, necessarily, be concerned with the development of a theoretical approach for the sake of academic respectability. Instead, this movement is an attempt to provide for better interaction between the organization and its administrative structure.

A review of the literature indicated that physical educators have, prior to 1966-67, neglected to identify administrative writings into a theoretical perspective.
Since physical educators are concerned with the behavioral aspects associated with organizational administration, applied research must be conducted in this area. The potentiality for this is limitless; no longer can they rely on other disciplines to do this for them. Administrative theory is a part of physical education's body of knowledge and depends upon studies such as this to provide for a better understanding of its organizational structure and leadership. This inquiry is dedicated to this task.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the methods and procedures employed throughout this study designed to analyze the administrative leadership in physical education organizations. Primarily, it is concerned with the methodology associated with basic assumption five (administrative leadership styles can be identified on a continuum ranging from authoritative to participative group governance).

Basic assumptions: 1 (administrative theories can be traced historically); 2 (the term "theory" is allusive); 3 (organizational structure and leadership resulting in most effective organizational performance will reflect "participative group" governance); and 4 (physical education administrators are now identifying administrative theory concepts which will provide for more effective organizational structure and leadership) were supported by the literature as indicated in Chapter II.

Six major procedures were employed to test basic assumption five and its sub-assumptions. These were: (1) construction of questionnaires relating to background information for the department chairmen and members of the
faculty, (2) construction of a profile or organizational characteristics, (3) administration of the questionnaires and profiles to a select group, (4) selection of population to be surveyed, (5) administration of questionnaires and profiles to population, and (6) analysis of data by statistical procedures.

**Construction of Background Information Questionnaires**

In order to obtain background information on the department chairmen, the departments which they chair or lead, and the members of the faculty surveyed in this study, questionnaires were constructed (see Appendixes A and B).

The department chairman questionnaire contained items such as: (1) Was your academic preparation geared toward administration?, (2) Age, and (3) Are you responsible for both physical education and athletics? Each item was compared to the results of the profile of organizational characteristics. This, as an example, did, within the limitations of this study, determine whether or not the organizational structure and leadership of a department chairman aged 30-40 differed significantly to one aged 50-60.

The faculty questionnaire contained items such as: (1) professorial rank; (2) highest degree held; and (3) length of time having taught at this institution? Each item was compared to the results of the profile of organizational characteristics. This, as an example, did, within
the limitations of this study, determine whether or not various professorial ranks significantly viewed the organizational structure and leadership differently.

**Construction of Profile of Organizational Characteristics**

Permission was granted by Dr. Rensis Likert and McGraw-Hill Book Company to use a modified version of Appendix II in Likert's *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. The Appendix II profile is, by Likert's admission, an improved version of the original profile published in 1961 in *New Patterns of Management*. "This form can be used to measure the management system of any unit within an organization, as well as that of the total organization."2

**About Likert's profiles**

Likert's profiles have resulted from numerous studies involving high and low producing industrial units. They provide for comparative differences among management systems ranging, on a continuum, from exploitative authoritative to benevolent authoritative to consultative to participative group governance. In addition, such operating characteristics as leadership, motivation, communication, decision-making, goal setting, and control are measured by the profiles.


2Ibid.
The Appendix II profile, consisting of 51 items, resulted from a very high corrected split-half reliability coefficient (Spearman-Brown), namely +.98 on the initial profile.\(^1\) This was attributed, in part to the systems headings which divided the continuum into four groups. It was felt that some respondents reacted to these headings (listed in preceding paragraph) and answered in terms of them, rather than responding to each item in the body of the profile. Also, a second condition, usually called a "response set," may have resulted in the high reliability coefficient since each item in the table had the same general relationship from left to right.\(^2\)

The Appendix II profile omitted all headings. In addition, the order of content was reversed on 23 items selected at random. This new version was administered to three different groups of managers and resulted in split-half, corrected reliabilities of +.90, +.97, and +.99.\(^3\)

Thus, the profile can, according to Likert be used as a reliable instrument to measure the nature of the management system of any organization in which there is at least a minimum level of control or coordination; i.e., it is not laissez-faire in character.\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ibid.  
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 117-118.  
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 122.  
\(^4\)Ibid.
Profile for this study

A modified version of the Appendix II profile was constructed for use in this study. The modifications were made because it was felt that the information desired could be obtained with a reduced number of questions. The thirteen questions and responses for this profile were used by Likert, although the wording differed.

Two profiles, one for the department chairmen and one for the faculty, containing the same organizational variables (although worded differently), were constructed (see Appendixes A and B). This was necessary in order that the organizational variables (stimuli) might be easily interpreted by both the department chairmen and the faculty.

The Department Chairman Profile was completed by the chairman of the undergraduate physical education department (both man and woman, if there were two separate departments); the Faculty Profile by members of the undergraduate physical education faculty. Each indicated the point on a continuum where he perceived the organizational structure and leadership characteristics now (N), where he would like them to be (L), and where they were two years ago (W). Each item was treated as a continuous variable from the extreme at one to that at the other. If a member of the department were not in the organization two or more years ago, they answered as of the present time.
Example:

Is authority commensurate with responsibility?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Administration of Questionnaire and Profile to Select Groups**

Permission was granted by selected members of the School of Physical Education, West Virginia University, to critically analyze the questionnaire and profile. After this was completed, significant changes allowing for clarity in the research instruments were advanced by this writer prior to submittal to the population.

In addition, permission was granted by Dr. Lewis A. Hess, Chairman, Division of Physical Education for Men, Ohio State University, to administer the instruments to the faculty of the Division of Physical Education for Men. This was done for the purpose of establishing the reliability of the instrument.

In order to test for reliability, the split-half method was chosen to test for equivalence. Twenty responses to the Faculty Profile were returned and recorded for each of the thirteen variables on the profile. A mean score for each variable was determined. The profile was divided into halves and correlated. Due to the odd number of variables, a mean score of the even numbered variables (2-12) was used as the fourteenth variable. Using the rank-difference
method, a correlation for the half-test was attained. The Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was then used to produce a reliability coefficient of .82.

Forty-six institutions were invited to participate. Seventeen consented; seventeen responded but either requested not to be involved or were eliminated due to the limitations of the study; and twelve did not respond. It was felt that those not responding and those responding negatively might have felt threatened due to the nature of the research instruments or were simply not interested.

**Selection of Population**

All institutions of higher education in the state of Ohio accredited by North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and containing a physical education department were invited to participate in this study. These institutions were chosen for the population to be surveyed because their physical education departments (1) are represented in large and small colleges and universities, (2) are represented by large and small numbers of faculty, (3) consist of men and women together and others that are separate, and (4) in numbers, are large enough to provide sufficient data.

In requesting permission to involve these institutions, a letter was sent to each physical education department chairman explaining the purpose of the study,
who is to be involved, the measure in which individual and institutional anonymity would be safeguarded, the procedure for distributing the research instruments, and the means for providing each department with an analysis of the findings at the conclusion of the study (see Appendix C).

In addition, the research instruments were included for examination purposes prior to making a decision relative to their participation.

**Administration of Questionnaire and Profile**

An exact number of research instruments for the department chairman and members of the undergraduate physical education department were sent to the department chairman of each participating institution. They were instructed to distribute these to the members of their departments.

Included with each research instrument was a letter explaining the purpose of the study, who is to be involved, instructions for completing and returning the instruments, the measure in which individual and institutional anonymity would be safeguarded, and the procedure for disseminating the findings from the study to the participating departments. In addition, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for the direct return of the instrument.

A follow-up letter was sent to the department chairmen of the participating institutions requesting their
assistance in facilitating the returns of the research instruments sent to their faculty. Since the respondents were to remain anonymous throughout the study, it was not possible to send individual letters. Thus, notices, sent to the department chairmen, were posted at points frequented by the faculty (see Appendixes D and E).

**Statistical Procedures**

Each respondent completed a background information questionnaire and a profile of organizational characteristics. From these, information concerning the administrative leadership of physical education departments in participating institutions of higher education in Ohio was determined.

This information was coded, punched into IBM cards, and computed at the Statistics Laboratory, The Ohio State University.

The statistical procedures used to consider possible significance for the twenty-seven variables taken from the background information questionnaires as they related to each of the responses on the profile of organizational characteristics were:

1. Summary statistics, means and standard deviations, were computed for each variable.

2. A t test was conducted on those variables resulting in two independent mean scores as determined by the faculty's now-responses on the profile, i.e., male versus
female department chairmen.

\[ t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sigma_{\text{Diff.}}} \]

3. An F ratio was conducted on those variables resulting in three or more independent mean scores as determined by the faculties' now-responses on the profile, i.e., length of time department chairmen have been in their administrative positions (1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16 plus years).

\[ F = \frac{X^2_{\text{of variation between groups}}}{X^2_{\text{of variation within groups}}} \]

4. The significant F ratios were analyzed by utilizing the Duncan Multiple Range test. The reason for utilizing this test was to indicate which one or more of the differences among the means were significant.

5. Using Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation, the following computations were conducted to show:
   a. the relationship of the department chairmen's now-responses to their like-responses on the profile.
   b. the relationship of the faculties' now-responses to their like-responses on the profile

\[ ^1 \text{David B. Duncan, "Multiple Range and Multiple F Tests," Biometrics, II (March, 1955), 1-42.} \]
\[ r = \frac{\Sigma XY - \Sigma X \times \Sigma Y}{\sqrt{[\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2] [\Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}} \]

6. Using the chi-square test, the department chairmen's now-responses were compared to the now-responses of the faculties on the profile.

\[ x^2 = \sum \left[ \frac{(F_0 - F_e)^2}{F_e} \right] \]
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Twenty department chairmen and one hundred fifty-eight faculty members, representing twenty physical education departments within seventeen institutions of higher education in Ohio, responded to the background information questionnaire and profile of organizational characteristics. The total return of the completed questionnaires and profiles was 62 percent.

The information resulting from the background information questionnaires was compared to the thirteen questions on the profile of organizational characteristics. The null hypothesis was tested at the .05 level to determine if there were significant differences between each of the background information variables as they relate to the responses on the profiles.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the data from the background information variables as determined by the now-responses of the faculty on the profile (see Appendixes A and B). In addition, the department chairmen's now-responses on the profile are related to their like-responses; the faculty's now-responses are related to
their like-responses; and the department chairmen's now-responses are compared to the now-responses of the faculty.

The data to be analyzed resulted from scores assigned to the spaces on the continuum used by the respondents to indicate the point which best indicated their analyses of the questions to be considered on the profile. The scores ranged continuously from 1 to 20. The following is an example.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |

Only those variables and questions which yielded significant results at the .05 level of significance were reported.

**Analysis of Background Information**

Eighteen variables selected from the background information questionnaires were analyzed separately to determine if there were significant differences among the faculties' now-responses on the profile. Those variables relating to the department chairmen were:

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Did academic preparation consist of administration courses?
4. Did administration courses contain administrative theory?
5. Length of time as department chairman
6. Percentage of time devoted to administration
Those variables relating to the department in general were:

1. Does faculty consist of men and women together?
2. Size of faculty
3. Are physical education and athletics separate?
4. Frequency of staff meetings

Those variables relating to the faculty were:
1. Professorial rank
2. Age
3. Sex
4. Highest degree held
5. Length of time on faculty in this department
6. Are you tenured?
7. Are you a graduate of this institution?
8. In addition to teaching, do you also coach an athletic team?

Age of department chairmen

Departmental chairmen ages 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 plus were analyzed by the faculties on the thirteen questions from the Department Chairman Profile (see Appendix A) to determine if significant differences could be determined with respect to the manner a particular age group administered to their departments.
Table 1 indicates a significant difference at the .05 level between the ages of department chairmen with respect to the responsibility for achieving departmental goals. Duncan's Multiple Range Test, as shown by the vertical line in the table, indicated that department chairmen ages 40-50 differ significantly at the .05 level from the other groups. This age group indicated that the responsibility for achieving departmental goals was shared by personnel at all levels. The remaining groups indicated that the responsibility for achieving departmental goals rested with the department chairman and with most faculty.

It is of interest to note that all department chairmen, irrespective of age, were observed by their faculties as being willing to involve the faculty in the governance of the department.

---

1 All tables containing significant F ratios were analyzed by the Duncan Multiple Range test and designated by the use of vertical lines.

---

TABLE 1
RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVING DEPARTMENT GOALSa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Fratiob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 plus</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39c</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 3 on profile.

bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 3.07.

cThe frequency of responses in group 20-29 was too small to be significant. Thus, they were combined with group 30-39.
It was expected that the older the department chairmen, the more autocratic they would be. This was rejected.

Sex of department chairmen

Male and female department chairmen were analyzed by the faculties to determine if there were significant differences between sexes with regard to the administration of their departments.

**TABLE 2**

**DIRECTION OF INFORMATION FLOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>tb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Question 6 on profile.

^Critical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Table 2 indicates that the direction of information flow is significantly different for departments with female chairmen. Communication in these departments tended to be up, down, and laterally among peers as compared to up and down in departments with male chairmen.

Table 3 indicates female department chairmen have a significantly better understanding of faculty problems, although both groups understand the problems fairly well.
**TABLE 3**

**DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN'S UNDERSTANDING OF FACULTY PROBLEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aQuestion 8 on profile.

^bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Table 4 indicates departments with female chairmen significantly differ with regard to the level in which decisions are formally made. In both groups, however, broad policy decisions were made at the top and more specific decisions at a lower level in the department.

**TABLE 4**

**LEVEL DECISIONS ARE FORMALLY MADE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aQuestion 9 on profile

^bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Table 5 indicates departments with female chairmen significantly differ with regard to the basis for decision-making. Departments with female chairmen based decisions largely on a group pattern which encourages teamwork. Departments with male chairmen based decisions on man-to-man patterns which partially encourage teamwork.
TABLE 5

BASIS FOR DECISION-MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 10 on profile

bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Table 6 indicates departments with female department chairmen differ significantly in the procedure for establishing departmental goals. They do so by means of group participation, whereas the men do so after discussion.

TABLE 6

ESTABLISHING DEPARTMENTAL GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 11 on profile.

bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

The female department chairmen differed from the male chairmen on each question on the profile in the direction of being more participative in the governance of their departments, although only five of the thirteen questions resulted in significant differences. It is of interest to note, however, that both groups involved their faculties in the governance of their departments.
It was expected that female department chairmen would be more participative in their administrative style. This assumption was supported.

**Academic preparation in administration**

The academic preparation of department chairmen regarding administration courses were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed between those chairmen having academic preparation in administration and those who had not had this preparation.

Table 7 indicates department chairmen without academic preparation in administration differ significantly from those whose preparation did contain administration courses with regard to the confidence shown by department chairmen toward their faculties. Both groups, however, demonstrated a substantial amount of confidence in their faculties.

**TABLE 7**

DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN'S CONFIDENCE IN FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preparation</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Question 1 on profile.

<sup>b</sup>Critical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

With the exception of the questions on the profile relating to the confidence the department chairmen have in
their faculties, there was no difference in the administra-
tion of the various departments based upon the academic
preparation of the department chairmen.

It was expected that those chairmen with academic
preparation in administration would be more participative.
This was refuted.

Administrative theory in
administration courses

Departmental chairmen whose administration courses
contained such administrative theoretical concepts as
role-behavior, decision-making, communication, leadership,
power, and authority were analyzed to determine if they
differed significantly from those chairmen whose courses
did not contain administrative theory.

Table 8 indicates department chairmen without a
background in administrative theory differ significantly
from those with this background in regard to the relation-
ship of members of their departments. In both groups, how-
ever, the relationship was cooperative and reasonably
favorable.
. TABLE 8

RELATIONSHIP AMONG MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( t_b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With theory</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without theory</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\({ }^a\)Question 4 on profile.

\({ }^b\)Critical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Table 9 indicates department chairmen without administrative theory in their administration courses differed significantly from those with this preparation with respect to the direction of information flow. In both groups, however, the direction of information flow was both upward and downward.

. TABLE 9

DIRECTION OF INFORMATION FLOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( t_b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With theory</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without theory</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\({ }^a\)Question 6 on profile.

\({ }^b\)Critical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Table 10 indicates department chairmen without academic preparation in administrative theory differed significantly from those with this preparation with respect to the levels in the department where decisions are formally made. In both groups, however, broad policy
decisions were made at the top with more specific decisions made at lower levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With theory</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without theory</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Question 9 on profile  
<sup>b</sup> Critical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

On four of the thirteen questions on the profile, a significant difference was observed between department chairmen without a background in administrative theory and those with this background. There was no difference between these two groups on the remaining questions. The faculties of both groups, however, were involved in the governance of their departments.

It was expected that departments whose chairmen had a background in administrative theory would differ significantly by being more participative. Surprisingly, this was refuted.

Length of time as department chairman

Department chairmen having served 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16 plus years were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the periods of time served as department chairman.
Table 11 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairman with respect to the relationship among members of the department. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen having served 1-5 years differ significantly at the .05 level from the 11-15 and 6-10 year groups. All groups, however, indicated the relationship among members of the department as being cooperative and reasonably favorable.

**TABLE 11**

RELATIONSHIP AMONG MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENTa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratiob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 4 on profile.
bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Table 12 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairman with respect to the relationship between department chairmen and their faculties. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen having served 6-10 years differed significantly at the .05 level from those chairmen having served 11-15 years. The chairmen in the 6-10 year group had only a professional relationship with their faculties while the other groups had a fairly
close social and professional relationship with their faculties.

**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Question 5 on profile.

*b* Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Table 13 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairman with respect to the direction of information flow. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that department chairmen having served 6-10 years differ significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. All groups, however, indicated the direction of information flow was up and down.

**TABLE 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Question 6 on profile.

*b* Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.
Table 14 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairman with respect to the level at which decisions are made. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen having served 6-10 years differ significantly from the other groups. This group made policy decisions at the top while others are made throughout but checked with the top before action is taken. The remaining groups indicated that broad policy decisions were made at the top with more specific decisions made at lower levels in the department.

TABLE 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Question 9 on profile.

*b*Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Table 15 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairman with respect to the basis for decision-making. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated chairmen having served 6-10 years differed significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. All groups, however, based decision-making on both man-to-man
and group patterns which partially encourage teamwork.

TABLE 15
BASIS FOR DECISION-MAKING\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3, 146</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Question 10 on profile.
\(^b\)Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Table 16 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairmen with respect to the frequency ideas are sought and used by the chairmen. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen having served 6-10 years differ significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. This group sometimes seeks and uses ideas of their faculties. The remaining groups usually seek and use ideas of their faculties.

TABLE 16
IDEAS SOUGHT AND USED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3, 145</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Question 7 on profile.
\(^b\)Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.
Table 17 indicates a significant difference between years of service as department chairman with respect to the establishing of departmental goals. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen having served 6-10 years differed significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. All groups, however, established departmental goals after discussion.

**TABLE 17**

**ESTABLISHING DEPARTMENTAL GOALS$^a$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3, 144</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 plus years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Question 11 on profile.

$^b$Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Department chairmen having served from 6-10 years appeared to differ with respect to their administrative style when compared to other periods of service. This style closely resembled an autocratic form.

It was expected that the longer the department chairmen had served in the chairman's position, the more autocratic they would be. This was refuted.
Department chairmen devoting 0-25, 26-50, 51-75, and 76-100 percent of their time to administrative duties were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with regard to the manner in which they administer to their departments.

Table 18 indicates a significant difference between the percentage of time the department chairmen devote to administrative responsibilities and the confidence the chairmen have in their faculties. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen devoting 26-50 percent of their time differed significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. This group had a great deal of confidence in their faculties while the other groups had only a substantial amount.

**TABLE 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.146</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 1 on profile.

bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.
Table 19 indicates a significant difference between the percentage of time the department chairmen devote to administrative responsibilities and the relationship among members of the department. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen devoting 0-25 and 76-100 percent differ significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. Chairmen devoting 51-75 and 26-50 percent differed significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. The 0-25 and 76-100 percent groups had a fairly close social and professional relationship with their faculties while the 51-75 and 26-50 percent groups had a very close social and professional relationship.

### TABLE 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.531</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.541</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.901</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.801</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 4 on profile

bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Table 20 indicates a significant difference between the percentage of time the department chairmen devote to administrative responsibilities and the direction of information flow. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that chairmen devoting 26-50 percent differ significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups. Chairmen devoting 51-75 and 26-50 percent differed significantly at the
.05 level from the remaining groups. The direction of information flow in the 26-50 percent group was up, down, and laterally among peers while in the remaining groups it was up and down.

**TABLE 20**

**DIRECTION OF INFORMATION FLOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Question 6 on profile.

*b* Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.

Table 21 indicates a significant difference between the percentage of time the department chairmen devote to administrative responsibilities and the level of decision-making. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that department chairmen in the 76-100 and 0-25 percent groups differed significantly at the .05 level to the remaining groups. Chairmen in the 51-75 and 25-50 percent groups differed significantly at the .05 level to the remaining groups. All groups, however, indicated that broad policy decisions are made at the top with the more specific decisions made at lower levels.
### TABLE 21

**LEVEL OF DECISION-MAKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question 9 on profile.*

*Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.*

All department chairmen, irrespective of the percentage of time devoted to administration, involved their faculties in the governance of the departments. Department chairmen in the 26-50 percent group appeared to be most participative on each question on the profile, although a significant difference occurred only on four of the thirteen questions.

Mixed faculties compared to separate

Departments consisting of men and women together and those separated by sex were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the manner in which department chairmen administered to their departments.

Table 22 indicates departments with faculties separated by sex differed significantly from those departments where both sexes were together with respect to the
basis for decision-making. In both groups, however, broad policy decisions were made at the top with more specific decisions made at lower levels.

TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aQuestion 10 on profile.

^bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Excepting the question on the profile pertaining to the basis for decision-making, there was no apparent difference between faculties where the sexes are together and those faculties that are separate in terms of the manner department chairmen administer to their departments.

It was expected that faculties with the sexes together might tend to be somewhat autocratic due to the fact that one sex might feel slighted by the department chairmen. This could not be supported.

Size of faculties

Departments with 1-10, 11-20, 21-30, and 31 plus faculty members were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the manner in which department chairmen administer to their departments.
Table 23 indicates a significant difference between the size of the faculty and the frequency department chairmen seek and use ideas of their faculties. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated departments with 21-30 faculty members differed significantly at the .05 level from the remaining groups and departments with 1-10 faculty members differed significantly at the .05 level from departments with 30 plus faculty members.

**TABLE 23**

IDEAS SOUGHT AND USED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 plus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question 7 on profile.*

*Critical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.*

With the exception of the question relating to the frequency department chairmen seek and the use ideas of their faculties, there were no significant differences on any of the questions on the profile as they related to the size of the faculty.

It was expected that the larger faculties would tend to perceive their departments as being autocratically governed. This could not be supported. It would appear as though the larger departments were more participative.
Physical education and athletics: Separate compared to together

Departments in which physical education and athletics are separate and those in which these areas are together were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the manner in which department chairmen administer to their departments.

Table 24 indicates departments where physical education and athletics are together differed significantly from those in which they are separate with regard to the basis for decision-making. In both groups, however, decision-making was based upon both man-to-man and group participation in which teamwork was partially encouraged.

TABLE 24
BASIS FOR DECISION-MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aQuestion 10 on profile
bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

Excepting the question on the profile relating to the basis for decision-making, there were no differences between faculty responses in either type of department with respect to the chairmen's administering to the departments.

It was expected that in departments where physical education and athletics were separated there would be a
tendency for faculty members to view the physical education department chairmen differently. This could not be supported.

**Frequency of staff meetings**

Departments having staff meetings weekly, monthly, once per semester, and once per year were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the manner in which the department chairmen administer to their departments.

There was no significant difference among the faculty responses with respect to the frequency of staff meetings with respect to the questions on the profile.

It was felt that the more frequently staff meetings were conducted, the more participative the faculties' responses to the questions would be. This could not be supported, although all groups reflected a participative form of governance.

**Professorial ranks of faculties**

Faculty members with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the department chairmen's administration of their departments.

Table 25 indicates a significant difference between professorial ranks of faculty members and the frequency
department chairmen seek and use the ideas of their faculty members. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated professors differ significantly at the .05 level from the remaining professorial ranks while assistant professors differed significantly at the .05 level from the instructors. The instructors indicated their department chairmen sometimes sought and used their ideas while the remaining professorial ranks indicated their ideas were usually sought and used.

### TABLE 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aQuestion 7 on profile.*

*bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 2.68.*

With the exception of the questions relating to the frequency department chairmen seek and use ideas of their faculty members, none of the questions on the profile resulted in a significant difference with respect to professorial rank.

It was expected that instructors might tend to consider their departments as being autocratically governed.
This could not be supported as all professorial ranks, excepting the instructors in Table 25, indicated their departments demonstrated a participative form of governance.

**Age of faculty members**

The faculty members were divided into age groups 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 plus and were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed among these groups with respect to the department chairmen's administration of their departments.

Surprisingly, no significant differences were observed between these age groups. It was expected that the younger faculty members would perceive their departments as being autocratically governed. The converse of this occurred in that all age groups reflected a participative form of governance.

**Sex of faculty**

Male and female faculty members were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed between the sexes with regard to the governance of their departments by the department chairmen.

Table 26 indicates female faculty members differed significantly from the males with respect to ascertaining where in the department is the responsibility for achieving department goals. Both groups, however, felt the
responsibility was vested with the department chairman and most faculty.

### TABLE 26

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVING DEPARTMENTAL GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aQuestion 3 on profile.

^bCritical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

The female faculty members differed from the male faculties on twelve of the thirteen questions on the profile in the direction of their department chairmen being more participative in the governance of their departments. It is of interest to note that the mean scores of all faculty members indicated their department chairmen gave them an opportunity to participate in the governance of the respective departments.

It was expected that female faculty members would reflect a more participative style of governance than male faculty members. This was somewhat supported, although the differences were not significant.

Highest degree held by faculty

Faculty members were grouped into those possessing a Doctorate, Masters, and Bachelor's degree and were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be
observed with regard to the governance of their departments.

There were no significant differences between the degrees held by faculty members and their perceptions of departmental governance as determined by the questions on the profile.

All professorial ranks perceived the governance of their departments as being somewhat participative. This was not expected as it was felt that the lesser the degree, the more autocratic would be the perceptions of the governance of the departments.

Length of faculty time on teaching staff.

The faculty members were divided into those having been on the teaching staff 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16 plus years and were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the governance of their departments.

There were no significant differences between these groups as they related to the questions on the profile.

All groups, irrespective of the time they had been on the teaching staff, perceived the governance of their departments as being somewhat participative.

It was expected that those faculty members having taught in the department for a short period of time would reflect an autocratic form of governance. This could not be supported.
Tenured compared to non-tenured faculty

The faculty members were divided into the tenured and the non-tenured and were analyzed to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to the governance of their departments.

No significant difference could be determined between these two groups, although the tenured group reflected a slightly more participative form of governance. All groups, however, reflected a participative form of governance. While it was expected that the tenured faculty would differ from the non-tenured, this could not be supported.

Graduates of institution compared to non-graduates

Faculty members who graduated from the institution in which they are presently teaching were compared with non-graduates to determine if significant differences could be observed with respect to their perceptions of the governance of their departments.

Table 27 indicates non-graduates differed significantly from the graduates with respect to the responsibility for achieving departmental goals. Both groups, however, indicated the responsibility for achieving departmental goals was vested in the department chairmen with most faculty members.
TABLE 27
RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACHIEVING DEPARTMENTAL GOALS\textsuperscript{a}

\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
Variable & n & M & SD & df & t\textsuperscript{b} \\
\hline
Graduates & 64 & 11.50 & 4.39 & 148 & 2.45 \\
Non-graduates & 86 & 13.35 & 4.65 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{a}Question 3 on profile.

\textsuperscript{b}Critical value at .05 level of significance is 1.98.

With the exception of the question relating to the responsibility for achieving departmental goals, there were no significant differences between these two groups as determined by the questions on the profile. Both groups indicated a participative form of governance for each question.

Coaches compared to non-coaches

Faculty members who teach and also coach an athletic team were compared to those who teach only to determine if significant differences could be observed between these two groups as they perceive the governance of the physical education departments.

There were no significant differences between these groups as they related to the questions on the profile. Both groups, however, on all questions perceived the governance of their departments as being somewhat participative. This was not expected as it was felt that the coaches would differ from the non-coaches.
Department Chairman's Now-Responses Related to Like-Responses

A intercorrelation matrix was constructed to show the relationship of the department chairman's now- responses to their like-responses to the thirteen questions on the department chairman profile (see Appendix A). This matrix is shown in Table 28.

The odd numbers (1-25) indicate the department chairman's now-responses to questions 1-13 on the profile, i.e., 1 refers to question 1, 3 refers to question 2, etc. The even numbers (2-26) indicate the department chairman's like-responses to questions 1-13, i.e., 2 refers to question 1, 4 refers to question 2, etc.

Due to the failure of some department chairmen to respond to the like segment of the profile, it was necessary to indicate the number of respondents for each of the twenty-six responses. The odd number now-responses resulted in twenty respondents. Like-responses 2, 4, and 8 resulted in thirteen respondents. Like-responses 6, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, and 26 resulted in twelve subjects. A correlation of .44 is significant at the .05 level for the group of twenty respondents; for the thirteen respondents the .05 level is .55; and for the twelve respondents the .05 level is .58.

From the 169 correlations relating the department chairman's now-responses to their like-responses, there
TABLE 28
INTERCORRELATION MATRIX: DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN'S NOW RESPONSES RELATED TO LIKE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were ten correlations significant at the .05 level. Thus, there was, as expected, only a minimal relationship between where the department chairmen perceived their administration now and where they would like it to be. Figure 1 presents an additional portrayal of this relationship.

Faculties' Now Responses—Related to Like-Responses

A intercorrelation matrix was constructed to show the relationship of the faculties' now-responses to their like-responses to the thirteen questions on the faculty profile (see Appendix B). This matrix is shown in Table 29.

As was the case in Table 28, the odd numbers indicate the now-responses and the even numbers indicate the like-responses.

Due to the failure of some faculty to complete the like response, this resulted in a variation of the number of respondents. One hundred-fifty faculty members responded to the now-responses and one hundred-seven to the like-responses. The .05 level of significance for both groups, however, is .20.

From the 169 correlations relating the faculties' now-responses to their like-responses, there were 94 significant at the .05 level. Thus, there was considerably more of a relationship between the faculties' now-responses to the like-responses than there was with the department
## Operating Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Characteristics</th>
<th>Autocratic Governance</th>
<th>Participative Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where faculty see department now

Where department chairmen see department now

Where faculty would like department to be

Where department chairmen would like department to be

Number of faculty respondents: Now (150) Like (107)

Number of department chairmen respondents: Now (20) Like (12)

**Figure 1.**—Combined Profile.
|   | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 | 1.00 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 2 | .37 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 3 | .52 | .15 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 4 | .21 | .36 | .51 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 5 | .48 | .34 | .51 | .43 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 6 | .10 | .28 | .24 | .44 | .37 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 7 | .49 | .17 | .41 | .28 | .42 | .14 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 8 | .22 | .49 | .23 | .37 | .32 | .44 | .30 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9 | .39 | .21 | .54 | .32 | .46 | .23 | .53 | .09 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|10 | .20 | .21 | .30 | .24 | .32 | .21 | .08 | .56 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|11 | .48 | .08 | .55 | .12 | .47 | .17 | .46 | .19 | .45 | .18 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|12 | .25 | .30 | .23 | .15 | .35 | .35 | .25 | .34 | .22 | .32 | .40 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|13 | .39 | .20 | .64 | .28 | .48 | .13 | .36 | .13 | .54 | .18 | .44 | .24 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|14 | .15 | .24 | .21 | .34 | .30 | .27 | .11 | .14 | .23 | .19 | .03 | .17 | .59 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|15 | .48 | .23 | .66 | .38 | .54 | .24 | .44 | .22 | .64 | .29 | .49 | .23 | .60 | .22 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|16 | .29 | .50 | .26 | .51 | .36 | .42 | .39 | .59 | .26 | .15 | .27 | .39 | .18 | .19 | .40 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|17 | .44 | .33 | .50 | .32 | .57 | .24 | .50 | .24 | .52 | .22 | .54 | .32 | .54 | .18 | .54 | .33 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|18 | .13 | .38 | .13 | .39 | .27 | .52 | .16 | .31 | .07 | .16 | .09 | .30 | .15 | .25 | .07 | .38 | .32 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|19 | .40 | .13 | .50 | .19 | .50 | .14 | .49 | .07 | .54 | .25 | .57 | .23 | .54 | .17 | .56 | .27 | .64 | .14 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|20 | .12 | .26 | .22 | .41 | .25 | .43 | .28 | .29 | .22 | .28 | .15 | .10 | .09 | .18 | .15 | .35 | .19 | .50 | .40 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|21 | .44 | .25 | .49 | .30 | .53 | .26 | .35 | .26 | .41 | .13 | .37 | .29 | .52 | .15 | .60 | .32 | .55 | .21 | .56 | .23 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |    |
|22 | .11 | .37 | .13 | .37 | .35 | .32 | .17 | .35 | .07 | .19 | .06 | .22 | .13 | .23 | .17 | .36 | .20 | .50 | .17 | .51 | .44 | 1.0 |    |    |    |    |
|23 | .35 | .19 | .28 | .32 | .27 | .15 | .52 | .12 | .37 | .16 | .21 | .04 | .25 | .11 | .33 | .28 | .20 | .17 | .29 | .30 | .26 | .23 | 1.0 |    |    |    |
|24 | .06 | .15 | .15 | .24 | .01 | .07 | .14 | .10 | .10 | .07 | .03 | .16 | .26 | .21 | .23 | .33 | .05 | .20 | .11 | .26 | .24 | .35 | .44 | 1.0 |    |    |
|25 | .46 | .16 | .38 | .24 | .29 | .09 | .58 | .16 | .46 | .07 | .36 | .10 | .32 | .03 | .38 | .20 | .36 | .15 | .37 | .21 | .32 | .06 | .64 | .24 | 1.0 |
|26 | .30 | .20 | .24 | .24 | .27 | .34 | .32 | .25 | .25 | .26 | .10 | .30 | .21 | .15 | .23 | .30 | .19 | .28 | .22 | .37 | .20 | .33 | .34 | .43 | .42 | 1.0 |
chairmen. Additional evidence in support of this relationship is shown in Figure 1 which shows the difference between the department chairmen and faculties' nows and likes as being readily observable.

This difference was surprising as it was expected that the department chairmen's difference between the nows and likes would be considerably less than the faculties.

Department Chairmen's Now-Responses Compared to Faculties' Now-Responses

The now-responses of the department chairmen were compared to the faculties' now-responses on the questions on the profile to determine if significant differences could be observed.

The results of the application of the chi-square test to the data concerning these comparisons are shown in Tables 30-42.

The sum of chi-squares indicated the over-all agreement or disagreement between department chairmen and faculty members with respect to each department. The pooled chi-squares indicated the over-all agreement or disagreement without respect to the individual departments. The difference indicated the consistency between the departments.

Table 30 indicates the now-responses of both the department chairmen and the faculty members are agreeable at the .05 level of significance with respect to the
confidence department chairmen have in the faculties. There was not, however, a significant consistency between the various departments. Additional evidence in support of this relationship is shown in Figure 1.

**TABLE 30**

CONFIDENCE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN HAVE IN FACULTIES\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Question 1 on profile.

\(^b\)Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

Tables 31-37 indicate the same agreement as that shown in Table 30.

**TABLE 31**

RELATIONSHIP AMONG MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>93.16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>87.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Question 4 on profile.

\(^b\)Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.
### TABLE 32
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN AND FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>50.56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-aQuestion 5 on profile.
-bCritical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

### TABLE 33
DIRECTION OF INFORMATION FLOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-aQuestion 6 on profile
-bCritical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

### TABLE 34
DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN'S UNDERSTANDING OF FACULTY PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-aQuestion 8 on profile.
-bCritical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.
### TABLE 35

**BASIS FOR DECISION-MAKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Question 10 on profile.

<sup>b</sup>Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

### TABLE 36

**ESTABLISHING DEPARTMENTAL GOALS**<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Question 11 on profile.

<sup>b</sup>Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

### TABLE 37

**EXTENT OF INFORMAL ORGANIZATION PRESENT**<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>52.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Question 13 on profile

<sup>b</sup>Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.
Tables 38 and 39 indicate that there is a minimal agreement at the .05 level of significance between the now-responses of the department chairmen and members of the faculties.

TABLE 38

RELATIONSHIP AMONG MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aQuestion 4 on profile

^bCritical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 39

COVERT RESISTANCE TO DEPARTMENTAL GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aQuestion 12 on profile.

^bCritical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

Tables 40-42 indicate there is no agreement or disagreement between the now-responses of the department chairmen and members of the faculties.
TABLE 40
FREQUENCY DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN DISCUSSES WITH HIS FACULTY IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF THEIR POSITION\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Question 2 on profile.

\textsuperscript{b}Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 41
IDEAS SOUGHT AND USED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Question 7 on profile.

\textsuperscript{b}Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 42
LEVEL DECISIONS ARE FORMALLY MADE\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of chi-squares</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled chi-squares</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Question 9 on profile.

\textsuperscript{b}Critical value is indicated at .05 level of significance.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Physical educators are becoming aware of the need for developing a theoretical approach to organizational administration in order to provide for better interaction within the organization. This behavioral approach is not offered as a panacea for solving all present and future administrative problems nor is it intended to supercede the task-oriented, administrative processes. Instead, it is intended to point to the need for a better understanding of the dynamics of human activity.

A review of the literature in the fields of business and industry, public administration, educational administration, and the behavioral sciences revealed that a vast body of information has been accumulated to describe organizational needs with respect to most effective administrative management. Physical educators, while somewhat lax in the past by failing to apply these findings, are now, based upon administrative theory's inclusion into its body of knowledge, recognizing the benefits to be derived from this interdisciplinary approach.
The primary purpose of this study was to determine the type of administrative leadership which exists within undergraduate physical education departments representing institutions of higher education in Ohio. In addition, in lieu of physical education's rapidly expanding interest in administrative theory, a historical analysis of the development of this theoretical dimension as well as a specific theory reflecting "participative group" governance were included.

Conclusions

The conclusions for this study were based on each of the basic assumptions. Basic assumptions one through four were supported by the review of the literature (Chapter II) and basic assumption five was supported by analyzing the data (Chapter IV).

Basic Assumption 1

Administrative theories can be traced historically. From these it is possible to formulate an administrative theory that is "general enough" to be applicable to all organizations.

The administrative theory movement in educational administration originated outside the field of education. The psychological and sociological aspects of administration were developed by Mary Parker Follett, the first exponent of human relations in administration; by the Hawthorne
studies on informal organization; by Chester Barnard's theory of cooperation and organization for executives in formal organizations; and by Herbert Simon's basic ideas on equilibrium, decision-making, communication, and authority.

Administrative theory was not recognized by educational administrators until the early 1950's. Coladarci and Getzels' *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration*, Halpins' *Administrative Theory in Education*, and Campbell and Gregg's *Administrative Behavior in Education* provided important impetus to the application of the behavioral sciences to educational administration. Since then, a general theory of administration, concerned with the dynamics of human activity within organizations, appears to have become applicable to all organizations.

**Basic Assumption 2**

The term "theory" is allusive; however, many writers have conceptualized as to its sociological and psychological implications relating to organizational behavior.

The term "theory" has many different meanings. Its meanings vary from a literary style of descriptions to a taxonomy to a detailed hypothetico-deductive system. It is impossible to arrive at an absolute conceptualization. Griffith's definition, however, for the purpose of this study, appeared to be most suitable. "A theory is essentially
a set of assumptions from which a set of empirical laws (principles) may be derived."

Administrative theories were identified and grouped into theories of conflict, motivation, decision-making, bureaucracy, open-systems, and interaction-influence. Each of these groups have made it possible for one to derive a better understanding of the sociological and psychological implications relating to organizational behavior.

**Basic Assumption 3**

Methods of leadership resulting in the most effective organizational performance will reflect "participative group" governance.

Today, administrators are greatly concerned as to how to most effectively organize and lead a group of individuals toward achieving desired objectives. Historically, many of the views advanced toward this end reflected a scientific management orientation with the major emphasis on task-oriented processes. These classic organization theories with their machine concepts failed to recognize the importance of the human aspect within the organization and the mobilization of their energies in prescribed patterns. The human factor, as it relates to the leader and group's influence on organizational performance, cannot be ignored.

1Griffiths, "Administration as Decision-Making."
Organizational studies concerned with the problem of creating for their membership opportunities for obtaining maximum expression and, simultaneously, obtaining satisfaction for the demands of the organization reflect a formidable challenge for all administrators. These studies, concerned with this duality, conclusively support Likert's participative-group governance as a part of his interaction-influence theory for organizational operation. The nearer organizations approach this theoretical ideal, the better will be the communication, decision-making, leadership, goal-setting, and motivation processes of the organization, and, therefore, the more effective the organization will likely be.

**Basic Assumption 4**

Physical education administrators are concerned with the administrative leadership which will result in most effective performance. They are aware of many concepts which constitute administrative theory. They have failed, however, almost without exception, to identify these dimensions into a theoretical perspective.

An extensive development of administrative thought relating to organizational administration has occurred during the twentieth century. Specifically, in physical education, this development can be identified as the era of principles, the human relations and democratic
administration era, and the era of administrative theory and scientific research.

The review of the literature indicated that prior to 1966-67 physical educators neglected to identify administrative writings into a theoretical perspective. Their concepts, however, frequently paralleled present views of administrative theorists.

Since physical educators are presently concerned with the behavioral aspects associated with organizational administration, as is evidenced by administrative theory's incorporation into its body of knowledge, applied research must be conducted. The potentiality for this is limitless; no longer can physical educators rely on other disciplines to do this for them.

Basic Assumption 5

It is possible to identify various administrative leadership styles in physical education departments within institutions of higher education. In addition, various organizational characteristics will be discovered which will relate to a particular administrative style.

The findings related to this basic assumption were determined by analyzing background information of department chairmen and faculty members as it related to the profile of organizational characteristics. The following findings are noted:
1. Within the framework of this study, it would appear as though physical education departments in many institutions of higher education in Ohio are administered by chairmen who involve their faculty members in a participative form of governance.

2. Background information concerning department chairmen and their faculty members was discovered and found to be related, almost without exception, to a participative form of governance. The following represents the findings from each of the eighteen variables analyzed by the faculties' now-responses to the questions on the profile:

   **Age of department chairmen.** There was not a significant difference between the ages of department chairmen and their administrative behavior. All ages reflected a participative form of governance.

   **Sex of department chairmen.** Female department chairmen differed significantly from male chairmen by being more participative in the governance of their departments.

   **Department chairmen's academic preparation in administration.** There was not a significant difference in the administrative behavior of department chairmen based upon whether or not their academic preparation emphasized administration courses.

   **Administrative theory in administration courses.** Administrative theory in administration courses did not result in significant differences in the administrative
behavior of department chairmen. Both those with and without this theoretical background reflected a participative form of governance.

**Length of time as department chairmen.** The administrative behavior of department chairmen having served 6-10 years differed significantly from those having served 1-5, 11-15, and 16 plus years. The 6-10 year group resembled an autocratic form of governance while the remaining groups were participative.

**Percentage of time devoted to administration.** The administrative behavior of department chairmen devoting 26-50 percent of their time to administration differed significantly from those spending 0-25, 51-75, and 76-100 percent by reflecting a more participative form of governance.

**Mixed faculties compared to separate.** No significant difference in the administrative behavior of department chairmen whose departments consisted of both sexes and those which were separated by sex was observed. Both faculties reflected a participative form of governance.

**Size of faculties.** No significant difference in the administrative behavior of departments with 1-10, 11-20, 21-30, and 30 plus faculty members was observed, although the larger departments were more participative.

**Physical education and athletics: separate compared to together.** No significant difference was observed in
departments where physical education and athletics were separate and those together. Both reflected a participative form of governance.

**Frequency of staff meetings.** No significant difference in administrative behavior was observed in departments having staff meetings weekly, monthly, once per semester, and once per year. Each reflected a participative form of governance.

**Professorial ranks of faculties.** No significant difference was observed among the professorial ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor regarding the administrative behavior of department chairmen. Each reflected a participative form of governance.

**Age of faculties.** No significant difference was observed among faculties ages 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 plus with regard to the administrative behavior of department chairmen. Each reflected a participative form of governance.

**Sex of faculties.** Female faculties differed from their male counterparts by analyzing the administrative behavior of their department chairmen as being more participative, although the difference was not significant.

**Highest degree held by faculties.** No significant difference was observed in the administrative behavior of department chairmen by faculty members possessing a
doctorate, masters, and bachelor's degree. Each group reflected a participative form of governance.

Length of faculty time on teaching staffs. No significant difference was observed among faculty members having been on the teaching staffs 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16 plus years with regard to the administrative behavior of their department chairmen. Each group reflected a participative form of governance.

Tenured compared to non-tenure faculties. No significant difference could be observed among tenured and non-tenured faculties with regard to the administrative behavior of their department chairmen. Both groups reflected a participative form of governance.

Graduates of institution compared to non-graduates. No significant difference could be observed among graduates of the institution in which they are presently teaching and those having graduated elsewhere with regard to the administrative behavior of their department chairmen. Both groups reflected a participative form of governance.

Coaches compared to non-coaches. No significant difference could be observed among faculty members who also coach an athletic team and those who teach exclusively with regard to the administrative behavior of their department chairmen. Both groups reflected a participative form of governance.
3. Additional analysis of the profile of organizational characteristics resulted in the following conclusions:

There was a significant difference between where the department chairmen perceived their administrative behavior and the functioning of their departments now and where they would have liked it to be. This same statistically significant difference was also observed between the now and like-responses of the faculty, although the difference was not as great among the faculty. Both groups observed the present status as being somewhat participative, but they would like it to be more participative (see Figure 1).

There was a significant agreement between the department chairmen and the faculty members regarding the present status of the administrative behavior of the department chairmen and the functioning of their departments. While computations were not conducted on the like responses of these groups, it would appear, based upon Figure 1, that there might be significant agreement between these responses.

**Recommendations**

In view of the evidence presented in this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Continued investigations regarding the dynamics of human activity within organizations is needed to
determine more conclusively if there is a general administrative theory applicable to all organizations. Also, along these lines, investigations are needed to determine if the application of theoretical concepts to organizations will result in more effective performance.

2. Industrial management studies, such as those conducted by Dr. Rensis Likert and The University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, have resulted in more effective organizational performance. This study was an attempt to use an adapted version of the instruments used by Dr. Likert. Additional in-depth studies such as this are needed in physical education organizations.

3. Physical educators must no longer rely on investigations outside of the field for the substance of an area that has been accepted as an integral part of physical education's body of knowledge. They must eliminate the title of "naked empiricists."

4. Due to the difference between the now and like-responses of the department chairmen and faculty members regarding the administrative behavior of department chairmen and the functioning of their departments, these departments must strive to narrow this gap.

Department chairmen who will objectively analyze the results of this study will make their departments more harmonious and in turn should become more effective.
5. Physical education administrators, based upon this study, should give their faculties extended roles in the governance of their departments.

In view of the findings of this study, it would appear that physical educators interested in conducting research in administration could add much needed knowledge to this area through socio-psychological analyses of administrative behavior.
APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN QUESTIONNAIRE AND PROFILE
Dear Department Chairman:

For the past year I have been studying administrative theory and practice. For my Ph.D. dissertation I am attempting to identify types of organizational structure and leadership practices presently employed in undergraduate physical education departments of institutions of higher education throughout the state of Ohio in order to determine which practice results in most effective organizational performance.

Your institution has consented to participate in this study. Thus, I would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire and profile. In answering the profile, do so as you perceive your leadership as departmental chairman of your undergraduate physical education organization. Note: The chairman is interpreted to mean the administrative head of the undergraduate teacher education and service programs collectively. Throughout the study this person will be referred to as department chairman.

In participating, you have my assurance that all information will be kept strictly confidential. In an attempt to somewhat assure anonymity, the questionnaire and profile will be identified by institution only. In reporting the findings, no mention will be made to the names of individuals or institutions involved.

At the conclusion of the total study, I will send you a copy of the summary of your department's response as well as a summary of the total study.

After completing the research instruments, please return them to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

I am most grateful for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

J. William Douglas
Instructor

jwb
BACKGROUND INFORMATION (DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN)

Institution

1. Administrative title ____________________________________________________

2. College____ School____ Division____ Department____ Other____

3. Name of the above, i.e., Department of Physical Education____

4. Present age____

5. Sex____

6. Was your academic preparation geared toward administration?____
   How many courses in administration did you have?____
   Did these courses involve administrative theory, i.e., role-behavior,
   decision-making, communication, leadership, and power and
   authority?____

7. How long have you held your present administrative position?____

8. Previous administrative positions_____________________________________

9. Is your present administrative responsibility a full time
   position?____ If no, how much time is devoted to administra-
   tive responsibilities per week?____________________________________

10. Number of institutional committees of which you are a member____

11. Number of state, regional, and/or national professional committees
    of which you are a member____

12. Number of professional organizations of which you are a member____

13. Number of civic organizations of which you are a member____

14. Number of professional journals you subscribe to and read
    regularly____

15. Number of research projects in progress____ Number in last
    5 years____

16. Number of professional consulting services during the past year____

17. Number of faculty on your staff when you became department
    chairman____ Number at the present____

18. Does your faculty include men and women?_____ How many men?____
    How many women?_____
19. Number of speeches and/or lectures you have made during the past year outside of your departmental responsibilities

20. Number of publications:
   Before becoming an administrator
   After becoming an administrator

21. Number of student majors in your department when you became chairman
    Number at present

22. Approximate number of students who have received their undergraduate degree in your department during your tenure as department chairman that have since completed a graduate degree in physical education at any institution

23. Number of faculty on your staff:
   Holding doctorate as highest degree
   Holding master's as highest degree
   Holding bachelor's as highest degree
   No degree

24. Total number of faculty

25. Number of faculty holding each professorial rank in your department:
   Professors
   Associate professors
   Assistant professors
   Instructors
   Lecturers

26. Number of faculty that have been in your department 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, 26-30 years, 31+ years

27. Number of faculty holding tenured positions

28. Does your institution grant merit salary increments? If yes, what is the percentage of your faculty that received these increments last year?

29. In addition to your administrative responsibilities, do you continue to teach? Service program? Professional program? Graduate program?

30. Are you subsidized specifically for your administrative duties?

31. Is your administrative position permanent?

32. Are physical education and athletics separate? If no, are you responsible for both programs?

33. Accreditation of your institution: State, Regional, National

34. How frequently does your total instructional staff meet together?
DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN
PROFILE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Instructions:
1. To the right of each question, place the following letters at the point which in your experience, describes your organization:
   - N - Where it is now
   - L - Where you like it to be
   - W - Where it was two years ago

2. If you were not in your present organization two or more years ago, please check here _____ and answer as of the present time.

3. Treat each line as a continuous variable from the extreme at one end to that at the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How much confidence do you have in your faculty?</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 2. Do you discuss with your faculty important aspects of their position? | Seldom | Sometimes | Usually | Almost always |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| 3. Where is the responsibility felt for achieving organizational goals? | Vested totally with department chairman | Department chairman with some faculty | Department chairman with most faculty | Personnel at all levels |

| 4. What is the relationship among members of the organization? | Subservient toward department chairman; hostility toward peers | Subservient toward department chairman; competition among peers | Cooperative and reasonably favorable | Cooperative and favorable throughout |

5. What is the relationship between you and your faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far apart</th>
<th>Professional basis only</th>
<th>Fairly close socially and professionally</th>
<th>Very close socially and professionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. What is the direction of information flow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downward</th>
<th>Mostly downward</th>
<th>Up and down</th>
<th>Up, down, and laterally among peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. How often do you seek and use ideas of your faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. How well do you understand problems of your faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Understand fairly well</th>
<th>Understand very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. At what levels are decisions formally made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All organizational decisions made by department chairman</th>
<th>Policy decisions made at top, others throughout but checked with top before action</th>
<th>Broad policy decisions at top, more specific decisions at lower level</th>
<th>Done throughout but well integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Is decision-making based on man-to-man or group pattern? Does it encourage or discourage teamwork?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man-to-man only; discourages teamwork</th>
<th>Man-to-man almost entirely and group; discourages team work</th>
<th>Both man-to-man and group; partially encourages team work</th>
<th>Based largely on group pattern; encourages teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. **How are organizational goals established?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orders issued</th>
<th>Orders issued; established after discussion</th>
<th>Established by means of group participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **How much covert resistance to organizational goals is present?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong resistance</th>
<th>Moderate resistance</th>
<th>Some resistance</th>
<th>Little or none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **To what extent is informal organization present? Does it support or oppose goals of the formal organization?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present and opposing goals</th>
<th>Usually present and partially resisting goals</th>
<th>May be present, informal and formal organization are one and the same</th>
<th>Informal and may either support or resist goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE AND PROFILE
Dear Colleague:

For the past year I have been studying administrative theory and practice. For my Ph.D. dissertation I am attempting to identify types of organizational structure and leadership practices presently employed in undergraduate physical education departments of institutions of higher education throughout the state of Ohio in order to determine which practice results in most effective organizational performance.

Your institution has consented to participate in this study. Thus, I would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire and profile. In answering the profile, do so as you perceive your undergraduate departmental chairman's leadership of your undergraduate physical education organization. Note: The chairman is interpreted to mean the administrative head of the undergraduate teacher education and service programs collectively. Throughout the study this person will be referred to as department chairman.

In participating, you have my assurance that all information will be kept strictly confidential. In an attempt to somewhat assure anonymity, the questionnaire and profile will be identified by institution only. In reporting the findings, no mention will be made to the names of individuals or institutions involved. Further, it may be of interest to you to know that your individual responses will not be shared with your department chairman.

Do not detach the questionnaire and profile as this is necessary for identification purposes.

At the conclusion of the total study, I will send your department a summary of your department's findings as well as a summary of the total study.

After completing the research instruments, please return them to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

I am most grateful for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

J. William Douglas
Instructor

Encl.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION (FACULTY)

1. Professioal rank __________________________
   Institution

2. How is your physical education organization classified?
   College____ School____ Division_____ Department____
   Other____

3. Name of the above, i.e., Department of Physical Education __________________________

4. Age____

5. Sex____

6. Highest degree held __________________________ Date received____

7. How long have you been teaching at this institution?____

8. Do you have tenure?____

9. Does your institution grant merit salary increments?____
   If yes, did you receive a merit salary increment during the past year?____

10. Number of professional organizations of which you are a member____

11. Number of research projects in progress_____ Number in the last two years____

12. Number of publications during the last two years____

13. Are you a graduate of this institution?____ If yes, which degree did you earn?
   Undergraduate____ Masters____ Doctorate____

14. In addition to teaching, are you also involved as an athletic coach?____ If yes, what sports do you coach?
FACULTY
PROFILE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Instructions:
1. To the right of each question, place the following letters at the point which, in your experience, describes your organization:
   N - Where it is now   L - Where you like it to be   W - Where it was two years ago
2. If you were not in your present organization two or more years ago, please check here   and answer as of the present time.
3. Treat each line as a continuous variable from the extreme at one end to that at the other.

1. How much confidence does your department chairman have in his faculty?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Does your department chairman discuss with his faculty important aspects of their position?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Where is the responsibility felt for achieving organizational goals?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vested totally with department chairman</th>
<th>Department chairman with some faculty</th>
<th>Department chairman with most faculty</th>
<th>Personnel at all levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. What is the relationship among members of the organization?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subservient toward department chairman; hostility toward peers</th>
<th>Subservient toward department chairman; competition among peers</th>
<th>Cooperative and reasonably favorable</th>
<th>Cooperative and favorable throughout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. What is the relationship between your department chairman and his faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far apart</th>
<th>Professional basis only</th>
<th>Fairly close socially and professionally</th>
<th>Very close socially and professionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. What is the direction of information flow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downward</th>
<th>Mostly downward</th>
<th>Up and down</th>
<th>Up, down, and laterally among peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. How often are your ideas sought and used by your department chairman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. How well does your department chairman understand problems of his faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Understands fairly well</th>
<th>Understands very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. At what levels are decisions formally made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All organizational decisions made by department chairman</th>
<th>Policy decisions made at top, others throughout but checked with top before action</th>
<th>Broad policy decisions at top, more specific decisions at lower level</th>
<th>Done throughout but well integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Is decision-making based on man-to-man or group pattern? Does it encourage or discourage teamwork?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man-to-man only; discourages teamwork</th>
<th>Man-to-man almost entirely; discourages teamwork</th>
<th>Both man-to-man and group; partially encourages teamwork</th>
<th>Based largely on group pattern; encourages teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strong resistance</td>
<td>Moderate resistance</td>
<td>Some resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How are organizational goals established?</td>
<td>Orders issued</td>
<td>Orders issued</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limited comment</td>
<td>after discussion</td>
<td>means of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much covert resistance to organizational goals is present?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent is informal organization present? Does it support or oppose goals of the formal organization?</td>
<td>Present and opposing goals</td>
<td>Usually present and partially resisting goals</td>
<td>May be present and may either support or resist goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

REQUEST FOR INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION
September 25, 1968

For the past year I have been studying administrative theory and practice. For my Ph.D. dissertation I am attempting to identify types of organizational structure and leadership practices presently employed in undergraduate physical education departments of institutions of higher education throughout the state of Ohio, in order to determine which practice results in most effective organizational performance.

Your institution is invited to participate. This will involve submission of the research instruments to the chairman of the undergraduate physical education departments (both men and women, if such is the case) and to the faculty of the undergraduate physical education department (excluding graduate assistants). Note: The chairman is interpreted to mean the administrative head of the undergraduate teacher education and service programs collectively. Throughout the study this person will be referred to as department chairman.

Empirical evidence in support of my assumptions will be attained from the perceptions as determined by the above two groups.

In order that you might examine the research instruments before making a decision relative to your participation, I am enclosing copies of all materials.

In participating, you and your faculty have my assurance that all information will be kept strictly confidential. In an attempt to secure anonymity, the research instruments will be identified by institutions only. In reporting the findings, no mention will be made to the names of individuals or institutions involved.

At the conclusion of the total study, I will send you a copy of the summary of your department’s response as well as that of all institutions surveyed.

I plan to distribute the materials to the participating schools during the week of October 21. I would be most grateful if your institution would consent to participate. Please inform me of your decision at your earliest convenience. Also, if your institution plans to participate, please complete the attached sheet in order that I can send the exact number of research instruments.

Very sincerely yours,

J. William Douglas
Instructor
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP ON RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS
November 12, 1968

Dear Department Chairman:

This letter is written as a follow-up to you and your faculty receiving the research instruments for my study during the week of October 28.

I am pleased to have your institution participating in this study designed to identify organizational structure and leadership practice presently employed in physical education departments in Ohio's institution of higher education. However, if the study is to be successful, it necessitates a maximum return of the research instruments.

As of Friday, November 8, the following is an analysis of your institution's response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chairman</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Sent</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since I cannot identify the respondents, I am asking you to assist me in facilitating the returns. Please post the enclosed reminders at the faculty mail box, bulletin board, or any other central point frequented by your faculty. Your assistance will be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

J. William Douglas
Instructor

JWD: jh
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP NOTICE
TO: Faculty

FROM: J. William Douglas

Instructor - Department of Physical Education
The Ohio State University

WHAT: Reminder to return research instruments

Please complete and return the research instruments you received during the week of October 23 to me at your very earliest convenience.

The success of my study "hinges" upon your willingness to cooperate.

Looking forward to receiving your response soon, I remain

Sincerely,

J. William Douglas
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