DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 068 HE 001 714

AUTHOR	Lane, Frederick S.
TITLE	A Study in Role Conflict: The Departmental Chairman in Decisions on Academic Tenure.
INSTITUTION	Florida Univ., Gainesville.
PUB DATE	67
NOTE	81p.; Studies in Public Administration No. 29
AVAILABLE FROM	Available from Director, Public Administration Clearing Service, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.15
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Freedom, *Administrative Personnel, Administrator Attitudes, Administrator Role, Attitudes, College Environment, *Conflict Resolution, *Higher Education, *Role Conflict, *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida University

ABSTRACT

This report considers the tenure system and its relation to academic freedom and focuses on Florida and the University of Florida. Role conflicts between faculty and administrators are presented including a discussion of viewpoints over budget allocations. An overview is given of the position or role attributes, status, and functions of the departmental chairman and an examination is undertaken of attitudes toward tenure and the tenure process. The paper concludes with a two part discussion covering: (1) recognition by the chairman about the nature of disagreement over departmental management as related to the tenure process; and (2) an analysis of role conflict resolution in decisions on academic tenure. (AF)

A STUDY IN ROLE CONFLICT:

THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN IN DECISIONS ON ACADEMIC TENURE

By Frederick S. Lane

Public Administration Clearing Service
University of Florida
Studies in Public Administration No. 29
1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the author and not official views of the University of Florida.

FOREWORD

Role analysis has come to be recognized more and more by students of public administration as a useful tool for the study of many kinds of administrative behavior. It is especially useful as a focus and framework for the analysis of administrative decision-making. Large groups of administrators in identical kinds of positions can be subjected to study with respect to identical categories or typologies of significant decisions that occur with regularity. New insights into their behavior under differing conditions and with different background characteristics on their part can thereby be obtained.

No more significant decision for the academic community can be found than that on the awarding of academic tenure, for this is, in essence, the door to a career in higher education in this country. Other rights follow from that of tenure. Tenure, too, is recognized by the American Association of University Professors as central to the exercise of academic freedom by the professor. The initial steps in making the decision on awarding tenure take place within each university or college department, and the department chairman has a central responsibility in initiating this decision, even if he is required to do no more than inform his departmental colleagues that one of their number must be considered for tenure.

Publicly supported state universities, too, are becoming more and more significant with each passing day both as to the magnitude of their monetary requirements and of their expanding enrolments. It seemed appropriate, therefore, to inform the academic community and our general readership of the findings of this study by Frederick S. Lane of the role perceptions of departmental chairmen with respect to the awarding of tenure at a fairly large and growing state university, namely, the University of Florida. Mr. Lane made this study as a master's thesis in the field of public administration in the Department of Political Science of the University of Florida. It has been the policy of the Public Administration Clearing Service to publish

theses and dissertations which are considered to have provided new insights into administration. Mr. Lane takes all responsibility for statements of fact and interpretations.

GLADYS M. KAMMERER
Director, Public Administration Clearing Service

May 1967

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With the increased number, size and complexity of institutions of higher education, greater attention has been focused on their governance as well as other aspects of their operation. Although attributing unique goals and tasks to colleges and universities, students of public administration also view them as "organizations" with administrative processes similar in some aspects to those of hospitals, government agencies, and even businesses. However, it should be recognized that one pervasive characteristic of universities is the high degree of normative commitment by the "professionals" or faculty to their concepts of institutional goals.

The importance of educational institutions to contemporary society presents the general setting in which this study takes place. The impetus for research in this field is the hope of providing more information about the way in which this educational "system" functions and fostering the development of theory in explaining its administrative process. Studies of universities assume additional significance because of the paucity of behavioral research in this field. Indeed, in looking at major American universities, one major writer suggested one of their biggest problems is recognition of what their problems actually are.[1]

The level of university administration investigated in this study is that of the departmental chairman. The central focus of the research has been the administrative process involved in the awarding of academic tenure at a public institution, the University of Florida located in Gainesville, Florida. This study centers around the "role" of the departmental chairman in a university operation because he is the person through whom administrative authority reaches the individual faculty member

---

[1] Neal Gross, "Organizational Lag in American Universities," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXIII (1963), 69.

and because he holds in his hands the procedures for primary and initial consideration of the granting or withholding of tenure to the individual faculty member.

Recent controversy about academic freedom and tenure at Yale University, the University of California at Berkeley, and Rutgers University, as well as the University of Florida, does more than make this subject topical; rather, these examples and many others further stress the need for research and understanding in this field. An awareness of the background and significance of academic tenure is necessary to comprehend administrative behavior in awarding tenure, upon which this study centers. Particularly for those unfamiliar with this process, the remainder of this chapter will highlight the tradition and apparent impact of this concept and practice in this country's institutions of higher learning.

The concepts of academic freedom and academic tenure must be considered together. The argument for tenure is as a safeguard or procedure for assuring a faculty member's academic freedom. The permanent or continuous nature of tenure in most institutions is often compared with the lifetime appointment of certain judges; theoretically this enables both faculty and judge to carry out their functions without threat of interference. The meaning of "academic freedom" and the case for tenure are set forth by Fuchs:

> Academic freedom is that freedom of members of the academic community, assembled in colleges and universities, which underlies the effective performance of their functions of teaching, learning, practice of the arts, and research. The right to academic freedom is recognized in order to enable faculty members and students to carry out their roles . . . the tenure rights of faculty members, which are conferred after a period of probation, bestow economic security as well as forestall restrictions on freedom that might stem from the power to dismiss.[2]

There appear to be three historical foundations for the concept of academic freedom in American universities: first, the intellectual freedom of Greece and the Renaissance; second, the

[2] Ralph F. Fuchs, "Academic Freedom—Its Basic Philosophy, Function and History," *Law and Contemporary Problems*, XXVIII (Summer, 1963), 431.

practices of university autonomy and collective faculty judgments developed in Western Europe; finally, freedoms assured by the Bill of Rights as defined by the courts.[3]

Since its 1940 *Statement of Principles* the American Association of University Professors has continued to have the greatest impact on the interpretation and existence of academic freedom and tenure, if for no other reason than that the *Principles* have been endorsed by major associations of institutions and educators. Also the sanctions behind the *Principles* in the form of censure by the AAUP have brought many institutions to use much of this statement verbatim as part of their by-laws. As for terminating a tenured staff appointment, this is specified to be only for "cause" and "the individual should be fully protected with the proper [procedural] safeguards."[4] The statement also stresses the other side of the picture—the responsibility of the faculty member.

As for the legal status of tenure, courts have proved hesitant to review tenure cases, and little real appreciation for academic freedom and tenure has appeared in judicial decisions. Indeed, "if professors enjoy some security of tenure, they have it for non-legal reasons largely."[5] Professional means of recourse have proved to be the chief reliance of faculty members. Regarding the legal status of academic freedom and tenure, two observations by Murphy should be remembered: first, that controversial academic freedom cases "are almost invariably invoked by or in behalf of some *persona* or *causa non grata*"; second, the academic world must educate the rest of our society to the importance of academic freedom.[6]

---

[3] *Ibid.* For a thorough presentation of the history and tradition of academic freedom, see Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).

[4] Bracketed word added by author.

[5] David Fellman, in William P. Murphy, "Academic Freedom—An Emerging Constitutional Right," *Law and Contemporary Problems*, XXVIII (Summer, 1963), 447.

[6] William P. Murphy, *ibid.*, pp. 448-449. Some public understanding seemed to be prevalent in the New Jersey gubernatorial election of November, 1965.

The arguments for legal standing of academic tenure stress academic freedom as a constitutional right, the contractual rights of the professor as an employee, and due process as an academic procedure. For a professor at a state-supported university who is dismissed in violation of the tenure plan there, Byse advises that the professor involved should argue that since the tenure plan approved by the controlling board as an instrumentality of the state is a form of sub-legislation, which has the force and effect of law, the court should enforce the law by ordering reinstatement of the professor by the board.[7]

Thus, tenure is the device for maintaining academic freedom in an institution of higher education. This is recognized as being essential to an atmosphere conducive to academic excellence. When then may a tenured faculty member's employment be justly terminated? There appear to be three "sanctioned" reasons for removal: (1) cause—which apparently includes both incompetency and moral turpitude; (2) genuine financial exigencies, and (3) changing curriculum.

In looking at the existence of tenure systems, Byse and Joughin surveyed eighty campuses in California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. While they noted that vague and indefinite language surrounds criteria and procedures for acquisition of tenure, the greatest shortcoming was found to be in the termination of a tenured faculty member:

> Termination procedures are clearly the weakest element in the whole tenure picture. Although fifty of the colleges and universities offer some description of procedure, most of the essential safeguards of academic due process have only scattered representation, and some are virtually nonexistent.[8]

Another aspect of the existence of tenure is found in the proportion of faculties which have tenured status; two studies provide some data. Viewing the faculty of three disciplines—chemistry, economics, and English—Marshall found that over half of

---

[7] Clark Byse and Louis Joughin, *Tenure in American Higher Education: Plans, Practices, and the Law* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959).

[8] Clark Byse and Louis Joughin, *op. cit.*, p. 70. Only published work of its type dealing exclusively with tenure.

the faculty members had tenure at their institutions; in chemistry, nearly two-thirds had tenure.[9] Regarding law college faculty, a nation-wide study demonstrated that over 70 percent of law schools had over 70 percent of their faculty on tenure.[10] While the rationale for central university review of tenure decisions rests in part on the financial burden involved and while financial exigencies are a possible basis for terminating a tenured professor's contract, in his recent study Marshall found that number (a ceiling on numbers of faculty on tenure) was an infrequently used limitation on departments.[11]

The most constant argument against the idea of tenure is termed "the mediority argument"—that is, that tenure results in mediocrity or "dead wood" because the faculty member no longer has to worry about his job. In evaluating this contention, Woodburne identifies the problem as being that tenure has been given far too easily and often without careful consideration. Woodburne's analysis was based on conferences with about a half-dozen officials at each of forty-six colleges and universities during a half-year period.[12]

Considering the importance and widespread existence of tenure systems, what are the opinions of university faculties regarding tenure? Several studies confirm the findings of Miller and Wilson that faculty expressed the need for continuing assurances from the administration, almost regardless of tenure, or that sense of faculty security and morale are likely to deteriorate.[13] Moreover, Fuchs notes an unfortunate attitude by many faculty members:

---

[9] Howard D. Marshall, *The Mobility of College Faculties* (New York: Pageant Press, 1964), pp. 101-102.

[10] Association of American Law Schools, *Anatomy of Modern Legal Education* (St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1961), p. 212.

[11] Howard D. Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

[12] Lloyd S. Woodburne, *Faculty Personnel Practices in Higher Education* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950). An important early study; its greatest shortcoming is the lack of presentation of any quantified material.

[13] W. Starr Miller and Kenneth M. Wilson, *Faculty Development Procedures in Small Colleges* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963). The *AAUP Bulletin* regularly describes academic freedom and tenure cases; also listed are censured institutions.

> Indeed, one of the most discouraging aspects of the situation is how many members of the teaching fraternity there are who show little comprehension of or sympathy for the cause, and who, so long as they are not personally affected, will watch with apparent unconcern while one of their colleagues is victimized.[14]

An intensive examination of faculty opinion was conducted by Lazarsfeld and Thielens; they surveyed 2,451 individuals regarding academic freedom and tenure in the post-World War II period. Concerned with "social scientists in a time of crisis," they found that faculty considered tenure overrated, that some who had tenure had been ousted, and that a full range of other pressures are available to make a professor's life "miserable." In addition, they discovered significant evidence of the arbitrary withholding of tenure and promotion as well as arbitrary dismissal. One of the most important conditions uncovered by the able Lazarsfeld team was that those surveyed felt the pressure of the time (the "witch-hunting" of the McCarthy era) and, as a result, often altered or tempered their statements in the classroom and outside. Thereby diminution in the value of academic freedom occurred.[15]

We are now ready to move to the conceptualization for the current study. In evaluating the role of the departmental chairman in the process of awarding tenure, the reasoning behind academic tenure must be kept in mind.

[14] Ralph F. Fuchs, *op. cit.*, p. 448.

[15] Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958).

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The development of organization theory can be seen in the succession of approaches which have evolved. Taylor's scientific management, the "human relations" model, and a variety of more recent approaches constitute the basis for thought and research by the contemporary student of public administration.[1] The current study is a "role analysis" of "the individual in an organizational setting"; it is an examination of the departmental chairman in a university's administrative process.

THE UNIVERSITY AS AN ORGANIZATION

Before considering the conceptualization for this study, it is important to recognize that many university problems are organizational problems—that is, the university is a type of "organization." Several illustrations of the organizational nature of the university will no doubt aid in understanding the current study.

Initially, the university is viewed as a "normative" organization because its organizational control (compliance structure) is normative as opposed to coercive or utilitarian.[2] In the accomplishment of its goals, the university is an organization where professional authority is dominant over bureaucratic authority. Academic freedom and tenure represent concepts which have been institutionalized to guard against the overexertion of bureaucratic authority. Normative institutions, hospitals like universities, are staffed by "committed" individuals who carry out a value-laden task.

---

[1] For an excellent examination of the many approaches to organization theory, see James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, *Organizations* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963).

[2] See Amitai Etzioni, *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), passim.

Along with the growth in size and complexity of universities, there has been a great increase in the number and importance of administrators. This "managerial revolution" in higher education has brought with it a changed style of academic administration. The recruitment of different personnel and the implementation of new techniques are easily observable.[3] Many faculty members have contended that this growth of non-teaching administrators is "choking" the faculty.[4] Others point to the "local" orientation of the administrator who cherishes loyalty and compromise.[5] Use of committees has grown enormously. This clash can be viewed as one between specialists (professors) and generalists (vice presidents, for example). The growing control of the administrator over the working conditions (rank, salary, office space, secretarial help, etc.) of the professor is seen by the faculty member as "illegitimate" authority.[6] This clash is easily observed in the budget process at public institutions. Where a wide range of departments and programs are competing for limited funds, the limitation of the generalist[7] in making sophisticated fiscal decisions is often criticized.

---

[3] Francis E. Rourke and Glenn E. Brooks, "The 'Managerial Revolution' in Higher Education," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, IX (September, 1964), 154-181.

[4] "John Q. Academesis," "A.B. Equals 'Academic Bureaucracy,'" *New York Times Magazine* (October 2, 1958), 10, 63, 64, 66.

[5] Robert Presthus, "University Bosses—The Executive Conquest of Academe," *New Republic*, CCLII (February 20, 1965), 20-24. He stresses that these administrators (and their aspirations) increase an already high amount of tension and conflict on large campuses.

[6] Robert Presthus, *The Organizational Society* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), pp. 237-256. Part of this problem is a conflict in values. For an interesting illustration, see Ralph M. Hower and Charles D. Orth, *Managers and Scientists* (Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1963).

[7] While the generalist in this sense may have a Ph.D., a vice president who did his work in sociology or law can hardly differentiate between proposed projects in medicine and physics. For a discussion of this problem in a different normative agency, see Gladys M. Kammerer, *British and American Child Welfare Services* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962).

Budgets, after all, are simply goals with price tags attached.[8]

It is important to note that much of this scorn is directed toward the higher administrator's nonacademic adjuncts (as, the business office). Thus, a second aspect of these difficulties is the conflict between professionals and instrumentalists. This type of clash has often been written about in organizational literature.[9] The differing importance attached to space utilization surveys readily exemplifies this. Data processing, computers and various other management aids are also indicators of the "managerial revolution."

Another set of difficulties within the university has arisen because it is a multi-purpose organization. While the goals of a university—teaching and research—are generally agreed upon, the balance between the two has posed a controversial question. As a result, some faculty members have called for a change from the supposed "publish or perish" system for promotion and prestige.

A final difficulty which might also provide insight is one of organizational loyalty; basic cleavages exist on almost any campus because the faculty member often cares more about what his peers in his own discipline throughout the nation think of his

---

[8] The question of administrators and authority patterns in higher education is a much-discussed and perplexing one. An interesting recent study was that of the Byrne Report to the Forbes Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of California after the widely publicized Berkeley incident. This report said that the Berkeley episode was inevitable under its particular system of governance. It said this was based on the failure of the Regents to "develop a governmental structure at once acceptable to the governed and suited to the vastly increased complexity of the University." One specific recommendation was that a larger portion of the budget be allocated for salaries to attract and hold executive and administrative talent of high caliber. See Jerome C. Byrne, "Report on the University of California and Recommendations to the Special Committee of the Regents of the University of California," (May 7, 1965). Of interest, this report was never accepted by the Regents, and no action was taken on it. Also see *Los Angeles Times* (May 12, 1965); Section IV, pp. 1-8.

[9] See Victor A. Thompson, *Modern Organization* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

work than what his university's officials think.[10] This apparently dysfunctional situation in a university operation is brought about by the professional or discipline orientation of the faculty member. Faculties, to a significant degree, are discipline-oriented and divided; moreover, there appears to be a split between the disciplines and the professions.[11]

Thus, even this brief examination of a few university problems demonstrates that its administrative process is subject to analysis in a similar manner to that used for other complex organizations and, to some degree, the applicability of findings about the administrative processes of other organizations. The conceptual tool to be used in this study is that of the "role."

ROLE AS A CONCEPT

The use of the "role" as a basic unit in political analysis is well established. The notion of the role provides the link between the individual and the institution. "It lays bare the interrelatedness and inter-dependence of people."[12]

A network of roles can be viewed as a "role system." According to Eulau, this has two corollaries:

> First, some roles are more directly related to each other than are other roles. . . . The existence and degree of their mutual implication is always subject to empirical determination. . . . The notion of role system directs attention to the totality of social behavior. At the same time, it points out the need of specifying the boundaries of the particular system under investigation.
>
> The second corollary of role system implies that a change in one role may have consequences for the actor's other roles, and, therefore, for the relationships in which he is involved by virtue of his roles. (This must not be confused with a change in position . . .)[13]

---

[10] David Reisman, "Alterations in Institutional Attitudes and Behavior," Logan Wilson (ed.) *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1965), pp. 66-73.

[11] John D. Millett, *The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 97-98.

[12] Heinz Eulau, *The Behavioral Persuasion in Politics* (New York: Random House, 1963). pp. 39-40.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

Moreover, Eulau focuses on the expectations which center around an individual in a particular position, plus what the individual actually does. Thus, he looks at the institution, the roles played by an individual, and actual behavior.

Looking at the individual in an organization through the concept of the role, one finds that a particular aspect is that of expectations, the problem of "influence." Presthus provides a good basis for this discussion:

> Complex organizations have an exceptional influence upon individual behavior because they are organized systems of expectation. Their status and authority systems function as patterns of manifest stimuli that reinforce the human tendency to honor majority values. The probability of compliance is increased by the fact that organizational behavior is group behavior of an exceptionally structured kind.[14]

Influence is a subtle and complicated concept. While the definition and means of measurement for this study are in terms of role analysis, to be explained shortly, other literature on "influence" will help provide a background. Oppenheim sees sanctions as the failure of control, and he talks about exercising control. He notes that actual control does not always mean contact:

> People do not normally intend or attempt to embark upon some independent course of action and are then suddenly jolted out of their pleasant illusions by someone else who, more or less forcefully, channels their thoughts and actions into another direction. Most people do what they cannot avoid, and refrain from pursuing, choosing, or even contemplating goals which they know to be unattainable or attainable only at great cost.[15]

Bachrach and Baratz look at decisions and "nondecisions." They observe:

> One person has *influence* over another within a given scope to the extent that the first, without resorting to either a tacit or an overt

---

[14] Robert Presthus, "Toward a Theory of Organizational Behavior," *Educational Administration* (eds.) Walter G. Hack, et al. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965), p. 291.

[15] Felix Oppenheim, "An Analysis of Political Control: Actual and Potential," *Journal of Politics*, XX (August, 1958), 513-534.

threat of severe deprivation, causes the second to change his course of action.[16]

Looking at the many problems of measuring influence, March suggests three approaches. These are: (1) measurement of attributed influence; (2) measurement of opinion change; (3) measurement of influence attempts.[17] In looking at influence in decision making, one must focus on the importance of an individual's anticipation of consequences. In this connection, it appears that the exercise of influence (the "power base") can be either used up or built up.

With this background, the importance of role analysis becomes clearer. As Eulau said, "Role analysis aids in discriminating between norms for behavior and actual performance of a role." He also notes the existence of role conflict in organizations.[18]

Perhaps the best basis for empirical studies in role analysis is the set of concepts and "language" developed by Gross, Mason, and McEachern, and used in their study of school superintendents.[19] They see the central problems of role analysis as being (1) consensus on role definition, both intra- and inter-positional consensus, (2) conformity to role expectations, and (3) role conflict resolution. The conceptual and empirical tools of their research were adapted for this study which is of a much more limited scope.

The role concept is based on several assumptions. These are: (1) behavior is influenced to some degree by the expectations others hold for an individual in a position; (2) a position in the social structure influences social relationships and standards others apply to behavior; (3) human behavior is in part a function

[16] Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, "Decisions and Nondecisions: An Analytical Framework," *American Political Science Review*, LVII (September, 1963), 637.

[17] James G. March, "An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence," *American Political Science Review*, XLIX (June, 1955), 431-451.

[18] Heinz Eulau, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-45.

[19] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964).

of positions an individual occupies and expectations held for incumbents of these positions. Certainly, the literature dealing with "influence" supports these presuppositions.

In terms of conceptualization, then, emphasis is placed on expectations and their congruence or incongruence (role conflict means incongruence). As to expectations, research is concerned with (1) the direction of expectations, (2) the intensity of expectations, and (3) the categorization of roles or sets of roles into relevant groupings. Regarding expectations, additional comment is pertinent. Initially, it is recognized that positions in complex organizations are subject to differing expectations. Second, expectations are not always known—that is, overtly expressed expectations and actually unknown expectations in conflict are often present. There is also the problem of perception; something perceived (and acted on) by an individual may or may not be valid. In addition, perception is needed previous to action or conformity to expectations.

Role conflict and role conflict resolution are to be considered next. Noting that a foreman in industry is caught between conflicting definitions of his role by management and by his subordinates, Seeman states:

> Role conflict here refers to the exposure of the individual in a given position to incompatible behavioral expectations.[20]

Role conflict will result, it can be seen, in either (1) compromise or (2) avoidance behavior. Three types of avoidance behavior are: (1) primacy on moral or legitimacy orientation (Gross notes the need and deals extensively with the legitimacy aspect); (2) primacy on sanctions (deprivational) or an expediency orientation: (3) primacy on neither, but a balance which can be termed a moral-expedient style. It is also generally accepted that satisfaction in a job is related to the perception of role conflict.

Rigorous definitions are needed for systematic research. Listed below are some of the basic definitions used by Gross which this study will also use:

[20] Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," *American Sociological Review*, XVIII (August, 1953), 373.

A *position* is the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships.

An *expectation* is an evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position.

A *role* is a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position.

A *role behavior* is an actual performance of an incumbent of a position which can be referred to an expectation for an incumbent of that position.

A *role attribute* is an actual quality of an incumbent of a position which can be referred to an expectation for an incumbent of that position.

A *sanction* is a role behavior the primary significance of which is gratificational-deprivational.[21]

HYPOTHESES

Thus, as a result of previous studies relating to role analysis, organizational theory and behavior, and higher education, certain hypotheses guided the current research. These were:

Hypothesis Number One: Regarding the assessment of the value of tenure by departmental chairmen, chairmen will assess the value of tenure based on three variables: (1) academic field, (2) reference group membership, and (3) perception of marketplace in the field.

Hypothesis Number Two: Regarding conformity to expectations in the process of awarding tenure, an attitude of ambivalency will result from changing expectations (lessening authority) based on two variables: (1) assessment of the value of tenure, and (2) experience in the new awarding system.

Hypothesis Number Three: Regarding role conflict resolution by the departmental chairman in decision on academic tenure, chairmen conform closest with one of two perceived sets of conflicting expectations depending on two variables: (1) legitimacy —definition of the role of a departmental chairman, and (2) expediency—perceived intensity of expectations (including sanctions).

---

[21] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

RESEARCH TECHNIQUES

The data for this study were collected in two ways. Initially, the substance for chapter three, "The Setting," was collected through interviews with individuals in formal positions of leadership connected with the university and through an analysis of administrative and policy documents plus other material relating to the University of Florida's administrative process. Emphasis was given to interviewing key university administrators, pertinent University Senate committee members, AAUP spokesmen, and those connected with recent controversial tenure cases on campus. These interviews varied from thirty minutes to two hours in length. In the analysis of administrative papers, stress was given to a comparison of the content (thus, to some degree, the intent) of the many documents at the various levels.

The data for chapters four, five, and six were collected by interview. The goal was to interview all University of Florida departmental chairmen. The first problem was defining "departmental chairman." The criterion used for this survey was an individual who functions constitutionally as a chairman in an academic department in which faculty may obtain tenure and in which there is at least one additional full-time faculty member.[22] By this definition, there were 95 departmental chairmen; 89 were interviewed. Table 1 shows the distribution of chairmen by college and the distribution of those interviewed.

---

[22] This proved to be a difficult problem. There exist "chairmen" and "directors" strictly for curriculum or program purposes. One cannot differentiate among these by simply looking in the University Catalog or looking for "chairman" line items in the university budget. Also excluded were agricultural experiment station units not based in Gainesville, Florida. Departments were placed in the college from which their budgets originate. If there were no chairmen in a school or college, the dean or director was interviewed as the "chairman." Three acting chairmen and three assistant deans, who at the time were also departmental chairmen, were interviewed within the 89. The Mathematics Department budget and functions are in both University College and Arts and Sciences; for categorization purposes of this study, as it functions as a single unit, it was placed in Arts and Sciences.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMEN

College	Number of Chairmen	Number of Chairmen Interviewed
University College (first two years, all students)	6	6
Architecture and Fine Arts	4	4
Arts and Sciences	17	17
Business Administration	6	4
Education	7	7
Engineering	10	7
Food and Agricultural Sciences (Institute)	18	18
Health Related Professions	6	6
Journalism and Communications (School)	1	1
Law	1	1
Medicine	12	11
Nursing	1	1
Pharmacy	3	3
Physical Education and Health	3	3
Total	95	89

The next problem was "access" to the departmental chairmen. An introductory letter from the researcher, a graduate student at the institution, was sent to each chairman. It explained that the research project was "being undertaken to view the idea of 'tenure' from the perspective of the departmental chairman" and that this project was to be presented as a thesis. The letter also explained that the researcher would be calling in the near future for an appointment.[23] Generally, departmental chairmen were both interested and willing to be interviewed. In some cases,

[23] A letter from the graduate student-researcher was judged to be better than one from his supervisory committee chairman, department chairman, or high administrative official because of these alternatives possibly producing an interviewee bias (for example, that there was any other purpose for the study than pure research in public administration). For those who were uncertain that this was legitimate research and not a campus newspaper project, assurances were given.

persistence over a three-month period was finally rewarded with the desired interview. Interviewing took place for the most part during October, November, and December, 1965, and in a few instances during January, 1966. Table 2 shows the responses to the request for an appointment to be interviewed.

The length of the interview (determined by the length of the interview schedule) was something of a compromise between what might be desired (eight hours), resources available for interviewing (one individual and about one trimester of his time), and what chairmen were willing to allot (15 minutes). While the interviews ranged from a half-hour to 2½ hours, the vast majority took about one hour.

TABLE 2
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Interviewed:	
Granted Interview	89
Not Interviewed:	
Prefer not; no other reason given	2
Prefer not; suggested that college dean be interviewed because all departments in college use same procedures	1
No time: busy with travel and research; "besides, I don't know much about tenure."	1
No time; poor health, period of hospitalization, limited work schedule	1
Position vacant; between old and new chairman	1
Total	95

The format for the interviews was mostly open-ended, but a structured part was included. Following the first nine interviews (10 percent), the interview schedule was revised. The structured part was eliminated because it proved ineffective and unworkable. Some questions were eliminated, and others were reworded for greater effectiveness. Additional probes played an unimportant part in obtaining satisfactory responses.

In arranging the interview schedule questions, emphasis was placed on the logical or natural order of questions, in order to

facilitate an effective and meaningful interview. This proved to be very useful in discussing different aspects of certain topics; moreover, the free use of probes facilitated adequate responses in addition to a natural give-and-take situation.[24]

Special effort was made to gain unguarded and complete responses in other ways. It was indicated at the beginning of each interview that responses would not be identified with either the individual chairman or his department "at any point during the study" and that "all answers are confidential." This anonymous chairman concept was repeated as needed in different wording. Essential to gaining "rapport" with the chairman was his understanding of the interviewer's acquaintance with the subject. This was often as simple as indicating familiarity with such administrative slang as FTE (full-time teaching equivalent) or OCO (capital outlay funds). Moreover, a question about the budget process near the beginning of the interview session often seemed to provide a certain base of rapport or enthusiasm in communication.[25]

A last problem—that of recording the interviewee's comments—was handled by the interviewer through recording key phrases and, occasionally at critical points, word-for-word statements. Immediately following the interview session, the interviewer reviewed the interview question-by-question and put down the interviewee's comments more fully. It is believed that the faulty memory problem was avoided to a high degree.[26]

In interviewing only one level of positional incumbents in the administrative process, departmental chairmen, the resulting information is based on only intrapositional analysis. There are certain shortcomings in this, for, as Gross pointed out, interpositional consensus, where possible, it usually preferable. This fact about the current study should be remembered because the

---

[24] See Robert K. Merton, Marjorie Fiske, and Patricia Kendall, *The Focused Interview* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956).

[25] For a discussion of these and other problems, see Alexander Heard, "Interviewing Southern Politicians," *American Political Science Review*, XLIV (December, 1950), 886-896.

[26] See Pauline V. Young and Calvin F. Schmid, *Scientific Social Surveys and Research* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956).

research procedure used in behavioral research determines the findings or results of that work.

A final point should be made about the nature of this study. Although this is a study of only one institution, this project is not, it is believed, a "case study" in the traditional sense. Initially in the fall of 1964, there were approximately two hundred publicly-supported four-year institutions of higher education in the United States. Many of these are already quite large or are growing larger. Their problems in many ways resemble those at the University of Florida. Second, considering the lack of investigation of the university administrative process—particularly at the departmental chairman level—this study could provide a basis for a larger, comparative study to which a greater amount of talent and resources might be committed. The idea of examining four multiversities of different make-up would, it seems, be extremely fruitful (particularly a study which emphasizes inter- as well as intra-positional consensus). Finally, the current research provides an additional empirical test and evaluation for the concepts and language of role analysis as a tool for organizational research.

CHAPTER III

THE SETTING

The findings of the current study are based on research at a specific institution. For this reason, it is important that the institutional framework be understood. This chapter presents an analysis of "the setting," a view of Florida and the University of Florida.

ATMOSPHERE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Statements regarding the environment in Florida for higher education represent a wide range of opinion. At all times the complexion of this southern state, with its rapid growth in population and emphasis on agriculture and tourism, should be recognized. State government is in the cabinet form in which all members of the Cabinet seek office independently and all except the Governor succeed himself in office. A single state board governs the entire state university system.

In taking an overview of higher education in Florida, it has been contended by many state office holders that their state's universities are doing "very creditable work" in many respects. Florida has established an extensive junior college system and has taken steps to maintain four-year institutions throughout the state. Universities operate on a trimester plan of year-round activity. Much emphasis has been placed on continuing education and extension activities.

In terms of voter support for higher education, two recent proposals found strong support. The first was a $75 million dollar College Building Bond Amendment approved in November, 1963. A second favorable indication came in November, 1964, when the electorate accepted a proposal to permit legislation to lengthen the terms of members of the seven-member Board of Control for nine years, staggered, set at nine members by the statute. That board's name was changed by statute to the Board of Regents. The 1964 amendment was an attempt to thwart the

efforts of outside pressure groups and of the Governor to use political pressure. Previously, the Board of Control had been limited to the four year constitutional terms of all state offices and appointments had been by the Governor during his four-year term in office. Great turnover in Board members occurred from one administration to another.

Nevertheless, financial support for higher education in Florida indicates at least one problem area. At least one statistical comparison of Florida with the other forty-nine states indicated that Florida was in forty-fifth place in dollars per capita spent on higher education and forty-fourth place in the percent of total state expenditures which go for higher education.

Part of the prevailing climate in Florida toward higher education and academic freedom can be illustrated by two cases. The first one brought nation-wide recognition to the problem of Florida's educational climate. Professor D. F. Fleming, international relations expert and author, was offered a position of half-time lecturer at the state-supported University of South Florida. Right-wing fire, initiated by a small town newspaper's criticism of one of Fleming's books, "forced" the university president to "withdraw" the appointment, then before the Board of Control. The poor attitude regarding academic freedom on the part of the president and Board of Control was noted by an AAUP investigating committee and led to censure by the AAUP.[1]

A second illustration follows:

> The weaker institutions are more vulnerable to pressure, but the big state universities of the lower South have also suffered indignities. The University of Florida at Gainesville, for example, submitted to an outrageous inquisition three years ago. It was conducted by a committee of the state legislature, headed by a gubernatorial candidate, which held hearings for seven months on or near the campus. With the aid of lawyers, police, detectives, and paid informers, the committee dragged in hundreds of witnesses, mainly students, to

[1] Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, "Academic Freedom and Tenure: The University of South Florida," *AAUP Bulletin*, L (March, 1964) 44-57. Another, recent incident of note at the University of South Florida was the Grebstein Case, in which an English professor was suspended for a time because of his selection of textbooks.

testify against professors. Disclosures of political heresies were disappointing, but sexual deviations supplied headlines.[2]

This climate of outside pressures and lack of support inside apparently resulted in the resignation of the able president of the public Florida State University at Tallahassee, the state's capital, not long before this study was undertaken.[3] It should be noted that top level political office holders in state government have periodically made public charges that the state's educational institutions have been significantly infiltrated by communists and "pinkos." Recently as in the past, sweeping purges have been threatened.[4]

CONTROL OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

At this point the emphasis shifts to the actual control of the state university system. In Florida, *all* of the following have a hand in governing the four-year institutions: the governor, the state legislature (meeting once every two years), the elected Cabinet as the Board of Education, the Cabinet as the Budget Commission, the Board of Regents and its Chancellor, the Council of (university) Presidents as a group, and "finally" individual institutional presidents and their staffs and the faculty.

A recent public confrontation between the president of the University of Florida and the Budget Commission (Cabinet) readily illustrates part of the problem in discussing control of Florida's universities. This problem centered around the fact that the Board of Regents does not have final fiscal responsibility for the operation of the state college system. After much debate, the Budget Commission, on advice from the State

[2] C. Vann Woodward (1962), in Jere E. Lober, "Academic Freedom: How does Florida Stand?" *University of Florida Law Review*, XVII (Spring, 1965), pp. 575-576.

[3] In early 1967 the President of the University of Florida who had engaged in a series of battles with the preceding Governor in trying to maintain the administrative integrity of his institution resigned because of "presidential fatigue."

[4] See *Gainesville Sun*, September 4, 1964, p. 1-A. Indeed, even the universities' academic calendar was a major issue during the gubernatorial campaign.

Budget Director, reduced the salaries of approximately 110 individual positions ranging from auto mechanics to vice presidents.[5]

The most comprehensive, recent examination of Florida's public universities was the Space Era Education Study, under the direction of Ralph W. McDonald. While it was primarily concerned with advanced work "as related to accelerating developments in science and technology," it is one of the few outsider-expert opinions available.[6] The McDonald Report notes the political pressures at work in the control of the state universities, and concludes that this is a major limiting factor to potential academic excellence. The extremely low salary of the University of Florida president is cited as an indicator of a politically-dominated system; the reason for the comparatively low salary is that a larger salary would exceed that of a Cabinet member. McDonald called for a stronger controlling board and greater autonomy for the institutions, particularly in technical and professional actions.

Before looking at institutional factors at the University of Florida itself, it is important to consider the opinions and pronouncements of the Board of Control, now Board of Regents.[7] The *Operating Manual* of the Board presented the best source of this material. This volume contained categorized references in the three areas of policy formation—statute, by-laws, policy and procedure.[8] Included in this volume was an extensive statement on academic freedom and responsibility adopted by the Board on December 7, 1962. Much of this

---

[5] University of Florida Office of Academic Affairs, *Third Follow-Up Report to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools* (October 5, 1965), pp. 4-5.

[6] Ralph W. McDonald, *A Feasible Course of Action for Florida's State System of Higher Education in the Space Age* (undated) circa 1963.

[7] Membership on the Board has not generally been considered to be the most valued patronage; most observers agree that the State Road Board and Racing Commission rank higher in power and rewards.

[8] Board of Control of Florida, *Operating Manual* (Tallahassee: Board of Control, 1964). A new *Operating Manual* was adopted by the new Board of Regents, November 1, 1966, but new material in it is not relevant to this particular study.

paralleled the AAUP guidelines. Aware that the possibility of "investigations" is always present, the Board also enjoined each institutional administration "to continue to guard against activities subversive to the American democratic process and against immoral behavior, such as sex deviation" as well as urging each member of the faculty to select teaching materials which are "germane and in good taste."[9]

The *Operating Manual* demonstrates how little autonomy the individual campuses have. Actions required to be reported to the Chancellor include faculty appointments, modification of any facilities, and special waivers of out-of-state fees. Another item concerns football. The Board specifies *precisely* to whom and how many complimentary admissions to institutional home games should go. This includes "two tickets to members of the Florida Legislature for personal use and upon request of the Member, for Homecoming games only."[10]

INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

In viewing the institutional factors at the University of Florida, one interesting aspect is the distribution of faculty by academic rank. Of the 992 faculty members reported in March, 1962, the percentage of teaching faculty in each rank was: professor, 30%; associate professor, 21%; assistant professor, 29%; instructor, 20%.[11] The distribution of approximately half of the faculty in the upper two ranks and half in the lower two ranks is viewed as a result of a Board standard based on budgetary considerations that faculty should be distributed in these proportions.

The University of Florida has been governed by two Univer-

---

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

[11] University of Florida, *Institutional Report: A Self-evaluation Study for the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools* (Gainesville, 1962), p. 124, in University of Florida Role and Scope Project Committee, *An Overview Prepared for the Board of Control* (Gainesville: University of Florida; April, 1962), pp. 23-29.

sity Constitutions during its recent history—the Constitution of 1949 and the one of February, 1964. An excerpt from the *Faculty Handbook*, of 1961, prepared under the old constitution, demonstrates the riddle that is often university administration: (regarding new appointments to the faculty) "If the *President appoints* the faculty member, the *recommendation* goes to the Board of Control *as information.*[12] (Emphasis added.)

One of the important differences between the old and new constitutions was the provision in the 1964 document for greater participation of faculty in departmental government, particularly in procedures for awarding academic tenure. Previously, no consultation with his faculty was required of the departmental "head" (as opposed to the new term, "chairman"). "This pleases some chairmen and displeases others," stated one central university administrator.

Because the current study deals with academic tenure, a look at the provisions of the new constitution is essential. The 1964 document adheres to AAUP doctrine and stresses clarity and academic due process at most points. Regarding "the procedure to be followed when a faculty member becomes eligible for the status of permanent member," the Constitution reads as follows:

1. The department chairman or the officer in charge of the unit concerned, after consultation with the permanent members of the department or unit, shall decide whether to initiate his nomination for this status or to postpone such nomination and shall inform him in writing of the decision made.
2. When the chairman of the department or the officer in charge of the unit concerned has initiated a nomination for permanent status, he shall obtain a secret poll of the permanent members of the department or unit. In the absence of a majority in favor of the recommendation for tenure it may be brought up again after a year. In the absence of a majority vote at that time the chairman may forward his recommendation with the results of both departmental votes.
3. No recommendation for tenure may be made later than at the close of the fifth year of continuous employment.

---

[12] University of Florida, *Faculty Handbook* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1961), p. 18.

4. A nomination for tenure becomes effective after receiving the approval of the head of the appropriate college, school, or division; of the President, and of the Board of Control.
5. The faculty member shall be notified immediately in writing by the President of the final action taken on his nomination for the status of permanent member.[13]

One tendency since the adoption of the Constitution is to give the college deans greater responsibility. However, a department or a college is still subject to great intra-institutional interaction. Much of this is prescribed policy, as in the appointment to the senior ranks. University policy requires that vacancies in these ranks be filled by appointment at the assistant professor level, unless "the office of Academic Affairs agrees that justifiable reason exists for an exception to the policy. . . ."[14] Thus, higher administration becomes deeply involved in this and other academic processes at all levels.

Regarding the location of the University of Gainesville, Florida, in the north central part of the state, some comments might be made. While agriculture is the dominant industry in this section of Florida, Gainesville has a few highly technical industries. The university is the area's largest employer and second largest employer in the State and it includes the wide range of jobs from physical plant laborers to graduate research professors. The city, with 59,000 inhabitants, has shown signs of a social elite derived from local business and professional people like other small or medium-sized southern towns. Its local politics, traditionally monopolistic, has recently turned quite competitive with a clash between the "old guard" and the "young Turks," which consists to some degree of university

---

[13] University of Florida (Senate), *Constitution, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida* (February 6, 1964), p. 13.

[14] University of Florida Office of the President, *Reitz Memorandum Number 61* (April 13, 1965). The new constitution calls for a *University Policy Manual.* Some of the significance of the manual and the reason for it centers around the need of an ordered system for codification of Senate-passed items. Previously, such policy was approved and then "filed somewhere" leaving presidential memos as the only ordered system. Both are incorporated into the *University Policy Manual* along with other material and regulations, arranged by subject.

people. The home-owned daily newspaper was purchased by Cowles Communications in 1962; this seems to have resulted in a newspaper with wide news coverage and a more liberal editorial policy on local issues. In previous years certain observers have contended that there was greater identification by some university administrators with local power groups than with the academic faculty.

Thus, "the setting" in which the current research takes place has been considered. To some degree, the nature of the state and its politics are important. Moreover, "external factors" are far from "external" and play a critical role in the University of Florida's administration.

The nature of the university's faculty and its state of development are also important factors. These "professionals" are the participants in the administrative process. The movement of sentiment among the faculty regarding campus "political" issues—as, the new constitution—must also be accounted for. It is within this environment and atmosphere, sparked by recent controversy, that this research was undertaken.

CHAPTER IV

FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN

The intent at the University of Florida appears to be that of placing "formal leaders" as opposed to "informal leaders" in the position of departmental chairman. By definition, formal leaders exhibit both task leadership and ascriptive power as against affective influence only. This chapter presents an overview of the position or role attributes, status, and functions of departmental chairmen. The handling of the tenure process, it must be recognized, is only one of a chairman's numerous functions; often other aspects of personal processes cannot be separated from that of tenure award.

ROLE ATTRIBUTES AND THE SELECTION OF CHAIRMEN

In viewing the role attributes of chairmen, it would be greatly simplified to examine stereotypes held by faculty or students, but an inter-college comparison yields much more valuable answers. Role attributes of chairmen were most often discussed with them in connection with the selection process for chairmen, and this vehicle was used to focus on these attributes. In many ways, the criteria used and method of selection seemed to differ somewhat with each opening.

Regarding the criteria for chairmen, it is interesting that chairmen seem to generalize in terms of their own backgrounds. It was not unusual for a former graduate student coordinator to stress working with graduate students, a recognized scholar to list research reputation as most important, and the president of a national professional society to emphasize contacts in the field. Similarly, a former government administrator responded that administrative experience is essential, while a "compromise" chairman from within the department listed good human relations skills as being most important.

When asked what factors are prominent in the selection of departmental chairmen at the university, three chairmen in the College of Arts and Sciences each responded in part:

> In my case, I think the dean relied heavily on two or three members of the department. I know the president relied heavily on an old friend at a midwestern university. I think they were impressed with my academic background, having definite ideas, and administrative responsibility. . . .
>
> I don't know. I was interviewed by a dean and two assistant deans. I was asked, in part, about my attitude toward undergraduate teaching. . . .
>
> They are striving to bring fresh blood in and enhance the national reputation of the university from the outside. They're striving to, I said; I'm not sure that's what they've done. Most of those from outside in this college didn't add much additional reputation except perhaps one or two. . . .

The question of whether to go outside the University for a new chairman seems to be settled in each case as a result of interaction among the out-going chairman (if alive), a special departmental committee, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This decision is often a subject for disagreement between the department and the administration. The prevailing myth holds that the university looks off-campus when the opening occurs in a weak or mediocre department. Table 3 shows the tendency existing in each college to select chairmen from within the university in terms of the percentage of appointments from "within." The origin of chairmen in the University College is clearly from "within," while the recent trend in the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences stresses the selection of new chairmen from outside the university. The College of Arts and Sciences appears to hire consistently from "outside" about 60 percent of the time. Particularly when going off-campus for a new chairman, the selection group often includes other chairmen in the same college or related fields.

Chairmen seem to believe that the importance of research and accessibility to research funds are often major factors in the selection of chairmen. A soft but persistent cry against this emphasis was found in the Colleges of Medicine, Agriculture, and Engineering, and in departments of smaller professional

TABLE 3

ORIGIN OF DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMEN[a]

College (1)	Number of Chairmen: All Interviewed (2)	Number of Chairmen: Appointed In Last Five Years (3)	Percent of Chairmen: Percent of All Interviewed Appointed from Within the University (4)	Percent of Chairmen: Appointed from Within the University In Last Five Years (5)
University College	6	3	100	100
Architecture and Fine Arts	4	3	75	100
Arts and Sciences	17	8[d]	41	38
Business Administration	4	1	75	...
Education	7	4[e]	70	100
Engineering	7	6	43	50
Food and Agricultural Sciences	18	9	50	22
Health Related Professions[b]	6	3	17	...
Journalism and Communications	1	...	...	...
Law	1	...	100	...
Medicine[c]	11	4[f]	55	100
Nursing[c]	1	...	...	...
Pharmacy	3	1	67	100
Physical Education and Health	3	1	67	...

[a] Only those currently holding the position.

[b] Major portion of this college initiated in last eight years to serve medical center.

[c] These two colleges and all of their constitutent departments were founded about ten years ago.

[d] One is an acting chairman; he is included in this figure.

[e] One chairmanship is on an elected, rotating basis, with three-year terms in which an incumbent is not allowed to succeed himself.

[f] Not including two vacancies currently being filled by acting chairmen.

schools. Comments about the selection process included the following:

> It varies with the dean. An aggressive dean will recruit aggressive department chairmen who bring in funds, money. . . .
> I have no idea about the criteria. There are some pretty weak chairmen. Don't know what they look for. There's emphasis on research; the dean of the graduate school has strong influence. . . .
> There's overemphasis here on getting research funds. Actually, this is so almost everywhere now. It seems to overshadow everything else—tremendous overemphasis. At other schools, it's not quite as bad as it is here. The question when hiring a chairman is often, "How much money can he bring?" . . .

Two additional problems in the selection process should be noted. These particularly concern selection from "within." The first factor is a possible struggle between two or more subspecialties or even factions within a department. The result appears to be in terms of an individual who can be agreed on by all factions or sub-fields; normally, he is not "tops" in any of the sub-specialties of the department. A second factor relates not so much to reputation or subfield identification—many outstanding scholars do not want the job—but simply on a willingness to shoulder the responsibilities of the chairmanship.

A question often posed by faculty members about academic administrators centers on a "local" versus "cosmopolitan" orientation; this was mentioned in a previous chapter. One indicator of a local orientation is an inbreeding which stresses the importance of the institution and not of the nation-wide peer group in a field, particularly where emphasis is placed on committee work to the exclusion of continued academic growth and accomplishment. This is often linked with a "lifetime" or extremely long duration at a single university. Table 4 indicates the average length at the university and average length as chairman for each college's departmental chairmen. While no conclusive statements can be drawn from the information in Tables 3 and 4, certainly it can be said that departmental chairmen in certain colleges are far from "new."

In terms of the role attributes of departmental chairmen,

most can agree on such qualities as leadership and scholarship, but any real consensus in defining these qualities—even within the same college—is scarce. The wide variations in the attributes being sought and definitions of seemingly similar attributes and the methods used in the selection of new chairmen clearly illustrate this.

ORGANIZATION AND THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS

The structure of the University of Florida is such that it is divided into fourteen college-like units. This administrative structure, based on traditional areas of knowledge, generally provides the basis for administrative action and communication within the university. Two academic areas are supervised by provosts: agriculture and the health center. The provost for agriculture is the administrative head of an uncertain structure: from one viewpoint—the dean of the College of Agriculture, the directors of the Agricultural Experiment Stations and of the Agricultural Extension Service, and the director of the School of Forestry; on the other hand—the departments of the College of Agriculture and the School of Forestry. The provost at the health center supervises the four colleges there plus duties relating to the hospital's operation. From the point of view of the chairman, the role of the provosts is far from clear. While in both cases it is perceived to be strong, much uncertainty exists about the status of the provosts. The following statement is typical:

> The provost is the president's man. There's a duality with the deans in administrative functioning. This is not always clear. The present provost is more involved in medical affairs than the previous non-physician provost. I wouldn't see the 'provo' on departmental business without first talking to the dean.

Relations with their deans by departmental chairmen varied greatly. These relations were often expressed in simple terms of approval or disapproval:

> He's a good dean—not pompous. I hate pompous people. . . .
>
> Now I have frequent and close contact with the dean. Excellent.

TABLE 4
DURATION AS CHAIRMAN

College (1)	Number of Chairmen		Length of Chairmen[a]	
	Total (2)	Those Interviewed (3)	At This University[b] (4)	Chairman (5)
University College	6	6	19.5	6.0
Architecture and Fine Arts	4	4	10.0	4.5
Arts and Sciences	17	17	12.0	6.3
Business Administration	6	4	11.0	8.7
Education	7	7	21.0	10.0
Engineering	10	7	7.0	4.6
Food and Agricultural Sciences	18	18	10.0	5.7
Health Related Professions	6	6	7.5	6.0
Journalism and Communications	1	1	16.0	16.0
Law	1	1	20.0	8.0
Medicine	12	11	8.0	6.4
Nursing	1	1	10.0	10.0
Pharmacy	3	3	19.0	9.0
Physical Education and Health	3	3	12.0	6.0

[a] Data for chairmen interviewed only. Averages given in years.
[b] Time at University of Florida as academic staff member; length not necessarily consecutive.

This is a clean-desk man, who wants things done, now. The previous dean was tops in his field but a lousy administrator.

The relations between chairman and dean in most professionally-oriented colleges are facilitated by a similarity in training. But the College of Arts and Sciences presents a more troublesome situation. To promote a more adequate communication and decision-making pattern in this college, it was divided into four divisions or councils. As a result of this attempt to bring about understanding and better administration, a great deal of contact takes place between the chairman and the division director.

I used to see the dean more than I do now. Now, most of the time, matters go through the division head, who is hardly ever in town. . . .

I talk with the division head, on an average, weekly. I see the dean a couple of times a year—in addition to our monthly meeting, of course. . . .

A standard communication (and unifying) device used by deans is the regular group meeting with departmental chairmen. The range of regularity of these meetings varies: in the University College, once a week; in Education, twice a month; in Arts and Sciences, once a month. Of the fourteen colleges, this type of meeting produced least rapport in Arts and Sciences, where many chairmen viewed it as a "waste of time."

We're 'meeting' once a month, every month, whether there's anything to do or not.

Similarly, communication within departments relies to some degree on group meetings. These vary from weekly to "once at the beginning of each academic year." The departmental relationship appears to reach from genuinely collegial to autocratic. In many large departments which represent broad academic fields, sections or divisions within the department are used—formally as well as informally. Often the section chiefs plus the chairman compose a departmental executive committee. Chairmen differ in their use of committees. Many are anti-committee; they view their function as chairman to keep the burden of the administrative work "off of the rest of the department's backs." Still others, particularly in larger departments,

depend on committees for many purposes—most often for curriculum changes and evaluation.

A variety of communication devices come into play within a department. At least one chairman issues a departmental faculty manual in order to simplify faculty access to policies, recommendations, and procedures. Three communication tools used most often by chairmen are departmental bulletin boards (often with slips for faculty members to initial after reading important items), centrally located faculty mail boxes (as, in the department office), and faculty lounges. Responses indicated, logically, that close physical proximity makes communication easier. Halls and corridors provide means for convenient and frequent contact. Most of the departments in the College of Medicine readily illustrate the significance of this.

A variety of less formal means also seem to prove effective in communicating at the departmental level. Coffee breaks and lunching together informally exist in abundance almost everywhere, and are especially frequent in the agricultural institute. The only college in which a majority of chairmen pointed to "non-business" social contact both with faculty and administrators was the College of Medicine.

SPECIFIC PROCESSES

In addition to the tenure process which will be taken up in depth in the next two chapters, the other administrative processes must be considered both to explain university administration and to understand decision making on tenure questions. The following are viewed as the other principal functions in which chairmen are involved: budget-making, salary recommendations, promotion recommendations, faculty recruitment and selection, and curriculum development.

The interview responses indicated that the budget-preparation process is filled with difficulties. As discussed in the previous chapter, the setting for public higher education in Florida should be kept in mind. In generating the budget to be requested, a majority of chairmen voluntarily complained about insufficient voice and insufficient funds. Typical were these comments:

I ask for what we need which is 16 times what we'll get. I know what we'll get. Realistic figures mean nothing.

We're asked to submit statements of needs, which turn out to be ten times the money available. These are cut and cut again.

Critical of the small voice they have in budget recommendations, chairmen point to the importance of the dean and higher administration in this process. Departmental chairmen see their proposed budgets in terms of specific goals—for example, a new research laboratory or additional faculty positions may mean entering a new field of concentration or additional courses. Thus, chairmen attach greater "emotion" to their proposed budgets than the feelings they ascribe to the "higher ups" (at any level) who might cut these. It is also important to note that various chairmen have different attitudes toward the budget requests they turn in; many view these as aspirations while other chairmen see them as realistic expectations. These two outlooks result in greatly differing reactions to refusal.

A general feeling ("the word") also seems to prevail about each annual budget (really every two years). This comes from the top (Legislature-Governor-Regents) down. A good example of this is "hold the line." Thus, "the word" directs how much money—almost regardless of needs—will be originally requested. A vast majority of responses indicated that these operating expense and capital outlay figures are primarily based on the amount that was budgeted the year before:

We just get a few dollars more each year.

Our OE hasn't changed since 1958. Honest.

This is a very sore point. The budget is highly centralized with the dean. I lost a secretary because I had nothing to say about how much raise she got. I can be very bitter about this, but I won't.

Chairmen have no role at all in preparing the budget; well, perhaps indirectly, in generating college OCO requests. This college never sees the overhead part of grants. It's probably going to physical sciences.

While the disbursement procedures differ somewhat among the colleges, most chairmen—regardless of college—feel that the dean controls the OCO (capital outlay) too tightly. The ex-

tensive bookkeeping required is normally done by the dean's administrative assistant. The following are typical comments:

> The dean controls OCO. There's no separate OCO for each department—just a big pot. We put in requests, and the dean decides what we can afford.

> There's tight centralization on college use of OCO. The dean must approve each item. Certain sums are made known to each department.

> The dean's office controls OCO. You tell his administrative assistant, Mrs. 'Jones.' Well, we needed a new typewriter, and my secretary told Mrs. 'Jones.' We got Mrs. 'Jones' old one when she got a new one—that's all there was to it.

> The budget is handled routinely by administrative assistants. Since our grant monies are larger than the rest of our non-salary budget, there's no need to scramble for a few thousand dollars.

On salary items in the budget process some department chairmen commented:

> I make recommendations, but that's all. In the past, I haven't seen salary raises before they come. Grossly inefficient. This is supposed to clear up starting next year. I certainly don't want to be quoted. . . .

> I'm trying to build my teaching program. The college is a midget competing with two giants—the extension service and experiment stations. . . .

> We should be rewarding effective contribution. There's too much of automatic salary increases. There are people here who haven't done anything for thirty years and won't for the next thirty. . . .

Salary problems are a fundamental concern of chairmen. Section chiefs and senior faculty members are often consulted by chairmen in recommending salaries. Faculty rating forms play a very important part in the salary process in some colleges; the chairmen do the evaluating. Some chairmen simply discuss salaries with the individuals involved and with no one else in the department. Chairmen report that discussions between the dean and the chairman normally determine the figure. Chairmen have either a percentage increase or overall amount in dollars with which to work (for example, 3 percent increase); this is part of "the word." Each dean seems to have a "little extra" for

special cases. All money is supposed to be allocated on a merit basis. Pertinent comments included the following:

> I set salaries—alone. It's one of the main responsibilities of the chairman. . . .
>
> There is a built-in animosity from upper division departments toward the University College. . . . What they call 'no standards' are really different standards. In the past this has been reflected by lower pay scales. We've had problems of faculty morale and bigger turnover. The president himself has pushed for higher salary, and the problem has been recognized by others in the last couple of years—but not by a snobby few. The academic community is quite a collection of prima donnas. . . .
>
> I had to juggle research funds to make sure that my faculty all received the salary I promised them. . . .
>
> In helping decide salaries, I initially use a three-member budget committee. I don't announce the budget committee members to the department. . . .

One observation concerning the budget process involves what can be called the "honeymoon effect." This occurs when a new chairman is appointed, usually from the outside, and he is given certain financial backing from his dean and the administration to support his department in a more extensive way than previously. This is often part of the "package" to get the man to come to the university. The "honeymoon" seems to wear off in two or three years.

Connected with the budget and salary questions is also that of sabbatical leave. There is widespread support among chairmen for the initiation of a sabbatical leave program at the University of Florida. The lack of one is viewed as "very damaging to a scholarly atmosphere."

Also related to the budget, the promotion recommendation function is one of many intricacies. The problem of criteria for promotion is great. It is important to note that throughout the university, a minority—but a significant minority—of chairmen is trying to rebel against what has been called the "publish or perish syndrome." Some of the comments of these chairmen are interesting:

> Research is still the easiest way to get someone promoted. It's harder to get a good teacher or splendid physician a raise in cash. . . .
>
> Research is not as important as teaching. Often research is just doodling up data no one will ever digest; it sounds big to bring in government grants. . . .
>
> He's an associate professor. He had eight or ten items of publication when he came in. We generally consider that enough for associate professor. . . .
>
> People in my field just don't write articles in scholarly journals every day. . . .
>
> He's one of the best teachers I have, and I still can't get him promoted. . . .

Five of the 89 chairmen interviewed suggested a plan for institutionalized student evaluation of faculty because of the difficulty of documenting "good teaching."

With this emphasis on research productivity, significant problems were noted by two chairmen in the University College about their situation:

> There are heavier teaching loads in the University College. Thus, we attract those who are primarily interested in teaching. Promotions should recognize this. . . .
>
> The problems of the University College are unique. There is a strong tendency for university promotions to be based on publications—that is not our primary job. Our job is classroom teaching. A secondary problem concerns many people who quit just before they got a Ph.D. We have one who failed one language. There is a place in our setup for some tenured faculty members without Ph.D.'s. . . .

The problem of promoting a non-Ph.D. appears to be equally difficult in the professional colleges where a master's degree and job experience are often recognized as adequate training in certain fields.

Procedure for awarding promotions varies greatly. Clashes with the university-wide Personnel Board at times occur. The chairmen who believe that college level review has been the most rigorous were from the College of Medicine. There departmental chairmen as a group "advise" the dean on all pro-

motions to the two senior ranks. The sessions were seen as "rough" but fair.

The process involved with faculty recruitment and selection is also quite involved. The situation varies greatly as the following responses indicate:

> Selection is done jointly with the dean. We have a very active dean who doesn't leave it up to the department. The dean travels a lot to professional meetings and brings back names. This is one of the vital functions of a dean. . . .
>
> I generally do the hiring. The only place where the dean is involved is in setting the salary. . . .
>
> I am it. I ask for suggestions; they (department faculty) seldom have any. I write the letters. Only the one or two who will have to work directly with him are interested. . . .
>
> We narrow the list to two or three—bring them here. All the faculty gets a chance to look them over. Faculty in related departments too. Then we have a meeting, and take a vote. . . .
>
> Bad situations arise when the dean says this may be what you want, but not what the college needs. He has the power; he can move the line item. . . .
>
> We can never convince some to move to the South. No matter how good the department, no matter how nice the people here are—if he's reluctant, you just can't overcome it. . . .
>
> On the people we hire, we're careful to get recommendations. We're fairly sure of not getting one of those odd-balls. . . .
>
> If we're paying a salary over $15,000, then it goes informally to the Regents and informally to the Cabinet; then, formally to the Regents and formally to the Cabinet. It's easier to pay $14,900, and we have done just that. . . .

One particular aspect of the selection process which was often mentioned as a problem involves bringing potential faculty members to the campus.

> There's the problem of bringing people to the campus for an interview. The comptroller prevents a supposed free trip to Florida. A seminar is asking a bit too much of a fellow coming in. . . .
>
> There's no funds which can be used to bring a man down here. We bring them down as consultants—teach a seminar. . . .

Nothing discovered regarding faculty recruitment challenges the findings of the Caplow and McGee study which deals comprehensively with this part of university administration.[1] As with several other functions of the department chairman, it may be concluded that there is great diversity in hiring practices—from college to college, from department to department, and from opening to opening.

Curriculum development presents another facet of departmental and university administration. As for originating a new course, generally any faculty member can initiate such an idea. He and the chairman, along with other interested staff members, work up a course outline and usually present it to the departmental faculty for approval. Often suggestions come from the chairman who has "stolen" the idea from another institution. Most frequent reason given for a new course was the acquisition of a new faculty member who brings with him either new skills or new ideas. Many departments traditionally follow the recommendations of accrediting agencies in their field quite closely; agricultural engineering and law are good examples.

Committees are almost always used in general evaluations of departmental course offerings. Some departments have permanent curriculum committees. Interestingly, curriculum revision is often triggered by an "instrumental" activity—the announcement of the deadline for revisions of the next year's catalog.

This examination of the individual processes in which the departmental chairman is involved facilitates an understanding of the status and functions of the chairman at the institution being studied. In many ways, the tenure-awarding process is a much more critical point for observation of the university's administrative process.

[1] See Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, *The Academic Marketplace* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958). In this important work, Caplow and McGee look at the university world by focusing on the faculty vacancy-and-replacement process at the "big league" universities. These two sociologists cite the "dead wood" problem at "weak" universities because of the current mobility of productive, tenured staff.

CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM OF TENURE

One of the most important of the departmental chairman's numerous functions centers around his participation in the awarding of academic tenure. The importance of academic tenure to the accomplishment of a university's goals has already been discussed. In light of the history and tradition of tenure, the significance of the tenured faculty to the progress of any program, department, or college is readily seen. As the "permanent" members of the faculty, the tenured staff is counted on by an institution to provide that institution with its academic "muscle." In examining the problem of tenure, it is important to examine attitudes toward tenure in addition to the procedures used. From that point one can look at the major variable associated with these attitudes.

ATTITUDES TOWARD TENURE

Underlying any administrative process, to some extent, are the values of the participants. In connection with the problem of tenure, then, some consideration must be given to the normative attitudes of chairmen toward the idea of academic tenure. Evaluation of each chairman's "commitment to tenure" was made in terms of his perception of two relationships: that between academic tenure and academic freedom, and that between tenure and academic excellence.

The literature dealing with tenure is nearly unanimous in agreement that academic tenure exists to protect academic freedom. Moreover, observers also see this relationship as essential to the development of academic excellence—which is the real basis for these institutionalized concepts.

A vast majority of the departmental chairmen studied saw a positive relationship between tenure and academic freedom. But, their explanations of this often differed. Segments of selected responses are inserted below to illustrate this:

Yes. In any situation where a man's contribution to an institution is an intellectual contribution, and therefore subjective, personal, and highly controversial, there has to be some kind of security mechanism to protect this person from economic persecution. Moreover, this security mechanism is not needed where the object is clear—profit motive. . . .

Tenure is a valuable last resort institution—through the AAUP or the regional accrediting agency. . . .

Very much so. Intimately related. Tenure doesn't guarantee a professor a position, but it does guarantee a more or less fair hearing for his actions. Usually, capable people—not always—have courage to make controversial statements. There's protection to some extent. . . .

Yes, this is the whole point. To make it possible for a faculty member to work in a field not popular with the people who are providing dollars for the university. Some engineering projects are way out; it's basically to avoid undue industrial, political, and general economic pressure—like everybody working on oranges. . . .

There were also those who did *not* see the relationship between academic tenure and academic freedom. Their responses indicated the reasoning behind this attitude:

I have never been concerned with academic tenure as being very meaningful. Tenure is a mere technicality, while academic freedom is a broad concept which means different things to different people. . . .

A professor has to be able to seek the truth as he sees it. Whether tenure is important to this, I don't know. . . .

I don't believe so. This academic freedom business apparently affects people on the rest of the campus more than it does us. A couple in the department see this as a serious matter—but not as much as the 'thinkers' on the other side of campus. Haven't had much trouble. . . .

I never thought of the two being closely associated. I never felt tenure was a strong bond anyway. If the university wants to terminate a contract, it can. It seems terribly important to some faculty people; they desire it. But greater academic freedom because of tenure, I doubt it. I haven't seen reticence on the part of the non-tenured faculty to talk up. . . .

No. To me academic freedom should be available to all. My idea of academic freedom is a little different than most. I don't believe in complete freedom—do anything you please. Only freedom within university policy. . . .

Part of the tenure problem appeared to be the existence of a general awareness by many chairmen that academic freedom and tenure were usually associated together but their personal views found definitions for "academic freedom" to be nebulous. Thus, they often indicated that they saw a relationship, but were not sure of the exact nature or reasons for that relationship.

> There's a positive attitude under the new constitution. It was largely put together by AAUP members who think they have some definite ideas on what academic freedom is. I'm not sure I understand them. . . .
>
> I think that most faculty think so. I'm not convinced that it is—sometimes works the other way. . . .
>
> I imagine there could be a relationship. I've never myself considered tenure important. I imagine it's important to lots of people; it makes them more secure. . . .
>
> I never really understood academic freedom. . . .
>
> I see it in magazines; people talk about it. Inside me, I never felt that I didn't have freedom. Tenure's not most important. Personally, I don't think so. In my experience—no. But if you quoted me, I'd deny saying it. . . .
>
> No. Not in this terminology. Some faculty members think academic freedom is to shoot their mouth off and say what they think. I don't grant tenure to anyone because it's a right, or so they can go off and _____. My faculty doesn't see tenure in terms of academic freedom. Some see it as security. It brings a sense of belonging. If another university was to attempt to steal a tenured faculty member, he might think twice. I don't grant it just because the calendar says you've been here so many years. . . .
>
> The word academic freedom has been so tarnished lately. I prefer not to use it at all; rather, the maintenance of an atmosphere where scholarly work can be done. Academic freedom is a dirty word these days. Academic freedom is not freedom to be a radical, not license to be a radical. . . .
>
> In my opinion, those who place such a great emphasis on tenure would like to have some method to prevent being released because of poor performance of duty. . . .
>
> The less we put in writing what academic freedom is, the better off we're going to be in the long run. . . . Part of the problem is one of definition. There's the problem of state-supported univer-

sities and taxpayers. We ought to develop programs to benefit taxpayers, and they ought to be heard, from time to time. . . . There's more emphasis on tenure here than any place I've been. Sure, tenure plays some role, but in our field, we're not impressed with these things. If an individual has high ideals, a code of ethics, professionalism—to get tenure is meaningless. . . .

In addition, those who indicated through the content of their responses that they did not really understand the significance of academic freedom and tenure . . . in the accepted AAUP sense—also had a tendency to indicate that tenure was overrated.

There was significant indication in the statements of a number of chairmen that tenure is "far from permanent" at the University of Florida. This view seemed to affect their viewpoint of the relationship between tenure and academic freedom. The comments below are representative:

Yes, key point. However, tenure—in a way—doesn't mean anything. You can abolish the position if you want, or you can cut a salary. . . . Yes, there's a strong relationship between tenure and academic freedom. . . . But line item review encourages and enables investigation of unpopular ideas. . . .

We have year-to-year contracts, yet tenure too—so tenure doesn't mean a great deal. Salary can be stopped. Tenure's good to have, but I never felt that it meant very much. . . .

On exactly the other extreme of opinion are the views of some of the chairmen which indicate that tenure-produced "dead wood" has affected their view of the concept of tenure. Comments in this area included the following:

I'd like to see tenure thrown out the window. If I had my way, I'd ask two tenured members of my department to resign right now. They violate regularly the regulations of the college. They don't get along with the other members of the department. It's a bad situation. It's hurting students. . . .

Some full professors haven't had a salary raise in ten years. They'll remain until they retire. There should be some way of dealing with the problem. This is still a business. The student has a right to expect competent instruction. . . .

If there was no tenure, I would axe three or four of my present staff. . . .

> Academic freedom and academic tenure are meaningless in a technical field. I am diametrically opposed to tenure in a technical field. Look around the university. A good one-quarter to one-third of the faculty of the College of _____ has simply used tenure to make Florida a lovely place to live, but isn't helping the university one iota.
>
> Tenure is the greatest thing which prevents academic excellence. I would fire three men on tenure today, if I could. Because of the safety of tenure, they have ceased to grow. . . . Decreasing salary was OKed; it's legal. I'm not sure what I'm going to do yet. . . .

Another chairman reported:

> Some dead wood is the price you have to pay for the principle of academic freedom. . . .

Ten percent (9) of those interviewed indicated that concern for awarding tenure often comes from outside the university—a professor's family. They commented that it had an emotionally beneficial effect, permitted buying a home, and allowed "settling into the community." Besides, "the wife quits nagging."

A total commitment to academic tenure was defined for this study, based on the literature already discussed, as not only seeing the relationship between tenure and academic freedom but also that between tenure and academic excellence. An individual's "commitment" was scaled on a continuum with four grades or levels.

The first hypothesis for this study dealt with possible variables in the chairman's assessment of the value of tenure, i.e., his "commitment." They were academic field, reference group membership, and his perception of the marketplace in his field. Regarding the importance of the individual's academic field in light of previous studies, the traditional division into different colleges was used to measure objectively differences from one academic area to another. About this, certain limitations should be recognized. Initially, there is the broad nature of the College of Arts and Sciences and University College. Second, grouped around a service concept, the College of Health Related Professions in many ways is not homogeneous. Finally, a few of the science departments placed in the Institute of Food and Agri-

cultural Sciences at this university are often placed in Arts and Sciences or Medicine at other universities. Table 5 shows the result of an analysis of "commitment to tenure" divided by colleges (academic field).

The University College departmental chairmen indicated by far the greatest commitment to tenure. Arts and Sciences was second. These are the traditional centers of the "liberal arts" where the subject matter seems to be potentially more controversial and the orientations of the faculty (there is some indication) toward controversy as citizens (like civil rights) is greatest. Agriculture, Health Related Professions, and Engineering demonstrated the least commitment to tenure. The distribution of attitudes in Engineering made it the field with the smallest commitment. In terms of subject matter (teaching and research) as well as personal orientations, those in Engineering represent the extreme opposite of the "liberal arts," and the importance of this was reflected in the comments of the chairmen interviewed. The tradition of an experience with little controversy has not "forced" extensive thinking about concepts like academic freedom and academic tenure. The distribution of opinion in the various colleges indicated that "academic field" was an important variable in the commitment to tenure of departmental chairmen.

Regarding reference group membership, there have been many studies confirming the importance of this variable in political activity. Adapting this concept for the purpose of this study proved to be an interesting problem. The American Association of University Professors is apparently the only real reference group available. This is especially significant because of the AAUP's traditional support for the idea of tenure. It has been particularly important at this university because it had the ninth largest local AAUP chapter in the country at that time of interviewing. The significance of AAUP membership ($p < .01$) in predicting a chairman's commitment to tenure is demonstrated in Table 6.

Because of the association between the AAUP and commitment to tenure, it was felt that greater identification with the AAUP might be related to a greater commitment to tenure.

TABLE 5

COMMITMENT TO TENURE IN THE DIFFERENT COLLEGES

College	Commitment to Tenure											
	1 Total Commitment		2		3		4 No Commitment		5 Unclassifiable		Total	
	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P
University College	5	83	1	17	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	100
Architecture and Fine Arts	1	25	2	50	..	..	1	25	..	..	4	100
Arts and Sciences	4	24	10	59	2	12	1	6	..	..	17	101
Business Administration	1	25	2	50	..	..	1	25	..	..	4	100
Education	2	29	3	43	..	..	1	14	1	14	7	100
Engineering	2	29	1	14	1	14	2	29	1	14	7	100
Food and Agricultural Sciences	3	17	9	50	2	11	4	22	..	..	18	100
Health Related Professions	1	17	2	33	..	..	2	33	1	17	6	100
Medicine	2	18	6	55	..	..	2	18	1	9	11[b]	100
Other Departments[a]	3	33	2	22	2	22	2	22	..	..	9	99
Total	24	27	38	43	7	8	16	18	4	4	89	100

N = Number of chairmen *interviewed*.

P = Percentage. All percentages are rounded off.

[a] Keeping with a policy of non-identification of the interviewee-chairman, all other departments—because their colleges have three or less departments—are grouped togther.

[b] There was little difference between the basic science (Ph.D.s) and clinical (M.D.s) departmental chairman in the College of Medicine. Definitions Used for Scaling—Commitment to Tenure:

1. Chairmen see "the idea of academic tenure related to the goal of academic freedom" and also see tenure as "important to academic excellence." Total commitment.
2. Chairmen see "the idea of academic tenure related to the goal of academic freedom."
3. Chairmen have "some" commitment to tenure. Responses to questions about the value of tenure included:
   "It encourages young staff members to work hard."
   "Some people think tenure is important."
   "We couldn't keep faculty here without it."
   "I don't think we could recruit top people if there was no tenure system."
   "It makes some feel more responsible toward the institution—that's all."
   "Tenure's not important in my field—perhaps in others; I don't know."
4. Chairmen do not see "the idea of tenure related to the goal of academic freedom" or tenure as "important to academic excellence" or any other w h. Generally, chairmen in this group see tenure's effect as "bad" and would like to "get rid of it." No commitment.
5. Unclassifiable—because either very nebulous or completely contradictory.

The differences between active AAUP member and non-active ones were analyzed. Active membership was defined to include any of the following at any time, past or present: chapter officer, executive committee, committee chairman, or member of key committee. This did not prove to be statistically significant as shown in Table 7, although some comments indicated it might be.[1]

The idea of a second "reference group" was also included. It was activity (or "membership") in university-wide or Senate committees not directly related to departmental or subject matter activity. A member of the university Personnel Board would be included, while a member of a university committee to establish a doctoral program in a related field or regular Senate membership alone without any activity would not be considered in this general "group." Those with university-wide involvement were sought here. While chairmen grouped in this category showed a much smaller percentage with "no commitment" than chairmen who were not involved in university-wide activity, the reason for this was not at first clear. This was explained by an analysis of AAUP and non-AAUP members within this group of chairmen with university-wide involvement. This is shown in Table 9. The significance of AAUP membership as a reference group was again supported as it was the basis for a greater commitment to tenure by Senate and university-wide "actives."

A third hypothesized variable regarding commitment to tenure was that of the chairman's perception of the marketplace in his field. Although the data which were collected could not be quantified, there is a strong indication that perception of a "tight" marketplace results in a lower assessment of the value of tenure. This appears to be especially true in scientific-technical fields. In "tentatively confirming" the importance of this variable, statements during the interviews included the following

[1] It should be noted that the one AAUP active member who indicated "no commitment" to tenure also talked about his troubles with the two tenured members of his department whom he wished he could dismiss. As cited earlier, his responses included, "I'd like to see tenure thrown out the window."

three answers to the question, "Is tenure important to academic excellence?"

> At one time, perhaps. Now the marketplace for prominent people is great. They don't worry about tenure like they used to. There's many many jobs. . . .
>
> Only peripherally. In modern American society, competent academic physicians always find good jobs. Thus, tenure is not important to feed oneself and family. . . .
>
> In my field, tenure is almost irrelevant. There's so many jobs and so few people. There's five jobs for every Ph.D. Perhaps in other disciplines. . . .

In attempting to assess the importance of this variable of perception of marketplace, there are several complicating factors. The first is that this "tightness" has often occurred in academic fields which have previously been demonstrated to have a lower commitment to tenure than the average. Second, this situation of tightness seemed especially to prevail when

TABLE 6
THE AAUP AND COMMITMENT TO TENURE

	Commitment to Tenure				
Department Chairman:	Total Commitment 1	2	3	No Commitment 4	Total
Not and Have Never Been AAUP Members	5	15	6	10	36
Are or Have Been AAUP Members	19	23	1	6	49
Total	24	38	7	16	85[a]

With reference to this table, a chi square (x^2) of 11.90 with 3 degrees of freedom (d.f.) was obtained which is significant at the .01 level ($p < .01$); the corresponding contingency coefficient (C) was .351.

[a] Those 4 which were unclassifiable are not included.

Definitions:

Commitment to Tenure—Same as Table 6.

TABLE 7

ACTIVE AAUP MEMBERS AND COMMITMENT TO TENURE

Chairmen Who Are or Have Been AAUP Members	Commitment to Tenure: Total Commitment 1	2	3	No Commitment 4	Total
Active AAUP Members.....	7	5	..	1	13
Non-active AAUP Members	12	18	1	5	36[a]
Total.....	19	23	1	6	49[a]

With reference to this table, a chi square (x^2) of 1.96 with 3 degrees of freedom (d.f.) was obtained which is not significant ($p > .10$); the corresponding contingency coefficient (C) was .20.

[a] Those 2 were were unclassifiable are not included.

Definitions:

Commitment to Tenure—Same as Table 6.

TABLE 8

UNIVERSITY-WIDE INVOLVEMENT AND COMMITMENT TO TENURE

Departmental Chairmen Who Have Been Active In the Senate or University Committees:	Commitment to Tenure: Total Commitment 1	2	3[a]	Total
Not AAUP Members	2	6	3	11[b]
AAUP Members	11	14	1	26
Total	13	20	4	37[b]

With reference to this table, a chi square (x^2) of 5.18 with 2 degrees of freedom (d. f.) was obtained which is significant at the .10 level (p); the corresponding contingency coefficient (C) was .351.

Definitions:

[a] Commitment to Tenure—Same as Table 6 *except* that columns 3 and 4 were combined into the column designated 3 above (for the purpose of statistical analysis).

[b] The 1 which was unclassifiable is not included.

chairmen indicated that industry and government were also competing for faculty in the field in addition to other universities. Third, some of this perception of "tightness" has been found in applied fields where individuals can practice privately on their own; for this reason, these fields might always appear to be "right." Finally, how important this variable might be at a university that can offer substantially higher salaries and greater status is uncertain. Future studies will have to examine "perception of marketplace" as a variable very carefully before we will have a better idea of its importance.

THE TENURE PROCESS

The tenure process can be viewed from two perspectives: first, the criteria for tenure; second, the procedures followed. The criteria for tenure were primarily sought through the following question: "In your mind, what are the criteria for academic tenure, and which is most important?" Additional probes were often needed to gain satisfactory responses. Criteria listed by chairmen as "most important" included: ability to get the job done, good teaching, research, compatibility with the college's aims, publications, character, Ph.D., integrity, ability to get along in the department, loyalty, and others. Many chairmen said that they could not list criteria in any order; of these, most said a combination of teaching and research was of the greatest significance. A departmental chairman in the College of Business Administration provided a good summary in his answer:

> Ph.D., teaching capacity—as far as you can judge it, and publication record. The publication record helps; it's more convincing to the Personnel Board than us. It's quite important in getting by the University Personnel Board now. This is not true historically, but it's true now. . . .

Another chairman had an interesting comment:

> When you't believe in something, it's hard to establish criteria. . . .

Many students of higher education urge hiring, tenure, promotion, and salary for faculty to be based on the same, constant, announced, university-wide criteria. Despite the attempt to provide guidelines through listing the supposed criteria for each

rank and for promotion in the *Faculty Handbook*, of 1961, and having repeated this since, responses of the chairmen interviewed not only indicated a great variety of criteria used in awarding tenure but also a difference in the criteria used for tenure and that in the other personnel processes.

One aspect of the tenure process is submitting the actual, yellow "Recommendation for Tenure" form (Form 269, six copies). Several departmental chairmen made some previously-executed and in-process forms available for the current study. This form is normally accompanied by a letter (or letters) of opinion and a list of the faculty member's publications.

As it involves the role of the chairman in tenure decisions, the tenure process came under changing expectations with the adoption of the new constitution on February 6, 1964. This was discussed in a previous chapter. With this in mind, the question was asked of chairmen, "What procedure do you use in awarding academic tenure?" The following segments were included in their answers and give some idea of the way chairmen viewed the tenure process:

> We have had two faculty members up for tenure since the new constitution. One I recommended, and one I did not. The faculty recommended both unanimously. Both were based on teaching and not research. Both were granted tenure. Now this is tenure and not promotion. . . .
>
> I have to make a lot of judgments on my own without specific consultation. I attempt an objective judgment, yet I don't go around seeking peer opinion. You sense these things; they're pretty obvious. . . .
>
> I take the matter of tenure quite seriously. It's a more critical point than hiring. We spend a good amount of time on it. Some departments don't take it seriously enough. . . .
>
> (After looking at a copy of the new constitution to check the procedure:) Well, I wouldn't follow that. We had one wide-open meeting on a tenure problem. The fellow was sympathetic to Negroes and did some picketing; a couple of others held that against him. . . .
>
> The chairman should be the key to a tenure decision. A 51 percent vote would be insufficient. . . .
>
> I'm ambivalent about the procedure for tenure. I'm consulted, but I don't like my role. In addition, many confidential things are

known by a chairman if he's doing his business. I'm embarrassed, feel like I'm violating a confidence to discuss this with all the faculty—but I'll have to under the new system. . . .

I use tenure as a pacifier. If I have no rank or salary raise (to give), then—tenure.

To make tenure work, you have to be careful who you give it to. . . .

The dean, the section chief (within the department), and myself usually make tenure decisions. We don't need additional advice. . . .

It's not just my personal, limited observation, but tenure is granted around here to any reasonably decent person. Initial selection is the critical point. I can't think of over three or four people who haven't been given tenure in the last couple of years. . . .

In the medical school, often an assistant professor is promoted to associate professor and proposed for tenure at the same time.

The university *Faculty Handbook* virtually guarantees a man tenure. Ridiculous. It's almost automatic. You have to have good grounds to deny tenure, and you have to give notice. . . .

The people on federal funds talk about tenure more than the regulars. They can't have it according to present policy set by the Regents or wherever. . . .

A promotion in rank or the awarding of tenure should be accompanied by a sizeable salary raise. Too often chairmen are playing around, and this doesn't happen. . . .

While the intent of the new procedures is good—giving everyone in the department a say—rumors from other departments indicate that this may also sharpen professional differences or clashes. . . .

Before the new constitution, we followed a similar procedure whereby the tenured faculty voted. It was less formal then, not all that blackball stuff. . . .

This has been changed. I adhere to the new constitution. The first procedure here in Education, according to the dean, is to confer with him or send a memo. Then conferences. Then prepare forms and materials. Then proceed to the department personnel committee. Then to tenured faculty. . . .

An insight into the attitudes of chairmen toward the current regulations was found when asking about their suggestions for adaptations of the current system and ideas for a different system which might be desirable. Responses included the following:

We should be able to award tenure to non-U.S. citizens. We can't now, but they can stay indefinitely. . . .

Tenure at UF is not the same as elsewhere I've been. There was real tenure; you generally got it in your mid-40's. Goes only to full professors. Tenure at lower levels was for a specific period of time. . . .

Tenure should go with being promoted to associate professor. That's the way it was where I came from, and we didn't have any trouble. . . .

I hate to say this—we've got a department that's really mediocre. Perhaps we need a little longer time for a final decision—especially for a new Ph.D. One looked like he had promise, but he's never really produced. . . .

Outside letters on assistant professors are absolutely ridiculous. Who do we write? Their old professors or people whose names they give me. . . .

I'm not exactly sure what the new constitution calls for (although we had several tenure cases under it), but I have no interest in any other system. . . .

I'd like to be able to do something with my grant people; they really want it. . . .

I'm not happy that this tenure business is forced on to us after four years, when one can hardly judge a research project in this field. I'm forced to make a decision. Flip a coin? Unfair to deny, but really insufficient evidence to say yes. . . .

Chairmen were asked about the problem of higher review. Currently departmental tenure decisions are reviewed at the college, university, and Regents levels. Generally, review by the Board of Regents is very objectionable to chairmen; however, some have become used to it and have accepted it simply as "the law, and I guess it always will be." Most chairmen agreed with the desirability of university-wide review; many wish it would stop at the college level only. The following answers are a few which resulted from the question: "Should you and your department alone have a free hand in tenure questions?"

Why not? We know the man best. We'll have to work with him . . .

Extra-departmental control is good. Some departments would lose their control. I've heard about departments of all tenured, full

professors, which were rampant ten to fifteen years ago—these clubby deals. I heard the grad school dean went a long way in stopping this in at least two colleges. . . .

In my department it would be OK, but in the College of _____ _____ it would scarce the hell out of me. They'd put all sorts of people on the faculty. There should be some all-university review. Like all major universities, how well it works depends on the competence of the administrators. . . .

I don't disagree with higher review, but I object to review by those who don't understand the problems of a professional field. I've never been turned down, but I've had some arguments. . . .

In this connection, considerable discussion was given to the "weak department" problem for which there is great concern. Most chairmen who mentioned the problem suggested that review of tenure decisions would not help much; needed was a new department chairman who would do his job and in whom the administration and dean could have confidence.

In light of these reactions to the nature of the tenure process, the question can be raised as to how fully departmental chairmen had complied with the existing regulations of the 1964 constitution. Because the division of the university's administrative structure is into 14 units (colleges), this would provide an approach for examining the current situation. The procedural alternatives available to chairmen were placed on a continuum ranging from adhering to the "democratic" constitution to complete control by the chairman without any consultation. The results are shown in Table 9.

Comments from the chairmen indicated the importance of the dean in implementing tenure procedures in the College of Education, which showed the greatest use of the constitutional procedure. On the other hand, departments in the College of Health Related Professions are new and small; some have only one tenured member—the chairman—and five of the six have less than five members.

An additional point of interest is that some consultation was often reported between the chairman of one department and members of a related discipline (not in his own department) with whom a given faculty member (up for tenure) worked.

TABLE 9

PROCEDURE FOR AWARDING TENURE IN THE DIFFERENT COLLEGES

College	Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure											
	A		B		C		D		E		Total	
	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P
University College	3	50	2	33	..	..	..	..	1	17	6	100
Architecture and Fine Arts	2	50	2	50	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	100
Arts and Sciences	6	35	8	47	1	6	1	6	1	6	17	100
Business Administration	2	50	1	25	1	25	..	..	..	..	4	100
Education	4	58	2	28	..	..	..	..	1	14	7	100
Engineering	1	14	4	58	2	28	..	..	..	..	7	100
Food and Agricultural Sciences	3	17	12	67	2	11	..	..	1	6	18	101
Health Related Professions	..	..	1	17	2	33	3	50	..	..	6	100
Medicine	2	18	6	55	2	18	1	9	..	..	11	100
Other Departments[a]	1	11	5	56	2	22	1	11	..	..	9	100
Total	24	27	43	48	12	13	6	7	4	4	89	99

N = Number of chairmen *interviewed.*

P = Percentage. All percentages are rounded off.

[a] Includes all other departments. Grouped to protect anonymous nature of responses because those colleges have three or less departments.

Definitions Used for Scaling—Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure:

A. Adheres to constitutional provisions including a secret vote.

B. Adheres to the spirit of the constitution in consulting with faculty, but does this "informally" and usually through individual discussions. Also includes those who poll only tenured faculty of *higher rank* than the faculty member being considered for tenure.

C. The chairman makes the decision with little and limited consultation, as with two other full professors in a department of 16 tenured members or only with those in the individual's sub-specialty or section of the department.

D. The chairman alone makes the recommendation for tenure.

E. Unclassifiable—that is, either indefinite despite probes or made contradictory statements or, in one case, read the pertinent part of the constitution to the interviewer and then said, "That's what we follow to the letter."

In viewing the tenure process, a variable suggested in the second hypothesis was that of "assessment of the value of tenure." This was based on the assumption, stated earlier in this chapter, that the values of participants play some part in their behavior. Thus, an analysis was undertaken of "commitment to tenure" and procedure used in awarding tenure. Presented in Table 10, the result showed some degree of association between the two. Numerous responses indicated that this association was more significant than the statistical analysis shows.

Another factor often examined in research of this type has been the importance of size. An evaluation of department size and tenure procedure was made. The result demonstrated that size (departments grouped in six categories from small to large) was not a significant variable; the frequencies were randomly distributed. Comments by chairmen gave no indication that department size played an important part in determining procedure except in the very small departments where there seemed to be greater ease in meeting and greater informality in such meetings.

In evaluating acceptance of the new constitution's provision's, the second hypothesis also suggested the variable of "experience in the new system".[2] To test this, chairmen were divided into two groups: those without tenure cases since February, 1964, and those who reported having had at least one tenure case since February, 1964. (If one was in process, it was counted as

[2] See Eugene Haas and Linda Callen, "Administrative Practices in University Departments," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, VIII (June, 1963), pp. 44-60. The authors in part conclude "It is repetitiveness of decision making which tends to produce increased formalization rather than size itself." (p. 58) They note that size does add to repetitiveness. Thus, their study argues that frequency of decision making is the key to the degree of formalization of procedures. Short structured interviews with department chairmen at a large midwestern university were the basis for these findings. Although quite interesting, this article provides little real assistance for the current research. The authors apparently were not concerned with what style the "formalized" procedure took (defined: "*some* systematic procedure" or predictable sequences) and never mention possible formal regulations covering the types of decisions studied except to say that central administrators traditionally had little control over departmental functioning at that university.

TABLE 10

COMMITMENT TO TENURE AND THE TENURE PROCESS

	Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure				
Commitment To Tenure:	A: Adheres to Democratic Constitution	B	C	D: Completely Done by Chairman	Total
Total Commitment—1	10	10	3	..	23
2	12	19	3	3	37
3	1	5	1[a]	1	8
No Commitment——4	1	6	5	2	14
Total	24	40	12	6	82[a]

With reference to this table, a chi square (x^2) of 14.76 with 9 degrees of freedom (d.f.) was obtained which is significant at the .10 level; the corresponding contingency coefficient (C) was .391.

[a] Those 8 which were unclassifiable are not included; however, 1 was added to meet the minimum assumptions of the chi square test of significance (logically, if the number of the sample would increase, this would not remain a 0 cell frequency).

Definitions:

Commitment to Tenure—Same as Table 6.

Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure—Same as Table 10.

the department's having had a case if the case in process had been entirely completed except for Personnel Board or Regents action.) These departments were then scaled as to tenure procedure used as reported by the chairmen in the interview. Shown in Table 11, the analysis demonstrates that the differences in procedure used were not statistically attributable to experience under the new regulations, whether or not the departments had someone come up for tenure since the adoption of the constitution.

Interview responses indicated that there might be another aspect of "experience under the new system" which should be considered. This involved the division of tenure cases into categories of "routine" and "critical." Critical ones were defined as those which involved a certain element of controversy. Interview

TABLE 11
EXPERIENCE UNDER NEW CONSTITUTION

	Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure				
Departments:	Adheres to Democratic Constitution A	B	C	Completely Done by Chairman D	Total
Without Tenure Cases Since February, 1964	8	22	4	3	37
With Tenure Cases Since February, 1964	16	21	8	3	48
Total	24	43	12	6	85[a]

With reference to this table, a chi square (x^2) of 1.70 with 3 degrees of freedom (d.f.) was obtained which is not significant (p. .10); the corresponding contingency coefficient was .10.

[a] Those 4 which were unclassified were not included.

Definitions:

Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure—Same as Table 10.

responses indicated that controversy is usually connected with the denial of tenure. Thus, in order to handle this factor in an objective manner, all tenure cases since February, 1964, "either postponed or rejected regardless of what point in the process this took place," were classified as "critical." (This does not mean that there were not critical cases which were approved, and that denial always means controversy, although it usually does.) An analysis of tenure procedures used was made for departments with and without "critical" cases of those which had at least one under the new constitution. This analysis is shown in Table 12. An evaluation of this analysis showed there was a correlation ($p. < .01$) of departments with critical cases and the actual procedure used in decision making.

In summation, this chapter presented an examination of the problem of tenure in university administration. Regarding a chairman's commitment to tenure, membership in the AAUP was

seen to be the most important variable along with academic field. The procedure for awarding tenure used in departments was viewed in terms of the university's 14 administrative units, its colleges, with some degree of consensus on role definition by chairmen particularistic by colleges often depending on the dean. There was only some indication that the procedure used was based on the commitment to tenure of the chairman, who is in the strongest position to decide which procedure the department will follow. Experience under the relatively new constitution had little to do with determining procedure; rather, cases with controversy seemed to result in stricter adherence to the democratic constitution. With these findings in mind, the next chapter will offer an explanation of role conflict resolution in tenure decisions.

TABLE 12
CRITICAL CASES UNDER NEW CONSTITUTION

	Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure				
Departments *with* Tenure Cases since February, 1964:	Adheres to Democratic Constitution A	B	C	Completely Done by Chairman D	Total
Without Critical Cases	5	15	7	3	30
With Critical Cases	11	6	1	..	18
Total	16	21	8	3	48

With reference to this table, a chi square (x^2) of 11.52 with 3 degrees of freedom (d.f.) was obtained which is significant at the .01 level (p); the corresponding contingency coefficient (C) was .439.

Definitions:
Procedure Used in Awarding Academic Tenure—Same as Table 10.

CHAPTER VI

PERCEPTION OF EXPECTATIONS AND ROLE CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Having viewed the tenure process in light of the status and functions of the departmental chairman, the question of the existence of role conflict can now be examined. Role congruency is a situation in which the incumbent of a position "perceives that the same or highly similar expectations are held for him." As discussed in Chapter Two, role conflict, then, is a lack of congruency or the presence of incompatible expectations.[1] Toward understanding the chairman's role conflict uncovered by the current research, this chapter presents two concepts: first, recognition by the chairman of the nature of conflict pervading departmental management as well as the tenure process; and, second, an analysis of role conflict resolution in decisions on academic tenure.

THE NATURE OF CONFLICT

The greatest indication of conflict expressed in terms of job dissatisfaction by chairmen dealt with the problem of time allocation between expressive and instrumental activities. Here chairmen found incompatible role orientations and expectations in their involvement in these two types of activities. All chairmen were asked the question, "Would you prefer *not* to be department chairman?" Of those responding yes, that they would prefer *not* to be chairman, the problem of time allocation as at least one reason given had a frequency of approximately 70 percent. Even in the responses indicating job satisfaction by the chairman, this proved to be a significant source of conflict. The term "red tape" inevitably was used.[2] The following re-

[1] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 244-257.

[2] This problem has been recognized by at least one college, the College of Medicine, which is experimenting with the idea of college-educated (male) administrative assistants.

sponses were typical of this attitude. "Would you prefer *not* to be department chairman?"

> Four years ago, no. Now, yes. I really want to teach. The university system doesn't offer enough help to administrators. My problem is just trying to keep up with the paperwork. . . .
>
> No, I've let professional research activities fall by the wayside since I've been chairman. If I duck out, I'm out of luck. It's foolish to be an administrator these days. If I had it to do over again, I wouldn't have started. . . .
>
> They ought to provide some administrative assistants to help us fill out these forms. People who are trained to do this; I'm not. Perhaps there could be one assistant for every three or four departments. I mean male assistants with degrees. . . .
>
> I'm happy as chairman of a small department; I wouldn't serve as chairman of a 20-member department. Too much work. . . .
>
> Real problems here. Inflexibility of state regulations, particularly in terms of appointing people. 2½ trimesters of work versus two trimester or semesters elsewhere. Very detrimental effect on university quality. Some frustrations. Here bothered by filling out monthly reports on faculty activity. Paperwork is time consuming. I don't have much time for important things. . . .
>
> I don't know, sometimes. The duties are onerous. The influence is not enough to be flattering. Salary's the only attractive thing. . . . The administration keeps us far too busy pushing paper. This university is far too centralized. We're reporting far too much of the time. Reporting is standing in place, not moving forward. For example, I submitted streamlined wording for the catalog. No major changes, just streamlined wording. It hadn't been done in years. Well, the wording in the catalog is still the same because I didn't send 12 copies through the college to the university curriculum committee. Major changes are different, but a little authority ought to be delegated you know. . . .

One factor which was examined as a source of conflict was department size. Lazarsfeld as well as Caplow and McGee spoke of the increase in tensions with the increase in university size. Logically, this might apply to departments. Assuming increased tension levels plus increased work loads in larger departments, size might result in greater job dissatisfaction by chairmen. An analysis of department size and job satisfaction showed no correlation whatsoever between increased size and

job dissatisfaction.[3] Of interest, the highest proportion of job satisfaction by the individual chairmen was indicated by those who were chairmen in the categories of departments with the largest and the smallest number of faculty members grouped in six categories of increasing department size. All of the eight chairmen of departments with 29 or more members (largest) indicated that they preferred to remain as chairmen. One possible explanation indicated by some of the responses is that those who accept chairmanships in the largest departments are more aware of what they are taking on and are willing to do it. Of the thirteen chairmen of the smallest departments (five or less), eleven chairmen answered that they definitely preferred to remain as chairmen. A plausible reason for this could be a lighter administrative work load and therefore less conflict between expressive and instrumental activities. The chairmen in the College of Arts and Sciences showed the largest degree of job dissatisfaction.

Another variable which was analyzed was that of the length of time an individual had been in the position of chairman. The result of examining this variable in terms of job satisfaction showed no degree of correlation whatsoever. In addition, it should be noted that length in the position proved to be an irrelevant variable where tested throughout the current study (for example, no correlation with tenure procedure).

Administrative organization proved to be the greatest source of conflict in the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. The problem of many administrative superiors in a changing environment seemed to result in uncertainty on the part of some chairmen there. Having a dean, two directors, and a provost to report to has fostered problems and questions about whose expectations are to be followed in which processes. Frustration regarding faculty utilization is present in nearly all facets of the administrative process.

---

[3] Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were measured in terms of the question, "Would you prefer *not* to be department chairman?" Additional probes were often vital to gaining a satisfactory response. In response to the question, 64 responses were coded "no" (prefer to remain), 9 as "perhaps," and 16 as "yes" (prefer *not* to be chairman).

There is a tendency for a similar situation to develop in the College of Arts and Sciences as a result of a structural change. Regarding the role of the new divisions or councils, a question of the proper source of authority seems to be involved. The following three statements are typical indicators of this atmosphere:

> We have a council system in Arts and Sciences now. You don't have to go through the council for salaries, etc., but it's an administrative channel—as for a new line item. . . .
> The division head and I confer on most problems. . . .
> The primary importance of the divisions in Arts and Sciences is to get a better informed voice. The dean can't judge such things as a research project. Departments with overlapping interests work together in councils—giving unity to various departments and contact with each other. This means that college level decisions include someone who understands more than the dean. The division heads discuss all promotions in Arts and Sciences. In fact, when the decisions were made last time on promotions, the dean was sick and out of town. Budgets, too. Some decisions I thought the dean could have made were thrown to the group. . . .

Several colleges have close relations with professional and business groups throughout the state. While this relationship was not noted as a source of conflict, it did take on the appearance of a potential source. Two comments from different colleges are interesting:

> The chairmanship in this department and similar departments is entirely different from one in math or geography. We represent an industry in the state. They have some ideas of what should be done here more than just teaching classes and shuffling schedules. You have to get along with them and work with them. . . . So-and-so (another chairman in that college) was appointed mainly for public relations; oh he knows his stuff, but mainly for public relations. . . .
>
> They (the state-wide professional group) are a big help in getting our budget past the legislature. . . .

In attempting to observe the intensity and direction of expectations, some emphasis was placed on influence from "above" the department (as well as "below"). At least two questions in each interview sought this out. These questions were: "Does the administration ever attempt to influence, push or block, depart-

mental decisions on tenure—in your department or in other departments you have observed?" "Is administration influence on tenure decisions, in your department or in other departments you have observed or heard about, made through informal advice, information, subtle means including the implied threat of sanctions, or edict?" Initially, there was significant indication that non-departmental pressures were at work. Very often, experiences were related to other functions in addition to the tenure process. The following indicate the type of answers received:

Yes, in the last five years a tremendous number of tenure appointments and changes of rank have been held back. . . .

I've known departments where tenure for an individual has been pushed by the administration, or blocked. . . .

All of these factors, from subtle word-of-mouth hints to edict, have been used. . . .

They "bombed out" the Home Ec. department here a couple of years back. . . .

I had to fight like "heck" for one—you really have to be an advocate. . . .

Not on tenure, but on selection. A distinguished research professor from _____ University (a major midwestern university under private auspices) was scorned by a member of the Board of Control. Having told him previously yes, he had to be told no. The university president flew to _____ (a midwestern city) to see him personally and to apologize. . . .

When 'no,' you don't really know who says no. Always standard answers. . . .

Yes, there were some political implications on one appointment to tenure. . . .

The way departments are hamstrung bothers me. Look at the Cabinet cut in new hiring. . . .

Promotions were blocked. Not meddling but circumstances. Quota from Personnel Board. Five that were desired (from that college) were left off the list. Three wrangled on. Two were still left off because their chairman didn't push. We almost lost two good men; finally they made it on. . . .

The previous dean periodically held up promotions and turned them down. . . .

Recognizing the possibility of influence being exerted from "above" (a majority of chairmen pointed to some incident), the question of what importance these expectations have in the administrative process is important to understand. The following statements provide a basis for analysis as they indicate the nature of such expectations:

> On tenure and promotion, no one submits a name without estimating the wind—using enough informal apparatus at all levels of administration to have a fairly good estimate of tightening. Often there are informal hints dropped, like add a man to extra departmental committees and hold off a year. Often have to add to documentation, marshal forces carefully. . . .
>
> I wouldn't initiate any tenure recommendation without talking to the dean. . . .
>
> There are two questions to consider: Is he really qualified and how will the vice president for academic affairs feel about it? I have to decide which battles to win and which battles to lose. Especially in promotion, I don't ask unless I feel I can win. I'm open with my people. If I have to defer something for 'politic' reasons, I tell the faculty members involved. . . .
>
> I've always considered my dean and the grad school dean to be important. I have discussed problems with them. . . .
>
> I have never once discussed departmental business with the provost. I don't intend to get down and crawl in front of him. I'd like to discuss some promotions with the dean, but I'll probably be told that the legislature said hold the line. . . .
>
> It was pretty overt in the _____ case. . . .
>
> I never put in anyone for tenure feeling they were not going to make it. . . .
>
> No. An enlightened administration like we have here is helpful. . . . I am influenced by informal means. If the President or the Vice President says something to me about one of my faculty members, I take it very seriously. . . .
>
> Tends to lead in some cases, as "so-and-so should be encouraged." Much of it's through the dean. . . .
>
> Just because administrators are above the chairman in a higher position, they should still have the right to express opinion—but no right to insist on them. . . .

(Having said that 'effective teaching' was the most important criterion for tenure—) In promotion, we put scholarly attainment right near the top. The reason is that we couldn't get by the university personnel committee if we didn't. It's easy to point out—recognized person in your field. . . .

If a man's lacking something, I make an informal overture to the vice president for academic affairs. . . .

I consult with the administration as needed. Occasionally I have to hold one back. . . .

With these typical responses in mind, a basic question for this research can now be posed: In decisions on academic tenure involving some degree of role conflict, what is the chairman's pattern of role conflict resolution?

ROLE BEHAVIOR

As previously discussed, the tenure process is a valuable point of focus for study of university administration. It presents an especially critical function for viewing role conflict. The assumption is what Caplow and McGee termed the "swivel effect." Analogous to a foreman's position in industry, this effect would explain role conflict as "two perceived sets of conflicting expectations." While perceived expectations do not always fall neatly into two sets on tenure decisions, there is a strong tendency for chairmen to classify their perceived expectations into two groups, one from within the department and one from the "higher ups."

Initially, it should be noted that the expectations of higher administration in the tenure process are perceived by chairmen to be presented in the form of the argument or myth, "in the best interests of the university." This could be equated to "the public interest" in government policy making. It facilitates the concept of higher review. Regardless of the various, specific reasons usually presented in individual tenure cases, chairmen perceive the theme of the administration to follow the logic that denial of tenure (almost always denial) would be "in the best interests of the university." In the overall picture, this presents situations for compromise.

> Yes, at times there's been attempts to influence, and they may influence. . . . Informal advice and information. But, I've always been given the opportunity to discuss—I've been wrong, and they've been wrong. . . .

The expectations of the departmental faculty, as perceived by the chairman, normally are keyed to a discipline orientation in which the decision about tenure may only be judged by academic peers, the individual's departmental colleagues. Chairmen also recognize problems of ideological clashes and personality difficulties within a department.

The third hypothesis suggested that chairmen in their decisions on tenure would conform with one of two sets of conflicting expectations depending on two variables, legitimacy and expediency. Legitimacy was defined to mean the departmental chairman's own definition of his role, and expediency was defined as the perceived intensity of the expectations by others, including perception of sanctions.

At this point, a differentiation between "routine" cases, which compose a majority of tenure cases, and what can be termed "critical" cases must be made. Long before the constitutionally prescribed consultations, the chairman senses that certain cases are "critical," involving a certain element of controversy. While this awareness is usually through informal interaction with the administration, dean, and department faculty, it also takes place without any specific communication.

> No problems in this department so far. I've had no 'borderline' cases, but, I've got one coming. . . .

In the routine tenure process, a basic predisposition on the part of the chairman appears to determine the administrative procedure used. The predisposition is confirmed as being that of the chairman's perception of "legitimacy," as suggested in the hypothesis; however, the definition of "legitimacy" must be broadened so that inherent in the chairman's definition of his role are his expectations for the roles of the incumbents of other positions involved. As previously explored, the chairman's definition of his own role is, similarly, to some degree determined by the expectations of others—including such formal prescrip-

tions as constitutional provisions. While the weight of the chairman's personal judgment about an individual coming up for tenure is important, how significant this is depends on the chairman's definition of his role in the process. Part of the chairman's forming a role definition is his attitude toward the particular function; this differs from function to function. In this study, an attitude toward the tenure problem has been viewed as a "commitment to tenure."

The question of "expediency," as set forth in the hypothesis, can now be raised. A certainty level of intensity of expectations, expediency, by one of the positional incumbents or group of incumbents is necessary to change a case from "routine" to "critical." Thus, in routine cases, with little or no expediency perceived, the chairman's basic predisposition (legitimacy redefined) determines the procedure followed. In "critical" tenure cases, the current research supports the theory that an attitude of ambivalency evolves which brings about the chairman's primacy on a moral-expedient style of avoidance behavior, a reliance on following the constitutional provisions regarding the tenure process.[4] This is sustained by Table 12.

Based on "the setting" for the current research, two assumptions are inherent in this explanation of role conflict resolution in the tenure process. First, the tenure process is unique from the other functions of the departmental chairman in that the possibility of intense conflicting expectations is greatest because of the potential involvement of all permanent departmental faculty as well as those "above" and because of the importance to the group of the tenure decision (as opposed to one individual's salary). Second, this attempt to explain role conflict resolution is based on research which took place during a transitional period—that is, if the then two-year old provisions had been operative for ten years and emphasis had been made on enforcement, the setting and the resulting findings of the research might have been different.

The reasons for the ambivalent attitude in critical cases are

[4] Thus, the second hypothesis involving an attitude of ambivalency in explaining tenure decisions in an environment of decreasing authority was not upheld, but it did provide important "keys" for research.

not as clear as they might be. A partial explanation comes in seeing the potential clash as the chairman does: between the reviewing administration stressing "the best interests of the university" and the department contending that only academic peers in the field can judge (discipline orientation). The moral-expedient style brought on by the ambivalency is really *non-participation* in the process. The interview responses suggested two reasons for this: first, the possibility of threatening consequences—more of the social relationship type than of job danger, although this could be involved; second, the deflation of self-esteem in getting "over-ridden" by *either* the departmental faculty or those "above."

> The way it's done now, a chairman is forced to follow the consensus of his staff. If not, it's an awkward decision. . . .
>
> After the vote, I just have to do my paperwork and turn that in. . . .
>
> It's quite a change from when I was the dominant figure. . . .

The responses of the eighteen chairmen who had cases either postponed or rejected in the last two years under the new constitution were of particular importance in developing this part of the empirically-based explanation presented here. In some cases the existence of conflicting expectations in critical tenure cases reinforced the tendency to follow the democratic constitutional regulations, while in other instances such cases brought about an adaptation *toward* (not necessarily *to*) the constitution's procedure from that previously used.

Thus, the findings of this study of decisions on academic tenure have facilitated an examination of the nature of expectations and conflict in a university's administration. Moreover, a "theory" of role conflict resolution in these decisions by departmental chairmen has been presented.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

A study of the University of Florida's administrative process has been presented in this monograph. The foci were the position of departmental chairmen and decisions on academic tenure. Observers of higher education agree that a more systematic study of institutions of higher education is needed. The importance of these institutions—especially the large public universities—cannot be emphasized sufficiently in a modern, complex society.

In understanding the background of public higher education in which the current study took place, the status of academic tenure and its importance to academic freedom as an institutionalized safeguard for "the community of scholars" was reviewed. In examining the significance of tenure, the role of the American Association of University Professors was viewed as the dominant positive force since its 1940 *Statement of Principles.* While the meaning of tenure in terms of job security is clouded because of an uncertain legal status, the tradition of tenure in the academic community is well established, and the existence of tenure systems is widespread.

The lack of sufficient research in higher education's governance limits what is known about the way this "system" operates; this is particularly true of the departmental level. Moreover, university officials ironically seem hesitant about being studied. It is now commonly recognized that the administrative process of large universities—in both practices and to some degree personnel—is similar in certain ways to the operations of government agencies, hospitals, businesses, and other "organizations."

The university's operation was examined as a behavioral study in public administration in a similar fashion to the analysis of other organizations. However, the unique nature of an institution of higher learning and its "staff" was taken into account. In viewing "the individual in an institution," the concept of "role" was used to understand the inter-relatedness and inter-

dependence of participants in the administrative process. The concepts and language of role analysis were used as the methodological framework for the study. Interviews were conducted with 89 of the 95 University of Florida departmental chairmen. The instrument used for collecting data was the open-end interview. Interviews averaged about one hour in length.

An analysis of "the setting" in Florida and at the University of Florida was presented in order to enhance understanding of the particular institution in which the research took place. This was a result of interviews with university faculty members and an examination of administrative documents. The provisions of the 1964 university constitution in prescribing a new place for departmental faculty participation in the tenure process were examined.

The findings of the research allowed an overview of the many functions of departmental chairmen. Consensus of chairmen on their roles in the various departmental processes is quite varied. The findings permitted recognition of the role attributes of chairmen, their selection, plus their place in the university structure and bureaucratic communication. In terms of the actual "output" of the university, the chairman certainly appears to perform the most critical administrative functions; combining the roles of administrator and professor, it is he who is responsible for university management at the lowest level, the most critical in a professional or "normative" organization.

Three hypotheses guided the research with regard to the role of the departmental chairman in decisions on academic tenure. These hypotheses were:

> Hypothesis Number One: Regarding the assessment of the value of tenure by departmental chairmen, chairmen will assess the value of tenure based on three variables: (1) academic field; (2) reference group membership, and (3) perception of marketplace in field.
>
> Hypothesis Number Two: Regarding conformity to expectations in the process of awarding tenure, an attitude of ambivalency will result from changing expectations (lessening authority) based on two variables: (1) assessment of the value of tenure, and (2) experience under the new system.
>
> Hypothesis Number Three: Regarding role conflict resolution by the departmental chairman in decisions on academic tenure, chairmen

conform closest with one of two perceived sets of conflicting expectations depending on two variables: (1) legitimacy–definition of the role of a departmental chairman, and (2) expediency–perceived intensity of expectations (including sanctions).

In evaluating the validity of the first hypothesis, the findings showed reference group membership in the AAUP to be the most significant variable. Through analyzing the differences in attitudes in the difference colleges, academic field was also confirmed as an important variable, and perception of marketplace in the chairman's field was tentatively confirmed.

The second and third hypotheses, although invalid, were representative of important concepts in analyzing role behavior by chairmen in tenure decisions. Based on the current research, a theory explaining role conflict resolution in the administrative process studied was presented. The importance of the chairman's basic predisposition (a broadened concept of legitimacy) in determining the procedure actually used in routine cases was stressed. The ingredients of this basic predisposition were his definition of his own role as well as those of others involved in the tenure process, and his attitude toward the function being performed (in this case, his "commitment to tenure"). The prevalence of an ambivalent attitude in critical cases results in nonparticipation by the chairman and greater reliance on the prescribed constitutional provisions bringing departmental faculty involvement. This is seen as a moral-expedient style of avoidance behavior.

An important implication of the current study for university administration, in addition to public administration in general, concerns the place of role conflict in the administrative process. Certainly as long as there is more than one "position" in an organization, there will be some degree of role conflict. Role conflict is an analytical concept which represents neither good nor bad in itself. Indeed, observations based on this research could lead to the conclusion that there are certain functional aspects of role conflict in minimizing organizational conflict, which might be badly disruptive to the institution. The importance of the patterns of role conflict resolution must be stressed.

An additional implication of this study in public administra-

tion is that it supports the applicability of role analysis to a study in which limited resources were available and in which adaptation of the methodology to a different type of institution than that for which it was originally designed was proved acceptable. Thus, the value of the concept of "role" and the usefulness of role analysis were again confirmed.

Implications of the study, of course, appear to be of some importance to the "organization" studied. It is significant to see the availability of knowledge about this unique institution through the conceptualization used. It is hoped that this research will offer an additional "jumping off point" for future study.

As a concluding observation, it can be stated that this study—in the opinion of the researcher—indicates the potential value of a comparative analysis of several multiversities. The value of such a study stressing inter-positional consensus as well as intra-positional consensus (used here) and in which sufficient resources and talent were committed would seem to be great—not only to our knowledge of the university administrative process but also to its improvement through understanding.