DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 742 24 HE 002 392

AUTHOR DeVries, David L.
TITLE Sources of Influence on Faculty Behavior.
INSTITUTION Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
REPORT NO R-106
BUREAU NO BR-6-1610
PUB DATE Jun 71
GRANT OEG-2-7-061610-0207
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns, *Behavior Standards, College Faculty, *Faculty, Higher Education, *Role Theory, *Teacher Behavior, *Values

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effects of shared values and expectations on the behavior of 290 faculty members representing 34 departments at a large graduate oriented university. Responses to a questionnaire indicated the expectations the faculty member had for himself, those his colleagues had for themselves, and those of his employing institution predicted positively and significantly the behavior of respondents. Self-expectations of the departmental executive officer did not relate significantly to faculty behavior. Behavioral conformity with collegial self-expectations was significantly related to degree of alienation, to the cosmopolitan-local dimensions, and to departmental size. Implications of the results were examined with reference to the role theory of Katz and Kahn (1966) and for the understanding of faculty behavior. (Author/JS)

REPORT No. 106

JUNE, 1971

SOURCES OF INFLUENCE ON FACULTY BEHAVIOR

DAVID L. DEVRIES

The Johns Hopkins University

STAFF

John L. Holland, Director

James M. McPartland, Assistant Director

Virginia Bailey
Thelma Baldwin
Zahava D. Blum
Judith P. Clark
James S. Coleman
David DeVries
Keith Edwards
Doris R. Entwisle
Gail Fennessey
James Fennessey
Jean Finnegan
Ellen Greenberger
Rubie Harris
Edward J. Harsch
Robert T. Hogan
John H. Hollifield
Nancy L. Karweit
Judith Kennedy
Steven Kidder
Hao-Mei Kuo
Samuel Livingston
Edward L. McDill
Rebecca J. Muraro
Jeanne O'Connor
Suzanne K. Pieper
Peter H. Rossi
Leslie Schnuelle
Aage B. Sørensen
Julian C. Stanley
Mary C. Viernstein
Diana F. Ward
Murray A. Webster
Phyllis K. Wilson

Sources of Influence on Faculty Behavior

GRANT NO. OEG-2-7-061610-0207

PROJECT NO. 61610-06

David L. DeVries

REPORT NO. 106

June, 1971

This study was sponsored in part by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, University of Illinois, and the United States Office of Education (OEG-0-70-3347, principal investigator Fred E. Fiedler). The paper is based on a dissertation submitted by the author in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree at the University of Illinois.

Published by the Center for Social Organization of Schools, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no offical endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

The Johns Hopkins University

Baltimore, Maryland

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The Center for Social Organization of Schools has two primary objectives: to develop a scientific knowledge of how schools affect their students, and to use this knowledge to develop better school practices and organization.

The Center works through five programs to achieve its objectives. The Academic Games program has developed simulation games for use in the classroom, and is studying the processes through which games teach and evaluating the effects of games on student learning. The Social Accounts program is examining how a student's education affects his actual occupational attainment, and how education results in different vocational outcomes for blacks and whites. The Talents and Competencies program is studying the effects of educational experience on a wide range of human talents, competencies and personal dispositions, in order to formulate--and research--important educational goals other than traditional academic achievement. The School Organization program is currently concerned with the effect of student participation in social and educational decision making, the structure of competition and cooperation, formal reward systems, ability-grouping in schools, and effects of school quality. The Careers and Curricula program bases its work upon a theory of career development. It has developed a self-administered vocational guidance device to promote vocational development and to foster satisfying curricular decisions for high school, college, and adult populations.

This report, prepared by the School Organization program, examines organizational and interpersonal controls operating on members of educational institutions.

Acknowledgment

The author is grateful for the invaluable direction of Fred E. Fiedler who both directed the larger research project and acted as dissertation chairman. Anthony Biglan and Gerald Oncken have also contributed immensely, particularly in the earlier stages of the project.

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the effects of one type of control -- shared values and expectations -- on the behavior of 290 faculty members of a large public university. The expectations the faculty member had for himself, those his colleagues had for themselves, and those of his employing organization predicted positively and significantly the behaviors of the respondents. The self expectations of the departmental executive officer did not relate significantly to faculty behavior. Behavioral conformity with collegial self expectations was significantly related to degree of alienation, to the cosmopolitan-local dimension, and to departmental size. Implications of the results were examined for the role theory of Katz and Kahn and for the understanding of faculty member behavior.

INTRODUCTION

Social scientists concerned with organizations have frequently stressed that influence over its members is an essential attribute of an organization. Definitions of "organization" invariably include some mention of control over the behaviors and cognitions of individual members (e.g., Katz and Kahn, 1966; Udy, 1965; Scott, 1965). However, it has also been noted that professionals operating within academic organizations have a considerable degree of autonomy (Hill & French, 1967; Goss, 1961) and may be more sensitive to general professional demands than the demands of the local employing institution (Caplow & McGee, 1958; Gouldner, 1957).

Given that control by an organization over its members is a necessary function, how do academic organizations govern their professional staff? The premise of the present study is that faculty members are governed through their conformity to the shared values and expectations of the members of their role sets. Using the role expectation theory of Katz and Kahn (1966) as a framework, we will examine (1) which groups or individuals form the role set for each faculty member, and (2) what factors determine the degree

of a faculty member's conformity with expectations or values of his colleagues. The answers to these questions should clarify the various processes which act to govern the behaviors of faculty members.

(1) What individuals or groups act as referents (i.e., form a role set) for faculty members? Whose role expectations appear to predict the behaviors of faculty members? Several possible referents have been suggested in the literature. The expectations of the formal organization (Clark, 1963), of departmental colleagues (Hill & French, 1967), of the departmental executive officer (Dykes, 1967), and of the faculty member himself (Marcson, 1960) have all been shown to be systematically related to a given faculty member's behavior. This study will examine each of these referents to determine if they do predict faculty behavior at the specific University being considered, and if so, how strongly each operates as a predictive factor.

> Hypothesis I: A faculty member's role behavior is positively related to the expectations of his role set. This role set includes the faculty member himself, his colleagues, his departmental executive officer, and the employing organization.

(2) What determines faculty conformity with the expectations or values of colleagues? Empirical studies from several bodies of literature suggest predictors of conformity to expectations of certain members of the role set. Four of these predictors will be studied here -- alienation, the cosmopolitan-local dimension, status, and departmental size. These predictors were selected because they have commanded prior attention in studies of professionals operating within academic circles.

Alienation (Fromm, 1941; Dean, 1961) has been treated as a determinant of conformity to group norms or expectations. Dean (1961), in a review of empirical studies of alienation, notes a positive relationship between degree of alienation and conformity. Etzioni (1968) has described a passive form of alienation in which an individual is subject to societal forces and acquiesces to his state. Finally, Gerson (1965) has noted that individuals frequently seek to reduce the stress of alienation by seeking social structure. The alienation can be reduced by entering into a series of patterned social relationships.

Dean (1961) has delineated three conceptual dimensions of alienation and has established some construct validity for all three. The present study tests, separately, the effects of two of the three dimensions. The first is "powerlessness," defined as the feeling of separation of the individual from control over his destiny. A second dimension, "social isolation," is defined as the feeling of separation from the group or of isolation from group standards.

> Hypothesis II: The more an individual faculty member feels alienated from his department, the more his behaviors coincide with expectations of departmental colleagues.

The cosmopolitan-local dimension, according to Gouldner (1957), has been shown to predict different patterns of behavior by faculty and may well predict degrees of conformity with expectations of departmental colleagues. A local identity is defined by Gouldner as high loyalty to the employing organization, low commitment to professional skills, and an "inner" reference group orientation. A cosmopolitan identity is defined as low loyalty to the employing organization, high commitment to professional skills,

and an "outer" reference group orientation. The cosmopolitan individual could be predicted to conform less to expectations of his departmental colleagues, particularly if such expectations did not coincide with his own profession-related expectations.

> Hypothesis III: "Cosmopolitan" faculty members conform less to expectations of departmental colleagues than do "locals."

Status, a third relevant individual factor, has been dealt with in the social conformity literature. Blake & Mouton (1961), in a review of conformity studies, have noted that individuals with high or low status conform less than those with an average amount of status. Long-standing (high-status) members of an academic department are allowed a certain freedom to deviate. Hollander (1967) has termed such tolerance of deviation "idiosyncracy credit." Such freedom is formalized, in a sense, by the granting of tenure. The deviation of low status faculty members, i.e., assistant professors, may be due to their attempts to establish national reputations, which orients them more toward general professional expectations than toward those of the department.

> Hypothesis IV: Faculty members with either high or low status conform less to the expectations of departmental colleagues than do faculty with average status.

A final predictor of behavioral conformity with the expectations of departmental colleagues is department size. Studies in social conformity (Allen, 1965) and role theory areas (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958), have noted systematic relationships between group size and the effects of group expectations.

> Hypothesis V: The larger the department, the less the individual faculty member's behavior coincides with the expectations of departmental colleagues.

METHOD

Participants

The faculty members included in the present study were employed by a large, graduate-oriented university. A questionnaire was sent to over 800 faculty from 56 academic departments, all of which offer a graduate program leading to the Ph.D. degree. From the total sample of respondents a subset of faculty was selected. From departments with a 45% or greater return rate, only faculty members who had been employed for four or more years were selected. From this subset of 290 faculty, two stratified random samples of 145 faculty members were chosen, and designated as Sample I and Sample II. The samples were stratified by department and rank. Analyses were conducted on both samples I and II in order to obtain a form of cross-validation of the results.

The 290 participants represent 34 different academic departments. Fifty-five percent of the participants are employed in the hard sciences (physical and biological sciences), 23% are employed in the soft sciences (i.e., social sciences and business areas), and 22% in the humanities. Fifty percent of the respondents are full professors, 24% are associate professors, and 26% are assistant professors or instructors. This distribution contrasts with the campus faculty population proportions of 34% full professors, 20% associate professors, and 46% assistant professors. The distribution across rank of the campus population is significantly different ($\chi^2 = 17.03$; $df = 2$; $p < .001$) from that of the two 145 member samples used in the study. It should be noted, however, that the total campus proportion of assistant professors who had been employed at the university for four years or more would have been considerably smaller than 46%. It would probably be close to the

26% used in our two samples.

Also of interest in describing the samples are data relevant to the sex, degree earned, and publication activity dimensions. With respect to the sex of the respondents, 92% of Sample I and 94% of Sample II are males. As to the highest degree earned by the respondents, 84% of Sample I and 82% of Sample II have obtained either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. The measure of publication activity was the number of articles published by the respondent in professional journals within the four years prior to the time of completion of the questionnaire. Of both Sample I and Sample II respondents, 78% published one or more articles within the preceding four years. The average number of articles published by Sample I respondents within the preceding four years was 5.1, whereas Sample II respondents published an average of 6.6 articles. In short, the two samples selected for the present study are predominantly males; have obtained a Ph.D. degree; are in the sciences; have tenure and have published to some degree.

Procedure

A field study was conducted during the spring of 1968 at a large public university in the midwest, using a variety of independent data sources:

I. Faculty Questionnaire

The prime source of data for the role expectations and role-behavior concepts was a faculty questionnaire which was sent to faculty members after the study had been explained to and endorsed by the executive officers of the various departments. Prior to the present study a questionnaire containing many items similar to those on the present questionnaire was administered to faculty from four departments (not included in the present study). The data from the pilot study were assessed and utilized in the construction of

the present questionnaire. Departmental return rates for the questionnaire varied from 23% to 100%, with the median being 57.5%.[1] The questionnaire included operational measures for the following variables:

A. Focal person's self-expectations: the focal person's assigned importance (for himself) to a given task area. The respondent distributed 100 points across five different task areas, three of which were used in the present study: teaching and training, research and scholarly work, and departmental and university administration.

B. Self-expectations of departmental colleagues: the average importance placed on a task by all other respondents from the focal person's department.

C. Executive officer's self-expectation: the importance the executive officer, speaking for himself, assigned to a given task area. Executive officers include both departmental heads and chairmen.

D. Role behavior - proportion time: the percent of time the respondent reports spending on each of the three different tasks.

---

[1] Tests were conducted in which respondents were compared with nonrespondents on 13 different organizational expectation variables (obtained from the University Bureau of Institutional Research). The operational definitions of such variables are specified later in this section. Of the 13 different variables, respondents differed significantly ($p < .05$; use of t-tests) from nonrespondents on the following: Full Time Equivalent (FTE) university administration; FTE departmental research; FTE organized research; FTE thesis research and FTE extension. Although respondents had significantly greater FTE for research and administration, no differences were noted for teaching and other, more peripheral, task areas.

E. Role behaviors - number of hours: the percent of time reported spent on task area multiplied by number of hours reported spent on all professional activities for an average week.

F. Alienation: alienation was examined in terms of the two dimensions delineated by Dean (1961), to which the following three measures are relevant:

(1) Powerlessness

(a) Participation: the faculty member's response to the question "How would you rate your own participation in departmental administration and decision-making?" The response was registered on an eight-point bipolar scale, ranging from "A great deal of participation" to "Very little participation."[1]

(b) Restriction: the faculty member's response on an eight-point bipolar scale to "Do you feel that the general organization and atmosphere of the department restrict you in the performance of your teaching (or research) duties?"

---

[1]The participation measure of powerlessness does reflect more than mere amount of time the individual spends in departmental meetings and other administrative duties. To test this assertion, correlation coefficients were computed between reported number of hours spent on administrative affairs (cf. Role behavior - number of hours) and perceived participation. For Sample I respondents, $r = .43$ ($r^2 = .18$), whereas for Sample II, $r = .32$ ($r^2 = .10$). Although both correlations are statistically significant, and in a positive direction, at most 18% of the variance (Sample I) of perceived participation can be explained by amount of time spent on administrative activities.

(2) Social isolation: the sum of the faculty member's responses to four eight-point bi-polar evaluative scales (Friendly-Unfriendly; Rejecting-Accepting; Cooperative-Uncooperative; Hostile-Supportive). The four scales apply to the faculty member's department.

G. Cosmopolitan-local (C-L) orientation: here measured by two of the several behavioral measures of C-L suggested by Bennis, et al. (1958). A cosmopolitan identity was defined as an above-the-median score on number of professional positions held outside the university, and a below-the-median score on number of administrative positions held within the university. A local identity was defined as a below-the-median score on number of professional positions held outside the university and an above-the-median score on number of administrative positions held within the university.

H. Status: defined as the formal academic rank of the individual: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor.

I. Behavioral conformity with expectations of department colleagues: the respondent's collegial self-expectations score for a given task area minus the percent of time reportedly spent by the respondent on the task.

II. Administrative Data Files

Each semester the university, through its Bureau of Institutional Research, collects (from several sources) data concerning each faculty member at the university. The data used in the present study were collected in the fall of 1967.

a. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) teaching, research, or administration: an assignment (by the executive officer) of the amount of effort each faculty member is "expected" to expend on each of the several task areas. The FTE measure is felt to represent expectancies by the university administration and others of the distribution of effort desired for a particular faculty member.

Because FTE is felt to represent an important and somewhat independent source of influence, the methods employed by the university in calculating the FTE are examined. Each semester a data bureau within the university collects data from the executive officers of each of the academic departments. Each executive officer is asked to distribute the effort of each of his faculty members across the various task areas. The executive officer may consult with the faculty member on determining the number of hours he spends per week on each task area.

Already listed by the administration are the various sources from which the individual is being paid, as well as the percent of appointment accounted for by the particular funding source. The total FTE (percent of a full load) must equal the summed percentages across the various funding sources, and must be somewhat congruent with the source of the funds. For example, if 50% of a faculty member's salary comes from a general teaching account if would be inappropriate for the executive officer to assign 75 FTE (or 3/4 of the individual's activities) to research. Thus, FTE can provide a fairly independent (from the faculty member's reported activities) estimate

of expectations having potential impact on faculty members.[1]

b. Departmental size: defined by the headcount of faculty (rank of instructor and above) employed by the department.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table I indicates that the FTE measure of organizational expectations and the self expectations of the focal person both predict positively and significantly the behavior of the respondents in both samples across all three task areas. Both the proportion of time spent and the number of hours spent in teaching, research and administration correlate highly with organizational and self-expectations. Such results are not particularly surprising, and have been informally observed by others (e.g., Clark, 1963).

For both samples, self-expectations of departmental colleagues predict role behaviors significantly and positively for teaching and research, but not for administration. The self-expectations of the executive officer do not predict the behaviors of the respondents to any degree.

These results provide support for the basic tenet of role theory--that role expectations of an individual's role set relate systematically to his behavior. The results also support the claim of several theorists in higher education (e.g., Clark, 1963; Anderson, 1963) that influence over faculty in academic organizations operates partly through certain bureaucratic,

---

[1]For a more detailed discussion of FTE and other measures of organizational expectations, one should consult the author's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The relationship of departmental and personal role expectations to the role behaviors of university faculty members, University of Illinois, 1970.

Table 1

Correlations Between Amount of Role Behavior
And Sets of Expectations

EXPECTATIONS	ROLE BEHAVIORS					
	PROPORTION TIME			NUMBER HOURS		
	Teach.	Res.	Admin.	Teach.	Res.	Admin.
FTE						
SAMPLE I	.533**	.587**	.524**	.493**	.564**	.471**
SAMPLE II	.439**	.543**	.500**	.495**	.469**	.485**
COLLEAGUES						
SAMPLE I	.467**	.372**	.062	.414**	.387**	.072
SAMPLE II	.391**	.312**	-.036	.328**	.317**	-.012
SELF (Focal Person)						
SAMPLE I	.628**	.638**	.466**	.494**	.671**	.429**
SAMPLE II	.725**	.741**	.622**	.591**	.685**	.591**
EXEC. OFFICER						
SAMPLE I	-.035	.030	-.118	-.036	.041	-.114
SAMPLE II	.176*	-.085	-.106	.210*	-.030	-.138

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Each correlation coefficient is based on an N = 145

or more formalized, requirements. Such variables as FTE do appear to structure the faculty member's efforts. Although this latter finding is not a major discovery, it is well to see empirical data which substantiate the contention.

The significant relationships between self-expectations of colleagues and faculty behavior for teaching and research reinforce the concept of strong professional norms. This concept has appeared repeatedly in the literature dealing with professionals, e.g., Martin, 1969; Caplow & McGee, 1958. Even though a given respondent may not come into frequent contact with many of his departmental colleagues, there appears to be a common norm concerning the importance of teaching and research. The nonsignificant relationships between departmental colleagues' self-expectations and faculty behavior for administrative tasks are also of interest. These may be due to the uniformly low importance placed on administration by the faculty members studied. The degree of importance of the role may be a significant mediating factor in determining the influence of the self-expectations of departmental colleagues.

The lack of a significant relationship between the executive officer's self-expectation and the respondents' behaviors is probably due to the highly differentiated role assigned to the executive officer. That is, although the roles of most faculty members are likely to be highly similar, the role of the executive officer is an exception. The executive officer may be the one faculty member who is expected to spend a majority of his time and effort on administrative activities. Consequently, the executive officer expects of himself extremely different role behaviors than his colleagues expect of themselves.

The strong predictive power of the focal person's own expectations reinforces the concept of professional autonomy, so sacred to academicians. An alternative interpretation of these results might suggest that the behavior

of the faculty member is the independent variable, and that the self-expectation is largely a function of what the respondent does. Data from several other sources support the former interpretation. On other influence items, the faculty indicate that they have a considerable degree of influence over decisions concerning their research and teaching activities. Also important is the fact that 50% of the respondents were full professors. Both of these results suggest that the respondents do have a certain degree of power, which should allow them to structure their activities according to their own values.

Another notable result in the study is that there is a drop in the predictive power of self-expectations of departmental colleagues for the teaching and research areas when these expectations are placed in a multiple correlation analysis.[1] A possible explanation for the drop is that the effect of collegial expectations on a respondent's behavior is mediated by his own expectations. If the respondent's own expectations are given greatest weight, as they appear to be, then the expectations of departmental colleagues may influence his behavior only to the degree that such expectations coincide with his own. Subsequently performed partial correlation analyses support such a contention.

Personal and organizational predictors of conformity with self-expectations of departmental colleagues. Depending upon the measurement properties of the predictor variable (alienation, cosmopolitan-local dimension, status, or departmental size) either eta ratios and correlation coefficients

[1]Multiple correlation tables were constructed containing multiple R's, beta coefficients, and cross-validation multiple R's for each of the three task areas.

or one-way analyses of variance were performed to determine how each variable affects conformity with the self-expectations of department colleagues. In order to specify the direction of deviation of behaviors from collegial self-expectations, etas which measure curvilinear as well as linear relationships were included.

Alienation

Table 2 contains the etas and correlation coefficients between each of the three measures of alienation and degree of conformity by the respondents with the self-expectations of departmental colleagues. Hypothesis II predicts a curvilinear relationship between degree of alienation and amount of conformity, that is, faculty members who either spend more time or less time than their colleagues expect (of themselves) should have a lower alienation score than those faculty whose behavior does not deviate.

For teaching, both degree of restriction and social isolation are related in the hypothesized direction to conformity with the self-expectations of departmental colleagues. However, participation is related significantly and in the predicted direction only for sample I respondents.

For research, there exists little, if any, systematic relationship. For administrative activities, however, degree of participation is strongly related, in a negative direction, to behavioral conformity. The negative relationship is due in part to the fact that very few if any respondents conduct more administrative activities than what their colleagues expect of themselves, i.e., there are few if any positive deviance scores. Consequently, with only the left-hand side of the curve being tested, the results for participation do support Hypothesis II.

To what degree do the three measures of alienation overlap? The intercorrelations between all possible pairs of alienation range from .148

Table 2

Eta Ratios And Correlation Coefficients Between
Alienation And Behavioral Conformity
To Department Expectations

	POWERLESSNESS				SOCIAL ISOLATION	
	Participation		Restriction			
	eta	r	eta	r	eta	r
TEACHING						
Sample I	.365***	.293***	.424***	-.139	.376**	.129
Sample II	.198	.089	.387***	.053	.346**	-.001
RESEARCH						
Sample I	.256	.057	.222	-.162	.329*	.027
Sample II	.218	.216**	.191	-.122	.284	.006
ADMINISTRATION						
Sample I	.404***	-.367***			.055*	-.084
Sample II	.411***	-.320***			.324	-.083

NOTE: Each analysis based on an N = 145

*p < .10

**p < .05

***p < .01

to .480 (N = 145), with eight of the ten correlations reaching statistical significance. In general, the intercorrelations are not sufficiently high to permit substitution of any measure by another.

Alienation (as measured by degree of participation, restriction, and social isolation) appears to predict degree of behavioral deviance, particularly for the teaching area. Faculty who deviate little from the self-expectations of their colleagues appear to be more "socially isolated," perceive themselves to have less participation in departmental decision-making, and see the department as being more restrictive. Such results provide support for the contention of Gerson (1965) and Etzioni (1968) that alienated individuals are those who conform rigidly to societal norms.

Cosmopolitan-Local

Table 3 contains the results of the one-way analyses of variance which measure the relationship between the cosmopolitan-local dimension and behavioral conformity with the self-expectations of departmental colleagues (Hypothesis III). As noted earlier, locals were defined as high on number of university positions and low on number of outside professional positions (Hi Lo). Cosmopolitans were defined as low on number of university positions and high on number of professional positions (Lo Hi). Two other groups of faculty remain: Lo Lo and Hi Hi. The one-way analyses of variance test for differences across all four groups.

As Table 3 reveals, only for administrative activities are the F ratios significant for both samples. Subsequent t-tests for differences between the means of the Hi Lo and Lo Hi groups for administrative tasks, proved to be significant (Sample I: $t = 4.099$; $df = 54$; $p < .001$; Sample II: $t = 1.884$; $df = 50$; $p < .10$). The direction of the differences between the means for both

Table 3

Analyses of Variance of Role Conformity to Departmental Expectations as a Function of Cosmopolitan-Local Dimension

	df	MS	F
Teaching			
Sample I			
Between	3	2033.181	4.585**
Within	141	443.467	
Sample II			
Between	3	658.024	1.325
Within	141	496.459	
Research			
Sample I			
Between	3	1272.927	3.041*
Within	141	418.614	
Sample II			
Between	3	407.997	.791
Within	141	515.717	
Administration			
Sample I			
Between	3	1585.750	9.760**
Within	141	162.481	
Sample II			
Between	3	1421.207	6.169**
Within	141	230.381	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .005$

samples was opposite of that predicted, that is, the local-oriented faculty members deviated significantly more from their colleagues' self-expectations than did the cosmopolitans.

As seen in Table 3, for sample I respondents significant F ratios were obtained for teaching and research. Subsequent t-tests which tested for significant differences between locals and cosmopolitans resulted in significant t-ratios for research only. Locals appear to spend less time on research than their colleagues expect of themselves.

The unexpected results for the cosmopolitan-local dimension may give rise to questions concerning the validity of the behavioral measures used. An examination of the empirical networks for the measures of the cosmopolitan-local identities is useful in answering such questions. The number of positions held by an individual outside the university does predict positively the desirability of the first jobs his Ph.D. graduates obtain and the quality and quantity measures of his journal articles. The number of positions held in the university relates positively to the degree of perceived participation and to percent of time spent on administration. In short, the measures do tap the cosmopolitan-local dimension, as conceptualized by Gouldner and others.

The significant differences were all in the opposite direction of that predicted. That is, the locals deviated more from the "norm" than did the cosmopolitans. This result may occur because the average faculty member in the university studied may be a cosmopolitan. In contrast, Gouldner utilized faculty at a small, liberal arts college, in which the prevailing norms were local-oriented. Given these different populations of faculty members, it is not surprising that the locals in the present study were the deviants.

Status

Hypothesis IV relates status to conformity. In our analysis, however, only one of the six F ratios computed (research task; sample II) approached significance. In short, Hypothesis IV was not empirically validated.

The generally nonsignificant relationships which were found between rank and behavioral conformity may lead one to suspect the adequacy of rank as a measure of status. Caplow & McGee (1958) have suggested that two status systems exist for academicians--one based on formal rank and the other based on professional reputation or prestige. The latter form is probably more important, particularly in "cosmopolitan" oriented departments. In investigating the empirical network surrounding rank, it was found that rank relates significantly ($p < .05$) and positively with number of positions outside the university, percent self-influence in determining research goals, and number as well as quality of journal articles. In short, rank is an appropriate measure of status, and the dual set of status systems posited by Caplow & McGee does not appear to exist in the departments studied.

Departmental Size

The results of the final predictor of behavioral conformity, departmental size, are contained in Table 4. Hypothesis V suggests a curvilinear relationship (U shaped), in which faculty from larger departments were predicted to deviate (in either direction) more from their colleagues' self-expectations than faculty from small departments. For teaching, departmental size is significantly related to behavioral conformity for both samples. For sample I, examination of the mean scores suggests a negative relationship; however, for sample II, the relationship is curvilinear and as predicted. The relationships in Table 4 for the research and administrative activities

Table 4

Eta Ratios and Correlation Coefficients Relating Departmental Size to Behavioral Conformity to Departmental Expectations

	Departmental Size	
	Eta	r
Teaching		
Sample I	.417**	-.188*
Sample II	.531**	.018
Research		
Sample I	.273	.155
Sample II	.218	.019
Administration		
Sample I	.756**	.118
Sample II	.291	.023

Note: Each analysis based on an $N \cong 145$

*$p < .05$

**$p < .005$

are nonsignificant, with the exception of sample I (administration).

The results of the analyses treating the effects of departmental size on behavioral conformity are inconclusive. For teaching, significant relationships were obtained; the direction of the relationships, however, differs across the two samples. The significant relationship for administration (sample I) may be due to the fact that larger departments have a staff of administrators, thus allowing many faculty members to be relieved of administrative duties.

In summary, three of the four predictors (alienation, cosmopolitan-local, size) appear to be significantly related to behavioral conformity with the self-expectation of departmental colleagues for one or more task areas.

Implications for Role Theory

The results lend support to a basic assumption of role theory--that the shared values and expectations of organizational members predict their own as well as others' behavior. The results also support the use of multiple groups of role senders. That is, it appears that role senders can be divided into several groups, with each group sending a somewhat unique message to the focal person. The present study suggests that the expectations of the formal organization and the focal member's own expectations are somewhat independent predictors of role behavior, whereas self-expectations of departmental colleagues are somewhat subsumed by the focal person's own expectations. Whether such relationships exist for members of other types of organizations might be determined by future research.

The contention of Katz & Kahn that "contextual" variables intervene in the role episode has also been supported. Several individual factors and one organizational variable were shown to relate systematically to the degree of conformity of behavior with the self-expectations of departmental colleagues.

The results of the analyses treating the organizational variable, i.e., departmental size, suggest that Katz & Kahn should assign a more central role to organizational variables in their theory.

Implications for Understanding of Faculty Behavior

Any form of generalization of the results of this study to other faculty should be made with caution. The present study was not intended to cover a broad, nationwide sample of faculty. The study concentrated rather on the empirical testing of a wide range of theoretical concepts on faculty at one institution. Nevertheless, the results may be suggestive for other established faculty members employed by large public universities in the United States.

There appear to be two modes of influence operating on faculty. There is evidence for the bureaucratic form of influence which operates through formal organizational requirements (Clark, 1963). A parallel mode is that of collegial or community influence, whereby the faculty member's own values and those of his colleagues act to predict his behavior. The two modes do not appear to contradict one another; rather, they complement each other.

An appropriate topic for future research would be clarification of the mechanisms involved in the aforementioned influence processes. For example, a specification of the organizational, interpersonal and individual variables which mediate the effect of the university's expectations on the faculty would be most useful.

A slight modification of the community mode of influence (Anderson, 1963) appears appropriate. Such influence is hypothesized as operating through informal communal norms. The data from the present study indicate significant relationships between the self-expectations of his departmental colleagues and

the role behavior of the faculty member. However, the effect of such communal values on the respondent's behavior is also shown to be mediated by the respondent's own values. That is, the faculty member's own expectations appear to be determined somewhat independently of those of his departmental colleagues, and they appear to be the more important predictor of his behavior. Further research should be conducted to determine the antecedents of such expectations. For example, are the expectations of a faculty member influenced greatly by the expectations or demands of the particular department or university by which he is employed, or are his expectations formed early in his career and his subsequent selection of academic departments limited to those whose expectations coincide with his own?

The cosmopolitan-local dimension, frequently utilized in the literature on higher education, has been shown to predict behavioral conformity with collegial self-expectations for the administrative task area in the present study. Although Gouldner spoke of cosmopolitans as departmental deviants, the present study suggests that at large, graduate-oriented universities, cosmopolitans may be in the majority and may set group norms. The fact that a cosmopolitan orientation may be the norm rather than the exception in a given department could have important implications for the functioning of the department within the context of the larger organization. The stage might be set for a basic conflict between member and organizational goals.

REFERENCES

Allen, V. L.
1965 "Situational factors in conformity." In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology, 2. New York: Academic Press.

Anderson, G. L.
1963 "The organizational character of American colleges and universities." In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.) The study of academic adimintration. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Bennis, W. G., et al.
1958 "Reference groups and loyalties in the out-patient department." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2: 481-500.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S.
1961 "The experimental investigation of interpersonal influence." In A. D. Biderman & H. Zimmer (Eds.) The manipulation of human behavior. New York: Wiley.

Caplow, T. & R. J. McGee
1958 The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books.

Clark, B. R.
1963 "Faculty organization and authority." In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.) The study of acadmic administration. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission of Higher Edcuation.

Dean, D. G.
1961 "Alienation: its meaning and measurement." American Sociological Review, 26: 753-758.

DeVries, D. L.
1970 The relationship of departmental and personal role expectations to the role behviors of university faculty members. Unpublished dissertation, University of Illinois.

Dykes, A. R.
1967 Faculty participation in academic decision making: report of a study. Unpublished paper, University of Illinois.

Etzioni, A.
1968 The Active Society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Fromm, E.
1941 Escape from Freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Gerson, W. M.
1965 "Alienation in mass society: some causes and responses." Sociology and Social Research, 49: 143-151.

Goss, Mary E. W.
1961 "Influence and authority among physicians in an out-patient clinic." American Sociological Review, 26: 39-50.

Gouldner, A. W.
1957 "Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles I." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2: 444-480.

Gross, N. C., W. S. Mason & A. W. McEachern
1958 Explorations in role analysis: studies of the school superintendency role. New York: Wiley.

Hill, H. W. & W. L. French
1967 "Perceptions of the power of departmental chairmen by professors." Administrative Science Quarterly, 11: 548-574.

Hollander, E. P.
1967 Principles and methods of social psychology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Katz, D. & R. L. Kahn
1966 The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.

Marcson, S.
1960 The scientist in American industry. New York: Harper.

Martin, W. B.
1969 Conformity: standards and change in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, W. R.
1965 "Field methods in the study of organizations." In J. G. March (Ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Udy, S. H. Jr.
1965 "The comparative analysis of organizations." In J. G. March (Ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand-McNally.