DISSERTATION

PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN IN-HOUSE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR NEW MID-LEVEL LEADERS AT DEVRY UNIVERSITY

Submitted by

Catherine J. Carter

School of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2005

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

May 11, 2005

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE DISSERTATION PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION BY CATHERINE J. CARTER ENTITLED PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN IN-HOUSE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR NEW MID-LEVEL LEADERS AT DEVRY UNIVERSITY BE ACCEPTED AS FULLFILING IN PART REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

Committee on Graduate Work

Patrick Mayers
PATRICK MAYERS

Clifford P. Horbon

George A. Morgan
Co-Adviser George Morgan

Timothy Gray Davis
Adviser Timothy G. Davis

Director Rich Gras kamp

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN IN-HOUSE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR NEW MID-LEVEL LEADERS AT DEVRY UNIVERSITY

The role of the mid-level academic administrator is one that is constantly expanding and evolving to meet the challenges faced by higher education institutions. Today's colleges and universities face a plethora of issues ranging from increased demands by traditional and non-traditional students to provide varied and alternative course delivery methods, implementation of new technologies to enhance student learning, faculty issues, budgetary constraints, and increased competition from other institutions leading to decreasing enrollments. Key to meeting these challenges is the mid-level academic administrator.

A growing body of literature recognizes the contributions of mid-level academic administrators to the success of the institution. The literature also indicates that the majority of these individuals receive little or no formal training to assist them in meeting the responsibilities and demands of their position. As a result, they are subject to occurrences of role conflict and role ambiguity. A number of programs, however, have been implemented to address these issues. One such program is DeVry University's New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP).

This study examines the effectiveness of the NALOP program from the participants' perspectives immediately after completing the program. Data immediately

following the program were analyzed regarding the content, delivery, and materials presented. Participants' perceptions regarding the most useful aspects of the program, least useful aspects of the program, and feelings of confidence in performing as a mid-level administrator after completing the program were analyzed. Results indicated participants were satisfied with the workshop content, delivery, and materials and reported increased feelings of confidence in performing as mid-level administrators.

A follow-up questionnaire was sent to the 112 NALOP participants 9 to 40 months after they attended the NALOP workshops. Questionnaires were received from 44 attendees, or a 39% response rate. Results of the data analysis indicated participants felt some degree of role conflict, a low degree of role ambiguity, a medium to high degree of understanding NALOP concepts, and a medium degree of ability to apply NALOP concepts. The results revealed no significant differences between genders, prior employment positions, prior employment affiliations, time elapsed between assuming responsibilities and workshop participation, or workshop formats on role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, NALOP application scores, or NALOP understanding scores.

Catherine J. Carter
School of Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523
Summer 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Timothy G. Davies, Dr. Clifford Harbour, Dr. Patrick Mayers, and Dr. George Morgan for their help and support. I especially wish to thank Dr. Morgan for his expertise, responsiveness, and kindness in shepherding me through the dissertation process. I also wish to extend a special thanks to Dr. Mayers for his suggestion of a dissertation topic and his help in the data collection process.

I extend my gratitude to the leaders of DeVry University who brought the Colorado State University Ph.D. program to the Chicago area campuses and made it possible for me to pursue this degree.

My deepest thanks goes to my husband, Don, and my children, Leanne and Tom, without whose love, encouragement, and support I would not have been able to complete this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Since its inception at the turn of the 20th century, the department chair has played a pivotal role in higher education. Initially created to protect faculty interests within their department, the chair's position has since evolved to become a crucial link between the department's faculty, students, other academic departments, and higher-level administrators including deans and presidents. Booth (1982) contends that the department chair is the only position in the institution that "attempts to interpret the department to the administration and the administration to the faculty" (p. 4). A growing body of literature, both historical and contemporary, describing the roles and responsibilities of the department chair has been produced (Dyer & Miller, 1999; Jennerich, 1981; Seagren, Creswell, & Wheeler, 1993; Tucker 1993).

The term "chair" or "chairperson" is used frequently in the literature when describing the person or the position responsible for performing these academic or administrative roles in higher education institutions (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Booth, 1982; Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, 1990; Dyer & Miller, 1999; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999; Seagren et al., 1993; Tucker, 1993; Wheeler, 2002). Other researchers refer to these functions as being fulfilled by the "department head," "division head" (Diamond, 1996; Fogg, 2001; Grau, 1997; Grumbles & Bregman, 1994; Murray & Murray, 1998; Simpson, 1984), "dean," "assistant dean," or "associate dean" (Hamilton, 2002; Murray & Murray, 1998; Pettitt, 1999). Likewise, in the for-profit higher education sector, these same roles and

responsibilities are performed by "deans" and "associate deans" (DeVry University, 2003; Ruch, 2001). These terms will be used interchangeably in this study to discuss the role of these mid-level academic administrators in post-secondary institutions.

The responsibilities of mid-level academic administrators at DeVry University, a for-profit higher educational institution, are similar to those of department chairs at other four-year educational institutions. These administrators at DeVry hold the title of dean or associate dean and select and evaluate faculty, determine and schedule course offerings, advise students, develop and implement long-range department goals and perform other department chair duties as identified by Carroll and Gmelch (1992). The main area of responsibility that differs between deans and associate deans at DeVry and chairs at non-profit institutions are in the areas relating to research related activities which are not part of DeVry's mission.

Two dimensions that typify the roles and responsibilities of the department chair are: (a) academic, and (b) administrative (Grumbles & Bregman, 1994). Duties such as teaching, advising, research, curriculum planning, and student and faculty development are part of the academic dimension. Department organization, short- and long-term goal setting, budget management, faculty recruitment and evaluation, record keeping, and communication to faculty regarding the mission and goals of the institution are part of the administrative dimension.

This position duality subjects department heads to role conflict and role ambiguity (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Carroll, 1991; Dyer & Miller, 1999; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Singleton, 1987). Conflicting loyalties to disparate external and internal department groups (e.g., upper-level administrators vs. students and faculty) can lead to role conflict

(Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak, 1986). According to Gmelch and Burns (1993), the administration and academic components that exist in a higher education institution are organized and operate differently. As a result, a "dynamic tension" is created between these two systems with the department head encountering the pressures and stresses of each.

Unclear or vague expectations regarding the functions and responsibilities of the department head position can lead to role ambiguity resulting in job-related stress (Singleton, 1987). Murray and Murray (1998) define role ambiguity as uncertainty regarding the functional boundaries of the organizational role. A chair experiencing role ambiguity may be unable to make what is normally considered a routine decision for the position and seek higher-level approval. Grau (1997) found a significant relationship between a lack of training prior to assuming the role of department chair and job-related stress. Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) noted that the lack of information regarding the "proper definition of the job, its goals and the permissible means for implementing them" (p. 94) is one of the main characteristics associated with role ambiguity.

Role conflict and role ambiguity can lead to increased levels of anxiety and stress and decreased job satisfaction (Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Murray & Murray, 1998). In U.S. colleges and universities, decreased job satisfaction positively correlates with voluntary turnover and is directly related to stress relating to role conflict or role ambiguity (Murray & Murray, 1998). The negative impact of turnover on the institution is substantial leading to increased costs in the recruitment and selection process, a

disruption of day-to-day activities, demoralization of remaining employees, and missed opportunities to pursue the growth strategies of the organization (Cano & Miller, 1992).

The role of the department head has been expanding in importance and complexity over the past decade (Diamond, 1996; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Leaming, 1998; Lucas, 2000; Seagren et al., 1993; Spangler, 1999). There is considerable concern that little or no training is provided to these individuals prior to assuming their duties (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Diamond, 1996; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Leaming, 1998; Seagren & Dockery 1996; Seagren et. al., 1993; Spangler, 1999). Seagren and Dockery (1996) estimated that 5,000 new chairs would assume chair responsibilities by the year 2000 and professional development is required for the 12,500 individuals currently holding chair positions at the nation's community colleges. Gmelch and Burns (1993) estimated that one-quarter of the nearly 80,000 department chairs are replaced each year

With the expected influx of new chairs and the expected replacement of departing chairs, the question becomes, How can the institution provide adequate support and preparation for those individuals who are expected to successfully perform the duties and responsibilities associated with the department chair role? A number of classic texts regarding the roles and responsibilities of the department head are extent (e. g., Creswell et al., 1990; Leaming, 1998; Lucas, 2000; Tucker, 1993); and, while individual reading of these texts is a valid way to acquire knowledge regarding newly acquired job responsibilities, it is a passive learning mode. McDade (1987) suggests the more active alternative of a professional development program to increase knowledge, enhance management and leadership skills, broaden perspectives, and stimulate creativity. Embracing that philosophy, a number of colleges and universities created programs that

provide orientation and development programs for its mid-level administrators. These programs range from those that are international in scope to those that provide institution-specific programs.

Management and administrative issues such as university policies and practices and budgeting and finance are provided at annual information/orientation sessions held by the University of Minnesota and Stanford University (American Council of Education, 2004). The Los Angeles Community College's Administrative Leadership Institute provides formal programs and peer interaction to build both administrative and leadership skills for its academic leaders including department chairs (Spangler, 1999). The Chair Academy, an initiative of the Maricopa Community Colleges, provides a year-long, skills based leadership program that covers a variety of topics including transformational leadership, effective work teams, change management, and learner-centered organizations. It provides leadership training and development programs to postsecondary institutions worldwide (Filan, 1999). North Carolina community colleges collaborate with North Carolina State University to provide six hours of credit-earning training in leadership skills to chairs and potential chairs (Gillett-Karam, 1999).

DeVry University implemented the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP), a comprehensive program designed to prepare its academic leaders to function effectively in their jobs, to retain them in their positions, to prepare them for leadership roles, and to attract quality individuals to the position. This program is especially important to the university as it continues to expand its curricular offerings and the availability of its programs nationwide. Program components include an introduction to the culture of the organization, academic leadership, faculty leadership, program

development and management, student success, and operations (Devry University, 2003).

While the literature describes the activities and components of these and other similar programs, a search of the educational literature found no evidence regarding their effectiveness in providing academic administrators with the tools they need to successfully assume the roles and responsibilities of their position. McDade (1987) surveyed over 35 professional development programs designed to enhance the management and leadership skills of academic administrators including department chairs. National institutes and internships, administrative conferences, national association conventions, seminars, workshops, and meetings were examined. She concluded that the benefits of participating in these programs are apparent; however, evidence supporting the benefits is anecdotal rather than quantitative.

In order for chairs to be successful, they must understand their role in the institution and effectively perform their responsibilities. Training and professional development programs allow chairs to accomplish this. It is therefore critical to provide effective managerial and leadership training for department chairs and to quantify those results.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, the study examined participants' perceptions, immediately after training, of the effectiveness of the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) in preparing them to perform their duties as mid-level administrators. Second, the study analyzed participants' application and understanding of NALOP concepts that were presented during the workshops as well as

their perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity 9 to 40 months after the training sessions.

Using the evaluations immediately after training, the research questions used to guide this study were:

1. How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials after each of the workshops?
2. How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of the workshops?
3. How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of the workshops?
4. How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the workshops?
5. What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide?
6. How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials for each workshop module?
7. How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of each workshop module?
8. How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of each workshop module?
9. How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing each workshop module?
10. What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide for each workshop module?

Using a follow-up questionnaire 9 to 40 months after the training, the research questions used to guide this study were:

11. Is there a difference between the two levels of gender (male and female) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

12. Is there a difference between the four levels of prior employment *position* (academic administrator, non-academic administrator, faculty, and other) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

13. Is there a difference between the three levels of prior employment *affiliation* (non-profit higher education institution, for-profit higher education institution including DeVry, and industry) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

14. Is there a difference between the three levels of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation (less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

15. Is there a difference between the two levels of program format of NALOP sessions (5 day in-person and 3 day in-person plus an online component) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions of terms were used.

***Deans, associate deans, chairs, academic administrators, department chairs, department heads, division chairs, mid-level administrators*:** These terms are used interchangeably to describe the role of the individual who typically heads a department or division within a higher educational institution who is responsible for the activities of that department or division. The function of this position acts as an intermediary between the administrative and academic systems that operate within a college or university. The terms dean and associate dean at DeVry University are used for the position commonly designated as "chair" in non-profit colleges and universities.

For-profit colleges and universities. Regionally accredited, degree-granting institutions of higher education, such as DeVry University, that offer programs at the

associate, baccalaureate, and master's degree levels. These institutions are owned and operated by publicly traded for-profit corporations (Ruch, 2001).

***NALOP*:** New Academic Leaders Orientation Program. A program designed to prepare and develop mid-level administrators (deans and associate deans) to assume and perform their roles and responsibilities at DeVry University.

Non-profit colleges and universities: Public and private higher education institutions including 2 year and 4 year institutions.

Role: A set of behaviors or potential activities that are performed by any person who holds a particular office, or position, within an organization (Kahn et al., 1964).

***Role Ambiguity*:** Occurs when inadequate or insufficient information is given as to what is expected of an individual occupying a role. Role ambiguity was measured by the Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman Instrument (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970) in this study.

***Role Conflict*:** Results when differing role expectations occur so that compliance with one makes compliance with the other more difficult (Kahn et al., 1964). Role conflict was measured by the Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman Instrument (Rizzo et al., 1970) in this study.

Role expectations: The beliefs and attitudes held by oneself or others regarding one's behavior and actions when occupying a role (Kahn et al., 1964).

Delimitations

This study was delimited to deans, associate deans, directors, and other administrators employed on DeVry University campuses who participated in NALOP workshops. The study was further delimited to those participants who attended the six

NALOP workshops conducted during May 2001, August 2001, November 2001, May 2002 December 2002, and December 2003.

Limitations and Assumptions

The data for this study were gathered using two self-reporting questionnaires. An assumption was made that respondents answered in an objective and unbiased manner. This type of instrument raises issues regarding the "filtering" of responses through participants' eyes so that reported answers are socially desirable and acceptable thus raising concerns about the validity of self-reporting instruments (Gliner & Morgan, 2000).

Significance of the Study

A number of training programs exist for the purpose of providing mid-level administrators at higher education institutions with the management and leadership skills necessary to perform their roles and responsibilities. The literature surrounding these programs is descriptive in nature focusing on the development and implementation of the program, the program content, and the number of attendees completing the program. A search of the educational literature found no empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of such programs in imparting the requisite skills to participants to function effectively in their jobs.

This study contributes to the overall knowledge regarding mid-level academic administrators and their management and leadership skill development activities. It analyzes the program's effectiveness from the learning and utilization perspective of the participants. Measures of the effectiveness of a training program include participants' reaction to the program, learning and applying the stated principles and objectives

presented in the program, or the perception that they learned and applied the stated principles and objectives (Kirkpatrick, 1998). This study, therefore, provides practical implications to DeVry University in enhancing and refining NALOP. It also provides guidance to other higher education institutions in developing and implementing training programs for mid-level administrators.

Researcher Perspective

The researcher's perspective toward the concept of training sessions is positive. Personal experience in assuming administrative management positions without prior training or skill in certain areas results in my having a presupposition as to the importance and benefits of formalized training. Prior to my current position as Library Director at DeVry, I held a number of administrative positions in a corporate environment. I was unfamiliar with the collegial environment in academe, especially the relationship between the administration and faculty. I believe participation in a NALOP training course would have benefited me in hastening my understanding of my role in the university and the expectations regarding that role as it related to faculty, other academic administrators, and students.

Some time after starting at DeVry, I observed two separate NALOP sessions, thus, my own observations and interactions with presenters, participants, program content, delivery, and materials may unintentionally affect the analysis and interpretation of results. I have experienced positive working relationships with a number of NALOP presenters which could affect my concurrence with the materials they presented or their presentation skills. Informal comments I may have overheard from the participants could possibly lead to a more or less favorable interpretation of the data. Lastly, my own

viewpoint regarding the usefulness of materials in my position at DeVry could be reflected in the analysis and interpretation of the data.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review examines the importance of the chair position in higher education, the multiple roles and responsibilities of the chair, and the constructs of role conflict and role ambiguity and their effects on academic department leaders including likely causes for these phenomena. It explores the need for training for those individuals in the chair position and identifies some existing chair training programs.

Importance of the Chair Position

The role of the academic or department chair is one that is complex in nature and often filled with ambiguity and conflict yet is vital to the well being of the educational institution. The position of department chair first appeared around 1900 when some colleges, such as Harvard, became large enough to create separate specialized departments (Fife, 1982; Tucker, 1993). In order to protect faculty interests, a member of the department was elected to act as a representative to the administration and to other departments. Since then, the role of the chair has evolved to become an important link between the administration, faculty, and students (Seagren, Creswell, & Wheeler, 1993). As the link between the administration and faculty, the chair must interpret, communicate, and implement campus policy and the goals of the institution's mission while at the same time articulate the needs of the faculty and the associated values of the academic department to the central administration (Booth, 1982; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Seedorf & Gmelch, 1989; Tucker, 1993). Merely forwarding information between the two constituencies is not sufficient; the chair must accurately reflect the intent of each

group by connecting department objectives and values to the broader mission of the institution (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999).

Chairs also act as the link in representing and responding to student interests (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Green, 2000; Tucker, 1993). An ever-increasing number of non-traditional students who work, commute, and pursue their degrees on a part-time basis require flexibility in course offerings and scheduling. These needs must be balanced against faculty workloads and scheduling issues (Pappas, 1989).

The term "chair" or "chairperson" is used frequently in the literature when describing the person or the position responsible for performing these academic or administrative roles in higher education institutions (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Booth, 1982; Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, 1990; Dyer & Miller, 1999; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Hecht et al., 1999; Seagren et al., 1993; Tucker, 1993; Wheeler, 2002). Other researchers refer to these functions as being fulfilled by the "department head," "division head" (Diamond, 1996; Fogg, 2001; Grau, 1997; Grumbles & Bregman, 1994; Murray & Murray, 1998; Simpson, 1984), "dean," "assistant dean," or "associate dean" (Hamilton, 2002; Murray & Murray, 1998; Pettitt, 1999). Likewise, in the for-profit higher education sector, these same roles and responsibilities are performed by "deans" and "associate deans" (DeVry University, 2003; Ruch, 2001). These terms will be used interchangeably in this study to discuss the role of these mid-level academic administrators in post-secondary institutions.

The organizational unit the mid-level administrator is responsible for varies by type of institution. In non-profit four-year colleges and universities, faculty are grouped by disciplinary departments headed by a departmental chairperson while in community

colleges, faculty are grouped within functional divisions that may be led by division chairpersons, or by both division and department chairpersons (Murray & Murray, 1998; Tucker, 1993).

The roles and responsibilities of the academic deans and associate deans at DeVry are similar to those of chairs in non-profit educational institutions. They are responsible for an academic program or curricular area rather than a department or division; however, they perform similar functions in hiring part-time and full-time faculty, developing and evaluating faculty, scheduling course offerings, budgeting, advising students, providing quality instruction, and developing the curriculum (DeVry University, 2003). A comparison of the 26 chair duties identified by Caroll and Gmelch (1992) and the duties of academic deans at DeVry University reveals that only five duties are not part of their responsibilities (DeVry University, 2003; Ruch, 2001). These include: encourage faculty research and publication, maintain research programs, obtain resources for personal research, obtain and manage external funds (grants, contracts), and select and supervise graduate students. These five duties focus on research related activities that are not part of DeVry's mission.

One significant difference between the deans at DeVry and chairs at some other post-secondary institutions is how they assume their positions. At DeVry, deans are hired specifically for the position of academic dean or associate dean. They may come from the ranks of faculty, from the corporate world, or other post-secondary institutions, but these positions are permanent administrative positions (Ruch, 2001). In non-profit colleges and universities, chairs may assume their roles through faculty election, appointment by the dean, jointly arrived at decisions by the faculty and dean, or rotation

within the department (Byrne, 1997; Carroll, 1991; Tucker, 1993). In many instances, these chairs retain their faculty status and after serving in the chair position, return to the faculty ranks. Another individual then assumes the chair position.

Another significant difference is related to basic cultural differences between for-profit higher-education institutions and non-profit colleges and universities. In his book *Higher Ed, Inc.*, Richard Ruch (2001) describes the organizational structure, operations, culture, and educational philosophy of for-profit colleges and universities and how they differ from the non-profit higher educational institutions. He refers to the dual nature of the for-profits—part business and part academic institution. He notes that for-profit colleges and universities use the language of business when describing organizational activity and to measure results unlike non-profits which tend to use the language of academics. When discussing academics, however, the language used by the for-profits is clearly academic.

Responsibilities and Role of the Chair

The list of chair duties and responsibilities is exhaustive. Studies conducted at the University of Nebraska found ninety-seven activities for which chairs are responsible (Creswell et al., 1990). Tucker (1993) identified fifty-four tasks and duties that are the responsibilities of chairs while a study conducted at nine universities in Australia identified forty separate functions (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). Many colleges and universities simply provide a laundry list of the chair's duties and responsibilities such as supervising curriculum, distributing teaching loads, budgeting, and preparing faculty evaluations (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). Pettitt (1999) synthesizes these myriad tasks and activities into seven general categories: (a) curriculum and instruction, (b) internal

administration, (c) professional development, (d) human relations and personnel administration, (e) budget planning development and control, (f) student relations, and (g) external administration (e.g., representing the department to the public).

Carroll and Gmelch (1992) contend that merely identifying and listing the myriad duties that are the chairs' responsibilities do not provide a meaningful description of the multiplicity of roles that chairs perform. In order to achieve results in performing these activities, chairs must assume those roles that are most effective in accomplishing their objectives. Building on the previous work of McLaughlin, Montgomery and Malpass (1975) and Smart and Elton (1976), Carroll and Gmelch (1992) used factor analysis to reduce twenty-six identifiable tasks that chairs performed into four main role areas: (a) Faculty Developer, (b) Scholar, (c) Manager, and (d) Leader.

The Faculty Developer role involves recruitment, selection, and evaluation of faculty. Carroll (1991) contended that recommending faculty for reappointment, promotion, and tenure is a major chair responsibility as well. Also included is providing leadership to enhance faculty morale and promote professional development. Chairs view this role as their most important (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). This role corresponds to the academic role identified by McLaughlin et al. (1975) and the faculty role as designated by Smart and Elton (1976).

The role of Scholar includes teaching or maintaining an active research program, seeking grants, or keeping current in an academic discipline. This is the role that is least often assumed as activities associated with the three other roles take precedence. Up to eighty-six percent of department chairs significantly reduce their scholarly pursuits or give them up altogether while serving as chair (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). The Scholar

designation may not be strictly applicable to the community college (Tucker, 1993) or for-profit university (Ruch, 2001) as neither support research programs, however, chairs in these institutions must keep current in their respective academic disciplines in order to perform curriculum related duties.

The Manager role is often the most disliked role that chairs must assume (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). In this role, chairs prepare and oversee budgeting activities, maintain department records, supervise non-academic staff, and assign duties to faculty. The majority of the chairs' workweek is spent on these departmental tasks (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993) with chairs being able to exert little control over the time spent on these duties (McLaughlin et al., 1975).

Chairs assuming the Leadership role engage in developing long-range goals and vision for the department, plan, evaluate, and review curriculum and instruction, and conduct department meetings. They provide external leadership for their departments by coordinating department activities with other departments, representing their department at professional meetings, and participating on college and university committees. Chairs like this role because of the challenges it provides and the opportunity to influence and shape the direction in which the college or university is headed (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993).

Manager Versus Leader Role

The distinction between managing and leading is subject to varying interpretations. One such interpretation is that leading and managing are substantially different and mutually exclusive activities while others contend that managing and leading are two distinct but complementary processes (Yukl, 2002). Both activities are

essential to the success of the organization (Kotter 2001, Yukl, 2002). Yamasaki (1999) coined the term "managerial leader" to describe the dual management and leadership roles that mid-level administrators in higher education perform. Chairs function as managers when they focus on "structures, policies, processes, and paperwork" and as leaders when they focus on "mission, vision, engagement, and adaptability" (Bowman, 2002, p. 159).

In order to incorporate leadership qualities into the managerial role, it is necessary to examine what is meant by leadership and leadership styles. This can be a daunting task as a review of the literature indicates thousands of books and articles have been written about this topic over the years. As a result, there is no consensus as to how to define or measure leadership (Yukl, 2002).

Tucker (1993) categorizes leadership style as being either directive or supportive. The directive chair provides detailed directions for what is to be done and how it is to be accomplished. Chairs can also be non-directive; after explaining what is to be done, little or no communication occurs until the task is completed. Chairs who adopt a supportive leadership style encourage two-way communication, offer encouragement and support, and exhibit concern for the personal and professional welfare of each faculty member. Nonsupportive chairpersons offer little in the way of communication or encouragement to faculty members.

After surveying hundreds of middle- and senior-level mangers in the private and public sector, community leaders, church and government leaders, student leaders, and others, Kouzas and Posner (1995) developed five key leaderships behaviors: "challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, model the way, and encourage

the heart" (p. 9). They contend that through the adoption of these behaviors, leadership skills can be learned or further developed.

Matusek (1997) agrees that leadership skills can be taught and learned. Leaders can effect positive change through visioning, initiating, guiding, and encouraging. She presents a five step framework that can lead to effective leadership: (a) weaving a shared vision, (b) appreciating a kaleidoscope of views, (c) practicing effective communication, (d) deciding how to decide, and (e) creating the future. Spaid and Parsons (1999) found in their study of college administrators that the most important elements of leadership were promoting teamwork, listening, admitting and learning from mistakes, and serving as change agents. Comments made by participants in the Spaid and Parsons study regarding their approaches to leadership closely paralleled those outlined by Matusek.

Administrator Versus Faculty Role

The diverse and complex nature of the chair's role requires that he or she bridge or span the managerial and academic cores of the institution (Creswell et al., 1990; Gmelch & Burns, 1993). This is nowhere more apparent than when acting as both an administrator and faculty member. Carroll (1991) found that most chairs come from the ranks of faculty, see themselves as teachers and scholars, and view the chair position as a temporary appointment with the intention of returning to full-time faculty status or moving on to a higher administrative position. In his study of career paths of department chairs, he found that 65 percent of chairs returned to faculty status immediately from the chair position while 19 percent continued in an administrative position either as a chair or other administrator.

Chairs who are elected rather than appointed by the administration are dependent upon reelection by their colleagues to retain their positions (Fife, 1982). Consequently, they view themselves as faculty rather than as administrators and tend to represent faculty interests over the administration's. The administration's view, however, is that the chair is the frontline supervisor in faculty/administration matters and works directly with faculty to ensure organizational effectiveness and to implement the decisions of the administration (Fife, 1982).

Summary

The literature reveals that academic department chairs must fill a multiplicity of roles each having functional expectations associated with it and multiple activities that must be performed as part of each role. They must function as managers when overseeing operations of the department such as budgeting and scheduling class assignments, leaders when creating and implementing a vision for the department, faculty developers when enhancing faculty morale and promoting professional development, and scholars when teaching, maintaining active research programs, and keeping current in their academic discipline (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993).

The chair acts as a representative for his or her discipline and department, members of the department, the administration, the students, and the educational institution. Most often only one of these groups is represented at a time; however, occasionally, two or more must be represented at the same time even when they have conflicting objectives (Roach, 1976). Uncertain or unclear expectations as to how to perform each role can lead to role ambiguity while the duality of the chair's responsibilities in representing multiple constituencies can lead to role conflict (Burns &

Gmelch, 1992; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Grau, 1997; Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987).

Fife (1982) contends that this multi-dimensional position has the most role conflict and role ambiguity associated with it of all the administrative positions in higher education. The literature regarding the concepts of role ambiguity and role conflict and their effects on the chair are examined in subsequent sections. Likewise, the importance of training as a means of lessening occurrences of role ambiguity and role conflict is also explored.

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

The concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity and their effects on modern complex organizations have been studied extensively in the literature over the past four decades (Breaugh & Colihan, 1994; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Krayer, 1986; Van Sell, Brief, & Schuler, 1981). Beginning with the seminal work on the relationship of role conflict and role ambiguity to organizational stress (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964), research in this area focused primarily on business and industrial organizations (McBride, Munday, & Tunnell, 1992; Singleton, 1987). A number of studies, however, were concerned with the impact of role conflict and role ambiguity on educational organizations (Chieffo, 1991; Hamilton, 2002; McBride et al., 1992; Wolverton, Wolverton & Gmelch, 1999) especially regarding their effects on chairpersons (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Grau, 1997; Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987).

Kahn et al. (1964) define a role as a set of behaviors or potential activities that are performed by any person who holds a particular office, or position, within an

organization. There are numerous offices within an organization with whom the role holder interacts directly, less directly, or perhaps only remotely. These offices constitute a role set. The chairperson's role set includes upper level administrators, faculty, students, administrative assistants, other chairs, and other institutional administrators.

Relationships are built between individuals holding the same office or with others in the organizational system with whom they interact thus creating a set of role expectations regarding the individual's behavior when occupying the role (Kahn et al., 1964; Owens, 1998). For example, chairpersons expect certain behaviors from faculty and faculty have certain behavior expectations of chairpersons. Thus, when interacting in their respective roles, chairpersons and faculty have complementary role expectations (Owens, 1998). A role perception is the role holder's estimate of the role expectation that another has for him or her. A chairperson dealing with faculty members knows that the faculty members have some role expectations of the chairperson; the chairperson's estimate of that expectation is role perception (Owens, 1998).

Role Conflict

Members of a role set may hold different role expectations toward the role holder, or focal person, thus imposing pressure upon the role holder regarding her or his behavior. These conflicting expectations create a psychological conflict for the focal person (Kahn et al., 1964). Role conflict is defined then as "the simultaneous occurrence of two or more role expectations such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult" (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 204). Messages regarding expected behavior of the focal person are sent by the role sender.

Kahn et al. (1964) identified five types of role conflict. Intra-sender conflict occurs when messages from a single member of the role set are incompatible. Inter-sender conflict occurs when pressures of one role sender are in opposition with pressures form one or more other senders. Occurrences of inter-role conflict result from membership in one group which are in conflict with pressures stemming from membership in another group. Person-role conflict develops when the focal role receives expectations that are incompatible with his or her value system. Role overload results from expectations that the focal person perform too many compatible tasks in too short a period of time.

The Kahn et al. (1964) classification scheme has been used by other researchers in their studies of role conflict and ambiguity. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) used the five types of role conflict identified by Kahn et al. (1964) to develop their questionnaire measuring those constructs. During the past 30 years, the resulting instrument has been widely used in over 100 individual studies in business, health, manufacturing, and education to analyze the effects of role conflict and role ambiguity (Freeman & Coll, 1997; Sheperd & Fine, 1994). Modifications of the Kahn et al. (1964) categories were used by Carroll (1974) and Gmelch and Torelli (1994) in their studies of educational administrators to measure the results of incompatible expectations between role sets.

The literature reveals that department chairs must fill a multiplicity of roles. They must function as managers when overseeing operations of the department such as budgeting and scheduling class assignments, leaders when creating and implementing a vision for the department, faculty developers when enhancing faculty morale and promoting professional development, and scholars when teaching, maintaining active

research programs, and keeping current in their academic discipline (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). In each role, the chair represents different constituencies (e.g., the administration, faculty, and students), each with differing demands and requirements. At times the requirements of one group are in direct conflict with those of another.

Each role carries differing expectations as to the behaviors, functions, and responsibilities of that role. Differing role expectations such that compliance with one is incompatible with compliance in another results in role conflict (Kahn et al., 1964). A number of studies have shown that the chair position is fraught with occurrences of role conflict resulting in dysfunctional outcomes such as increased stress, anxiety and tension, and decreased job satisfaction (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Carroll, 1974; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Grau, 1997; Maclin, 1995; Murray & Murray, 1998; Simpson, 1984; Singleton, 1987; Wood, 1992). Negative consequences directly affecting the organization include reduced organizational commitment resulting in a higher propensity to leave (Chieffo, 1991; Hamilton, 2002; McBride et. al., 1992; Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987), and lower confidence in superiors and in the organization as a whole (Kahn et. al., 1964). These findings lead to coping behaviors that are dysfunctional to both the individual and the organization (Owens, 1998; Rizzo et al., 1970).

Role Ambiguity

The focal person must have certain information in order to adequately perform the role expectations of his or her role set. Information regarding the rights, duties, and

responsibilities of the office as well as the appropriate activities and the best way to perform these activities are necessary for adequate role performance (Kahn et al., 1964). Additionally, the focal person needs certain information for her or his personal comfort and psychological return. Information regarding rewards and punishments for certain kinds of behavior, as well as the likelihood of their occurrence, and the kinds of behaviors that will be satisfying or frustrating are necessary to adequately meet her or his personal needs and values (Kahn et al., 1964).

Role ambiguity occurs when the quality and quantity of information necessary for a person to adequately perform in his or her position is lacking (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Torelli, 1994; Grau, 1997; Krayer, 1986; Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987; Wolverton et al., 1999). Two types of role ambiguity have been identified: (a) task related, and (b) behavior, or social-psychological related. Task related role ambiguity occurs when one is uncertain or unclear as to the required duties and goals of one's position and the permissible means of achieving them. Behavior, or social-psychological related role ambiguity occurs when one is uncertain or unclear as to one's place in the organization, relationships with others in the organization, or the appropriateness or consequences of one's actions in achieving personal goals (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Hamilton, 2002; Kahn et al., 1964; Singleton, 1987). Rizzo et al. (1970) elaborate on this concept by defining role ambiguity in terms of "the predictability of the outcome or response to one's behavior, and the existence or clarity of behavioral requirements that would serve to guide behavior and provide knowledge that the behavior is appropriate" (p.155).

The nature and structure of the modern organization contributes to an individual's feelings of role ambiguity (Van Sell et al., 1981). The modern organization operates in an environment of rapid change, one that may require its employees to adapt to new technologies resulting in uncertainty in not knowing how to accomplish new or different tasks. Reorganizations including mergers and downsizing impact an individual's understanding and expectations regarding the new role and how it may differ from the previous one (Jimmieson, Terry, & Callan, 2004; Probst, 2003). The structure of the organization itself may be a source of role ambiguity. Joyce (1986) found that implementing a matrix structure in an organization increased the level of employee role ambiguity.

The negative aspects associated with role ambiguity bear similarities to those of role conflict (e.g., decreased job satisfaction (Coll & Rice, 1990; Murray & Murray 1998; Singleton, 1987), increased anxiety (Singleton, 1987) and stress (Gmelch, & Torelli, 1994; Grau, 1997), propensity to leave (Hamilton, 2002, McBride et al., 1992; Murray & Murray, 1998), and burn out (Gmelch & Torelli, 1994)). In addition, Kahn et al. (1964) found that individuals experiencing role ambiguity exhibit feelings of low self-confidence and a high sense of futility often resulting in lower productivity.

Effects of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity on the Department Chair

The multifaceted roles and expectations associated with the position of department chair leaves its role holders vulnerable to occurrences of role conflict and role ambiguity. Burns and Gmelch (1992) cite a lack of professional training, mentoring, or socialization of chairs to prepare them for their administrative duties resulting in role ambiguity which is associated with uncertainty in identifying what tasks must be

performed, how to perform them, and how to prioritize competing tasks. Studies by Grau (1997) and Singleton (1987) support these findings.

The paradoxical nature of the chairperson's role often results in role conflict. On the one hand, the chairperson is a colleague to faculty members and, on the other, represents the administration (Seedorf & Gmelch, 1989; Tucker, 1993). Booth (1982) described the academic chair as holding the only office "that attempts to interpret the department to the administration and the administration to the faculty" (p. 4). Gmelch and Burns (1993) liken the chair to the Roman god, Janus, who faces in opposite directions, to indicate the duality of the chair's responsibilities in performing not only as an administrator but as a faculty member as well. Chairs must resolve conflicts both horizontally (within the department) and vertically (between the department and higher administration) (Seagren et al., 1993). Filan (1999) observed that chairs are placed in a precarious position as middle manager-administrators and faculty member-advocates. Chairs who promote institutional perspectives are marked as selling out to the administration while those who favor faculty interests are perceived as incapable of making tough decisions or advocating changes or improvements to established curriculum, teaching or related policies. The ambiguous in-between status of chairs, as being neither fish nor fowl, provides no clear indication about how they should act and be perceived (Seagren et al., 1993). Each role has functional expectations associated with it and the chair must fulfill multiple activities as part of each role.

The organizational structure of higher educational institutions may well be a source of potential role conflict and role ambiguity. The administrative and academic components of the university or college are organized and operate quite differently

wherein the academic functions of teaching and research operate in a "loosely-coupled" environment while the administrative functions exhibit more tightly controlled characteristics (Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Owens, 1998). The academic model that is the basis for the departmental structure relies on shared activity in decision making and peer control over department issues. The administrative model relies on efficiency and a top-down pattern of decision-making (Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak, 1986; Seagren et al., 1993). The resulting dynamic tension inherent in the operation of the institution by these two viewpoints adds to the difficulty of mediating between the administration and faculty (Gmelch & Burns, 1993).

While the vast majority of research dealing with role conflict and role ambiguity focused on industry-related areas (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Singleton, 1987), a number of studies focused on higher education, and the department chair in particular. The chair role is subject to unclear or vague expectations regarding its functions and responsibilities (Singleton, 1987) and conflicting loyalties to disparate external and internal department groups (e.g., upper-level administrators, faculty and students (Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak, 1986)) thus making chairs likely candidates to experience occurrences of role ambiguity and role conflict. Studies regarding the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on department chairs indicate this is the case and can be grouped into three main categories: (a) occupational stressors including stress, anxiety, and tension (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Grau, 1997; Maclin, 1995; Wood, 1992); (b) propensity to leave the institution or position (Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987); and (c) job satisfaction (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Simpson, 1984). The research

indicates that both role conflict and role ambiguity correlate with increased stress, an increased propensity to leave the position or institution, and decreased job satisfaction.

Occupational Stressors. Studies by Grau (1997), Maclin (1995), and Wood (1992) found a significant relationship between job-related stress, role ambiguity, and a lack of training prior to assuming the role of department chair. One of the main characteristics associated with role ambiguity is the lack of information regarding the "proper definition of the job, its goals and the permissible means for implementing them" (Kahn et. al., 1964, p. 94). Burns and Gmelch (1992) in analyzing high role ambiguity scores observed that chairs must have a clear idea regarding the authority, responsibility, and support they can expect in the position. They expressed a need for adequate training as election to the chair position should not assume competence as an administrator.

Stress associated with role conflict occurs when compliance with one role expectation is incompatible with compliance of another (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Kahn et al., 1964; Wolverton et al., 1999). Each role carries differing expectations as to the behaviors, functions, and responsibilities of that role. Burns and Gmelch (1992) concluded that the high role conflict scores achieved by chairs in their study are indicative of the stress associated with functioning as both an administrator and faculty member. Later research by Gmelch and Burns (1993) and Maclin (1995) supported these findings.

Another type of role conflict is role overload, or the expectation that a person is able to comply with and complete a number of compatible tasks within certain time limits (Kahn et al., 1964). The pressure to complete many competing tasks results in stress for the role holder. Gmelch and Burns (1993) found six of the top stressors for chairs related

to role overload (e.g., too heavy a workload, job interference with personal time, excessively high self-expectations, completing paperwork on time, meetings taking too much time, and telephone and visitor interruptions). Maclin (1995) reported similar results in identifying insufficient time to do research, too heavy a workload, not having adequate time for teaching preparation, and completing paperwork as role overload induced stressors.

Propensity to leave. The cost to the institution to replace experienced academic administrators is considerable. Costs not only include expenses related to recruiting, selecting, and training a new employee, but also costs to the institution in terms of disruption of daily activities, demoralization of remaining employees, and missed opportunities in pursuing growth strategies (Cano & Miller, 1992). Studies relating to the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on the department chair's propensity to leave are inconclusive. Singleton (1987) found a low, yet positive relationship between role ambiguity and the propensity to leave. In a study of community college chairpersons, Murray and Murray (1998) found contradictory findings in that chairs exhibited high levels of role ambiguity, medium levels of role conflict, and a low propensity to leave. While they concluded that the chairs in their study have accepted and can function with the ambiguity associated with the position, they also surmised that the age of the respondents (over half were 50 years old at the time of the survey) and the lack of a doctorate (held by fewer than 30 percent of respondents) may have been factors influencing their decisions to remain at their current institution.

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is the third category in the literature regarding the mid-level academic administrator and the constructs of role conflict and role

ambiguity. According to Simpson (1984), working under stressful conditions of role conflict and role ambiguity leads to role strain. In a study of community college division heads, Simpson found that the variables of being over 50 years of age, having eleven or more years experience as a division head and being satisfied with one's job resulted in less perceived role strain. Simpson concluded that satisfaction with one's job helps in the performance of that job and has a strong influence as a factor in lowering perceptions of role strain; however, he offers no insights as to why this might be but suggests that more knowledge is needed to understand how job satisfaction is achieved by division heads. Carroll and Gmelch (1992) reported that the most common variable for differentiating those chairs considered highly effective in their roles from all others were higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of role ambiguity. These chairs also had the highest number of years of service which can also be a contributing factor to lower levels of role ambiguity.

Summary

Each individual in an organization holds a specific role with a number of activities and expectations that are associated with that role. Activities and expectations regarding a specific role are self-directed to the role holder or outer-directed to others within the organization with whom the role holder interacts (Kahn et al., 1964; Owens, 1998). Uncertainty or a lack of clarity on the part of the role holder when engaging in these activities or interactions can result in role ambiguity (Breaugh & Colihan, 1994; Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Gmelch & Torelli, 1994; Grau, 1997; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Krayer, 1986; Murray & Murray, 1998; Rizzo et al., 1970; Singleton, 1987; Van Sell et al., 1981; Wolverton et al., 1999). Task related role

ambiguity occurs when the quality and quantity of information necessary for a person to adequately perform in one's position is lacking or insufficient. Behavior, or social-psychological related role ambiguity occurs when one is uncertain or unclear as to one's place in the organization, relationships with others in the organization, or the appropriateness or consequences of one's actions in achieving personal goals (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Hamilton, 2002; Kahn et al., 1964; Singleton, 1987).

Role conflict occurs when a role holder's behavior or action differs from what is expected by oneself or by other members of the organization. All members of an organization with whom a role holder interacts constitute a role set. Role conflict occurs when expectations held by one or more members of a role set differ from the actions of the role holder (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Gmelch & Torelli, 1994; Grau, 1997; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Krayer, 1986; Murray & Murray, 1998; Rizzo et al., 1970; Sheperd & Fine, 1994; Singleton, 1987; Van Sell et al., 1981; Wolverton et al., 1999). Person-related role conflict occurs when the expected actions of a role holder are incompatible with his or her own value system. Inter-role conflict occurs when an individual holds one or more roles that are incompatible with each other (Carroll, 1974; Gmelch & Torelli, 1994; Kahn et al., 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970).

Research indicates that the chairperson's role is subject to unclear or vague expectations regarding its functions and responsibilities resulting in role ambiguity (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Grau, 1997; Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987). In addition, conflicting loyalties to disparate external and internal department groups including upper-level administrators, faculty, and students results in role conflict. As a result, chairs experience increased levels of stress, anxiety, and

tension (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Grau, 1997; Maclin, 1995; Wood, 1992), propensity to leave the institution or position (Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987), and job dissatisfaction (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Simpson, 1984).

Need For Training

Successful academic leaders in addition to their professional creditability are decisive and can articulate a vision and persuade others to share that vision (Seagren et al., 1993). Leadership in an educational environment is a shared activity. It is expected that chairs consult with, or advise, faculty prior to making a major decision that affects the department (Seagren et al., 1993). In addition, the chair must manage the budget, implement institutional and departmental policies and practices, advise students, schedule courses and distribute teaching loads, and prepare faculty evaluations along with a myriad number of related tasks (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Pettitt, 1999; Tucker, 1993). The foregoing are just some of the leadership and management qualities that chairs are expected to have in order to perform effectively. How, then, can chairs acquire or develop the skills necessary to meet the demands of the position?

There is considerable concern that little or no training is provided to these individuals prior to assuming their duties (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Diamond, 1996; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Leaming, 1998; Seagren & Dockery, 1996; Seagren et al., 1993; Spangler, 1999). Seagren and Dockery (1996) estimated that 5,000 new chairs would assume chair responsibilities by the year 2000 and professional development would be required for the 12,500 individuals holding chair positions at the nation's community colleges. Gmelch and Burns (1993) estimated that one-quarter of the nearly 80,000 department chairs are replaced each year

Those individuals who accept the challenge of the chair position often do so for a short period of time. In a study of 193 department chairs appointed during the 1995-1996 academic year in community colleges in Texas, Smith and Stewart (1999) found that 12 percent stayed in their position for only one year and 29 percent stayed for only two years. The researchers concluded that chairs were not adequately prepared to learn the tasks, roles, and interpersonal relationships necessary to fully transition into the position due to a lack of training.

Gmelch and Houchen (1994) voice concern that new department chairs are not fully aware of the challenges of chair leadership,

> College department chairs come to their positions without leadership training; without prior administrative experience; without a clear understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of their role; without recognition of the metamorphic changes that occur as one "transforms" from an instructor to a chair; and without an awareness of the cost to their careers and personal lives. (p. 5)

Lucas (2000) noted that the chairs, themselves, acknowledged their lack of training. Comments gathered from a study of fifty-five chairs included, "I am a natural teacher and scientist. I am not a natural manger. I don't like being a department head," and, "the attacks of one professor on my leadership [are] a constant drain on my energy. I don't handle [them] well" (p. 46).

The role of the chair has been expanding in importance and complexity over the past decade (Diamond, 1996; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Leaming, 1998; Lucas, 2000; Seagren et al., 1993; Spangler, 1999). A survey of seventy-six institutions nationwide reported an increase in responsibilities for chairs with greater emphasis on administration, accountability, productivity and leadership (Giles-Gee & McMahon, 1997). Filan (1999) in noting how crucial the chair's position is to the college or university, cites Pelatson,

"An institution can run for a long time with an inept president but not for long with inept chairpersons" (p. 49).

Yet for all the importance and recognition that chairs contribute to the success of the institution, little support is given to prepare them for that position. This phenomenon is noted by Seagren et al. (1993) in their statement,

> In contrast to organizations that believe their most important resource is their employees and that the only way to ensure top performance is to provide continuous opportunities for training, most colleges and universities do not value the continuous training of their professional staff. Training for department chairs can be characterized as casual to nonexistent, oriented only toward understanding administrative procedures, and situational rather than holistic or systematic. (p. xvi)

Six years later, Filan (1999) asserts that lack of leadership training for chairs remains a major concern,

> Leadership training...has been designed for presidents, vice presidents and deans to prepare them for a presidency. Few opportunities are available to chairs who outnumber all other types of administrators combined...The chair position [is] widely regarded as key to the effective functioning of a college's major academic and career programs, [yet] those filling the positions generally receive little or no formal training for the job. (p. 49)

The need for adequate training is further evidenced from the results of a number of research studies on the negative effects of role conflict and role ambiguity on academic administrators including chairs. Grau (1997) found that occupational stress among chairpersons is related to role ambiguity and lack of training prior to assuming the chair position. Burns and Gmelch (1992) concluded that conditions resulting in role ambiguity and role conflict can be ameliorated through training so that chairs clearly understand the expectations of the position and can perform effectively in this role. As a result of their findings on the positive correlation between role conflict and role ambiguity with increased levels of stress and burnout, Gmelch and Torelli (1994) recommend

implementing programs that prepare academic administrators to recognize and deal with these constructs. Singleton (1987) recommends reducing role conflict and role ambiguity by clearly defining the chairperson's responsibilities, opening lines of communication to promote congruency in understanding the chair's role by faculty, administration, and the chair, and developing orientation programs for new chairpersons and in-service training for extant chairs.

Summary

The role of the department chair continues to grow in importance and complexity with a greater emphasis on administration, accountability, productivity and leadership (Giles-Gee & McMahon, 1997). The majority of individuals filling this position, however, do so with little or no training. They are ill-prepared to assume the tasks and roles expected of the chairperson and to engage in the interpersonal relationships necessary to perform effectively in the position (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Diamond, 1996; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Leaming, 1998; Seagren & Dockery, 1996; Seagren et al., 1993; Spangler, 1999). As a result, they are subject to occurrences of role conflict and role ambiguity. These constructs can be reduced through training so that chairs clearly understand and perform effectively in their role (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Torelli, 1994; Grau, 1997; Singleton, 1987).

Chair Training Programs

An analysis of the literature indicates that while the lack of adequate training remains a major concern, a number of programs have been implemented addressing issues relevant to chairs as academic leaders. In 1980, the Departmental Leadership Institute was formed by the American Council on Education which supports training and

developmental activities for university chairpersons (Pettitt, 1999). The Council offers leadership training at the national level through its three annual workshops held in November, February and June on such diverse topics as conflict management, decision-making, and evaluating college teaching. It provides workshops for college and university systems and private consortia and hosts the Department Chair Online Resource Center which provides materials from a variety of resources for those in the department chair position and for administrators who work with department leaders (American Council on Education, 2004). The Academic Chairperson Conference sponsored by Kansas State University's Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development was established in 1983 and holds annual conferences focusing on issues regarding chairs as academic leaders (Pettitt, 1999).

Individual colleges and universities have also implemented programs addressing orientation to and development of the chair position. Lehigh University supports holding campus-wide meetings for chairs to develop and improve their leadership skills. Provision is made for chairs to attend regional and international conferences specifically targeted to issues regarding leadership skills (McAdams, 1997). Stanford University conducts a day-long orientation session plus a series of follow-up workshops. New chairs at Michigan State University participate in a four-day workshop and a seminar series with more than a dozen programs a year is available to all chairs. Appalachian State University held occasional training seminars during the academic year beginning in 1999 but has recently instituted a summertime orientation program to prepare new chairs prior to the fall semester (Fogg, 2001).

The Chair Academy, formed in 1992, grew out of a concern by department chairs at the Maricopa Community Colleges regarding the lack of training for academic leaders. The chairs recognized their need for training that would help them in meeting their complex and varied roles and responsibilities in serving as academic and administrative leaders. They noted that existing conferences and training programs were geared toward department chairs at the university level rather than at the community college level. The chairs acted upon an idea to create a program designed to meet the specific needs of the community and technical colleges. As a result, in February 1991, a survey was distributed to more than nine thousand department chairs in community and technical colleges in the United States and Canada to collect data regarding the characteristics, responsibilities, and challenges of the community and technical college chairs. In addition, the survey was used to identify and develop appropriate Chair Academy training initiatives in the areas of academic and administrative leadership (Filan, 1999).

The Chair Academy provides a year long, skills-based leadership development program. It begins with a five-day learning-centered workshop, followed by a year-long practicum experience (Filan, 1999). The program covers a variety of topics including the role of the transformational leader, building effective work teams, leading during a time of change, acting as servant leaders, managing and leading technology, and creating learner-centered organizations (Filan, 1999). Since its inception, the Chair Academy has evolved into an organization that provides leadership training and development programs for leaders in postsecondary institutions worldwide (Filan, 1999).

The community colleges in North Carolina work in collaboration with North Carolina State University to provide six hours of credit-earning training in leadership

skills to chairs and potential chairs. Participants are nominated by their community college presidents and are paid for attending the sessions. In addition to classroom time devoted to leadership skills, teamwork and collaboration, scholarship and research, chairs intern with seasoned chairs for experiential training. In this way, participants are able to "study, observe, practice, and make (and correct) mistakes before they move into [leadership] positions" (Gillett-Karam, 1999, p. 6).

The Administrative Leadership Institute grew out of the Los Angeles Community College District's need to address the problems of a high turnover rate of academic leadership positions combined with inadequate training of academic leaders including department chairs. This situation was undermining the institution's stability and ability to adequately address its fiscal and operational responsibilities (Spangler, 1999). The resulting eighteen-month program provides an opportunity for chairs to learn leadership and administrative skills through formal programs and interaction with their peers (Spangler, 1999).

DeVry University implemented the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP), a comprehensive program designed to prepare its academic leaders to function effectively in their jobs, to retain them in their positions, to prepare them for leadership roles, and to attract quality individuals to the position. This program is especially important to the university as it continues to expand its curricular offerings and the availability of its programs nationwide. Program components include an introduction to the culture of the organization, academic leadership, faculty leadership, program development and management, student success, and departmental operations (Devry University, 2003).

While the literature describes the activities and components of these and other like programs, a search of the educational literature found no empirical evidence regarding their effectiveness in providing academic administrators with the tools they need to successfully assume the roles and responsibilities of their position. McDade (1987) surveyed over 35 professional development programs designed to enhance management and leadership skills of academic administrators including department chairs. National institutes and internships, administrative conferences, national association conventions, seminars, workshops, and meetings were examined. She concluded that the benefits of participating in these programs are apparent, however, evidence supporting the benefits are anecdotal rather than quantitative. A recent review of the literature indicates this continues to be the case.

Summary

Department chairs are called on to fulfill multiple roles as managers and leaders (Creswell et al., 1990; Leaming, 1998; Lucas, 2000; Tucker, 1993). They often continue with their faculty and scholarly activities of teaching and research (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Pettitt, 1999). As a manager, chairs typically spend over half their week on budgeting, maintaining department records, assigning duties to faculty, and supervising non-academic staff (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). Chairs must also take on a leadership role to provide a shared vision of where the department or institution is headed, be able to communicate that vision, and inspire others to reach that vision at the same time reaching their own professional developmental goals (Bowman, 2002; Creswell et al., 1990; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Hecht et al., 1999; Leaming, 1998; Lucas, 2000; Tucker, 1993; Yamasaki, 1999). They must act as both colleague and supervisor

by providing personal support to members of their department while at the same time evaluating them (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). Administrative expectations of the institution may run counter to the faculty values of the academic department (Seagren et al., 1993). They are frequently thrust into the chair position with little or no training (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Diamond, 1996; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Leaming, 1998; Seagren & Dockery, 1996; Seagren et al., 1993; Spangler, 1999).

The multiplicity of the chair roles with differing expectations as to how they are best performed and accomplished leads to occurrences of role conflict and role ambiguity (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Carroll, 1974; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Grau, 1997; Maclin, 1995; Murray & Murray, 1998; Seedorf & Gmelch, 1989; Simpson, 1984; Singleton, 1987; Wood, 1992). Representing various constituencies with incompatible demands and expectations results in role conflict (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Kremer-Hayon & Avi-Itzhak, 1986). A lack of clarity as to the role expectations and behaviors associated with that position results in role ambiguity (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Grau, 1997; Maclin, 1995; Murray & Murray, 1998; Singleton, 1987; Wood, 1992). Research has shown the detrimental effects of role conflict and role ambiguity to both the individual and the organization (Burns & Gmelch, 1992; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Grau, 1997; Maclin, 1995; Murray & Murray, 1998; Simpson, 1984; Singleton, 1987; Wood, 1992).

In order for chairs to be effective they must be able to accept and rise to the challenges of their positions. The role of the chair is critical in assisting higher education institutions to meet the challenges of economic uncertainty, new technologies and teaching methodologies, and student demands for a broad array of choices in pursuing

their educational goals. Training and professional development programs allow chairs to accomplish this. It is therefore critical to increase and expand effective managerial and leadership training for department chairs and to quantify those results.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is twofold. First, the study examined the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) participants' perceptions, immediately after the training sessions; their perceptions of the effectiveness of the program regarding course content, delivery, and materials; and their perceptions of the factors that may influence these perceptions. Second, the research analyzed participants' application and understanding of NALOP components as well as the constructs of role conflict and role ambiguity using a mailed questionnaire 9 to 40 months after the training sessions.

The setting was DeVry University (DeVry), a for-profit post-secondary educational institution that offers undergraduate degrees in the fields of technology, business, and health services, and graduate degrees in management. DeVry traces its roots to the technical education movement of the early 1900s with the founding of the DeForest Training School in Chicago by Dr. Herman DeVry in 1931 to prepare students for technical work in electronics, motion pictures, radio, and, later, television. The school's name was later changed to DeVry Technical Institute, and again, to DeVry Institute of Technology as the institution expanded its degree program offerings to include information technology and computer engineering technology. In 1987, DeVry merged with Keller Graduate School of Management which offers master's degree programs in management fields such as business administration, human resource management, and telecommunications management. In 2002, upon approval of The

Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, DeVry Institute of Technology and Keller Graduate School of Management became DeVry University (DeVry University, 2003).

DeVry's student population consists of 49,000 undergraduate and graduate students. In addition to twenty-three undergraduate campuses in fourteen states and Canada, the university offers graduate and undergraduate programs at forty-seven DeVry University Centers located in twenty states and through online access. A centralized home office is located in Oak Brook Terrace, Illinois (OBT). The DeVry system includes over 2,100 full- and part-time faculty and 178 academic leaders in the undergraduate programs and 800 part-time faculty and 45 academic leaders at the graduate level.

NALOP was developed to prepare DeVry University's academic leaders to function effectively and retain them in their jobs, and to attract quality individuals to these positions. NALOP participants include deans, associate deans, directors, and other administrators. The first session was conducted during May 2001. Since then, five additional sessions were conducted during August 2001, November 2001, May 2002, December 2002, and December 2003. The NALOP workshops consist of six modules, or units, encompassing the following topics:

1. University mission and purpose including the university's place in higher education, institutional culture, administrative structure at the system level and campus level, and academic leader's role.
2. Faculty leadership and supervision including recruiting, training, developing and evaluating faculty.
3. Program development, implementation, management and evaluation focusing

on curriculum development, implementation and review procedures.

4. Academic leadership skills including defining a personal leadership philosophy, developing and communicating a vision, leading by collaboration, acting as a change agent, and empowering faculty.
5. Department and campus operational responsibilities including the budget process, scheduling, student records, and policy issues.
6. Student success including student satisfaction, persistence, and academic integrity (DeVry University, 2003).

Topics covered in the workshop modules closely parallel the academic and administrative dimensions of the roles and responsibilities of department heads with a focus on the university's mission and purpose, faculty supervision, and operational issues indicative of administrative responsibilities while program development, academic leadership skills, student success factors, and measures of teaching and learning characterize the academic role (Grumbles & Bregman, 1994).

The first four programs consisted of a 5-day onsite session at OBT. The fifth and sixth programs consisted of a 3-day onsite presentation at OBT and an interactive online component prior to and following the onsite sessions. The reasons for the change in delivery were twofold: (a) more effective and efficient use of time as participants had an opportunity prior to and following the onsite course to read and reflect on the content, and (b) reduction in the amount of time deans and associate deans were off campus. DeVry offers courses in a trimester format thereby leaving little time between the end of one semester and the beginning of another for deans and associate deans to be away from

campus activities. While the delivery of the program changed, program components remained consistent.

In December 2003, a separate program was implemented for Center Directors, those administrators whose function is to oversee the operational activities of the DeVry University Centers. These participants are not included in this study as their roles and responsibilities differ significantly from those of campus deans and associate deans. Additionally, the Center Directors' program differs in terms of focus and content from that of the campus administrators.

This chapter describes the procedures used by the researcher in conducting the study. Details describing population, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis are discussed in detail.

Accessible Population

The population used consisted of 112 DeVry University mid-level administrators who participated in the NALOP program. These included academic deans and associate deans as well as finance and student services deans and other mid-level administrators (e.g., registrar). The terms "deans," "associate deans," and "mid-level administrators" are used at DeVry to describe the role of the individual who typically heads a department or curricular area and is responsible for the activities of that department or area.

Excluded from the study were 12 individuals who attended NALOP sessions but were not categorized as deans, associate deans, or mid-level administrators. This group consisted of 3 Center Directors, and 7 other guest observers. It cannot be determined if these individuals completed the program evaluation questionnaire immediately following each NALOP workshop.

The academic deans included Deans of Academic Affairs (DAA), program or department deans, and program or department associate deans. Dean responsibilities include faculty leadership, development, and management, instruction and curriculum development, internal administration including budgeting and scheduling, and student success factors including academic advising, and assessment (DeVry University, 2003). These duties and responsibilities are comparable to those reported in previous studies of the duties and responsibilities of the department chair (Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, 1990; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Pettitt, 1999; Tucker, 1993).

Sampling Procedure

Due to the limited number of accessible respondents, the entire population of all 112 mid-level managers categorized as deans, associate deans or other administrators (e.g., registrar) who participated in NALOP were selected for the survey. Excluded from the study were 12 individuals who attended NALOP sessions but were not categorized as deans, associate deans, or mid-level administrators.

Variable Description

The study consisted of two parts: (a) analysis of data reported by the participants and collected by DeVry University's Academic Affairs Department, the program sponsor, immediately following the NALOP sessions; and (b) analysis of data collected via a follow-up questionnaire distributed to NALOP participants by the researcher.

Variables identified in the first part of the study are NALOP program content, delivery method, materials provided, most useful aspects of the program, least useful aspects of the program, feelings of confidence in being a dean, and other comments and suggestions regarding the program.

The independent variables in the second part of the study were gender, employment position just prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, employment affiliation just prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, time between assuming dean responsibilities and participation in NALOP, and NALOP program format. The dependent variables were role conflict, role ambiguity, application of NALOP concepts, and understanding of NALOP concepts.

Demographic variables were used to describe the population of NALOP participants. Descriptive information regarding demographic data was divided into three categories: (a) personal characteristics (e.g., gender and age when participated in NALOP), (b) employment information (e.g., position prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, employment affiliation prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, current employment position, current employment at DeVry, academic curricular areas employed in, and current teaching activity at DeVry), and (c) NALOP participation information (e.g., time between participation and assuming dean duties, format of workshop attended, and position held when participated).

Instrumentation

Two separate self-reporting questionnaires were developed to gather data for this study. The questionnaire used in the first part of the study, "New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) Course Evaluation" (Appendix F), was developed and administered by DeVry's Academic Affairs Department which sponsored the workshop. The questionnaire was administered immediately following NALOP sessions. The instrument consisted of four open-ended items requesting participants to provide comments regarding the program's most useful aspects, least useful aspects, feelings of

confidence in being a dean, and other comments and suggestions for improving the course. A fifth item asked participants to rate course "content/subject matter," "delivery/facilitation," and "materials provided" using a 4-point scale with a rating of 1 for *poor* to 4 for *excellent.*

A self-reporting survey questionnaire, "NALOP Participant Questionnaire" (Appendix A), was designed by the researcher using procedures for developing questionnaires as outlined by Dillman (2000) to obtain data regarding participants' application and understanding of NALOP concepts after some time elapsed since participating in the program. Part of the questionnaire contains items relating to role conflict and role ambiguity as developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970). Permission to use these items was obtained from Dr. John Rizzo (Appendix E).

Application and Understanding of NALOP Concepts

NALOP program objectives were garnered from the *New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) Handbook 2003-2004* (DeVry University, 2003). One evaluative measure of a training program is whether participants have learned and applied the stated principles and objectives presented in the program (Kirkpatrick, 1998). For this reason, Questions 1-7 and Question 12 pertaining to *applying* NALOP concepts and Questions 8-11 pertaining to *understanding* NALOP concepts were included in the survey instrument. Examples of questions measuring *application* of NALOP concepts include: (a) Since NALOP, I developed a vision for my department and shared it with department members, and (b) I am currently applying the concepts presented in the NALOP session regarding planning a budget. Examples of questions measuring *understanding* of NALOP concepts include: (a) NALOP assisted me in understanding

DeVry's mission and its role in higher education, and (b) I now understand the difference between my leadership and managerial roles.

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

The literature reveals that academic department chairs must fill a multiplicity of roles as managers, leaders, faculty developers, and scholars (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). In each role, the chair represents different constituencies (e.g., the administration, faculty, and students) each with differing demands and requirements. At times the requirements of one group are in direct conflict with those of another leading to role conflict. Each role carries differing expectations as to the behaviors, functions, and responsibilities of that role. Lack of clarification or understanding as to what is expected of an individual occupying a role results in role ambiguity. For these reasons, the Rizzo, House and Lirtzman Instrument (Rizzo, et al., 1970) was included in the survey instrument to determine measures of role conflict and role ambiguity as experienced by DeVry deans, associate deans, and other mid-level administrators. This instrument has been widely used in over 100 individual studies during the past 30 years in diverse settings (Shepherd & Fine, 1994) and has frequently been used in academic populations (Cano & Miller, 1992; Davis, 1995; Grau, 1997; Hamilton, 2002; McBride, Munday, & Tunnell, 1992).

The instrument consists of 14 items designed to measure separate constructs of role conflict and role ambiguity. Eight items deal with role conflict and six with role ambiguity. Respondents are asked to respond on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 for *strongly disagree* to 7 for *strongly agree*. Rizzo et al. (1970) reported internal reliabilities of .82 and .82 for role conflict and .78 and .81 for role ambiguity. Using data

from 1,573 employees in six samples in four different organizations, Schuler, Aldag, and Brief (1977) found internal consistency reliability of .56 to .82 for role conflict and .63 to .87 for role ambiguity.

In the NALOP Participant Questionnaire, Questions 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26 address role conflict; Questions 13, 16, 18, 19, 22, and 25 pertain to role ambiguity. Examples of questions measuring role conflict include: (a) I receive incompatible requests from two or more people, and (b) I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently. Examples of questions measuring role ambiguity include: (a) I know what my responsibilities are, and (b) I feel certain about how much authority I have.

Personal/Background Characteristics

Items regarding "time between assuming dean responsibilities and participation in NALOP," "employment position just prior to becoming a dean at DeVry," and "most recent employment affiliation prior to becoming a dean at DeVry," were included based on participant comments submitted in the evaluative data completed immediately after each NALOP session. Immediately after each NALOP session, participants were requested by DeVry's Academic Affairs Department to complete an evaluation regarding each component of the workshop and the workshop overall as to content, delivery, and materials provided. As a result of this initial review of the data, items regarding these areas were included in the questionnaire.

Content Validity and Internal Consistency

The resulting NALOP Participant Questionnaire was reviewed for content validity by a panel of experts that included a NALOP program developer and presenter

and other higher education academic administrators. Appropriate changes and refinements were incorporated as needed.

Cronbach's alphas were performed on each of the four constructs to determine internal consistency. The results of the analysis revealed the following: (a) role conflict, $\alpha = .83$; (b) role ambiguity, $\alpha = .89$; (c) applying NALOP concepts, $\alpha = .87$; and (d) understanding NALOP concepts, $\alpha = .70$.

Human Research Approval

The purpose of this study was to examine participants' perceptions of effectiveness of the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program at DeVry University. As human subjects who participated in the program provided the data in this study, it was necessary to receive approval from the Colorado State University Human Research Committee prior to beginning data collection activities. In addition, it was necessary to receive approval from DeVry University to use existing archival data and to contact participants for additional data. The appropriate approvals were received to continue with the study by Colorado State University (Appendix H) and by the DeVry University Doctoral Research Review Committee (Appendix C). All approvals were received prior to beginning data collection procedures.

Data Collection Procedures

The study was conducted in two parts. The first part of the study consisted of a descriptive analysis of data collected via a self-reporting questionnaire completed by NALOP participants immediately following each NALOP workshop (Appendix F). The questionnaire was developed and administered by the university's Academic Affairs Department, located at OBT, which sponsored the workshops. Archival data from these

evaluations were transmitted to the researcher for analysis. No names or other identifying information were included except for 9 evaluations that inadvertently included participant names. The researcher immediately "blocked out" the names prior to looking at any of the response information to ensure respondent confidentiality.

Data for the second part of the study were collected via a self-reporting survey instrument, the NALOP Participant Questionnaire (Appendix A), sent to 112 deans, associate deans, and other mid-level administrators from 23 campuses who participated in NALOP. The survey instrument was sent to each participant along with a cover letter from the researcher asking each to complete the survey and explaining the significance of the study while providing assurance of anonymity and voluntary participation (Appendix B), a letter from the DeVry University Doctoral Research Review Committee (Appendix C) in support of the research, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Respondents were asked to complete and return the survey within two weeks. No identifying marks appeared on either the survey instrument or the return envelope. In this way, anonymity of the respondent was assured.

Two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up e-mail message (Appendix D) was sent to all respondents thanking the survey participants and encouraging non-respondents to complete and return the survey. The survey instrument was included as an attachment to the e-mail for the respondents' convenience.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, to ascertain the effectiveness of the NALOP program as perceived by the program participants immediately after training in preparing them to succeed in performing the duties and responsibilities of their positions

as deans or associate deans at DeVry University. The second purpose of this study was to examine the relationship, after some time, between the application and understanding of NALOP concepts, role conflict, and role ambiguity with selected personal, positional and program-related variables of gender, employment affiliation, position prior to becoming a dean or associate dean, amount of time between becoming a dean or associate dean and program participation, and session format.

Using the evaluations immediately after training, the research questions used to guide this study were:

1. How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials, after each of the workshops?
2. How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of the workshops?
3. How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of the workshops?
4. How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the workshops?
5. What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide?
6. How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials for each workshop module?
7. How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of each workshop module?
8. How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of each workshop module?
9. How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing each workshop module?
10. What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide for each workshop module?

Using a follow-up questionnaire 9 to 40 months after the training, the research questions used to guide this study were:

11. Is there a difference between the two levels of gender (male and female) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

12. Is there a difference between the four levels of prior employment *position* (academic administrator, non-academic administrator, faculty, and other) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

13. Is there a difference between the three levels of prior employment *affiliation* (non-profit higher education institution, for-profit higher education institution including DeVry, and industry) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

14. Is there a difference between the three levels of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation (less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

15. Is there a difference between the two levels of program format of NALOP sessions (5 day in-person and 3 day in-person plus an online component) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

The survey data collected by the Academic Affairs Department immediately after completion of the NALOP workshops was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequency distributions and percentages were applied to Questions 1-10.

Data collected by the researcher as a follow-up to participation in the NALOP sessions were analyzed using inferential statistics. Independent *t* tests were conducted on Question 11 and Question 15 to determine whether differences occurred between males and females and between the in-person program format and in-person plus online component program format for each of the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity,

application of NALOP concepts and understanding of NALOP concepts. *One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA)* were conducted on Questions 12, 13, and 14 to determine whether differences occurred between levels of prior employment affiliation, prior employment position, and time becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation for each of the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity, application of NALOP concepts and understanding of NALOP concepts.

Summary

The NALOP Participant Questionnaire was developed by the researcher to analyze participants understanding and application of components of the program. The Role Conflict and Ambiguity Instrument developed by Rizzo et al. (1970) was used to measure the constructs of role conflict and role ambiguity. Existing evaluative data were acquired to examine participants' perceptions of the program's effectiveness.

Participants' perceptions of the program's effectiveness were analyzed using descriptive statistics, frequency, and percentages. Differences in understanding and application of program concepts, as well as role conflict and role ambiguity were analyzed using independent *t* tests and *one-way ANOVA.*

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Two surveys were used to collect data for this study. The first was the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) Course Evaluation (Appendix F) which was conducted immediately after the NALOP workshops. The second follow-up questionnaire, the NALOP Participant Questionnaire (Appendix A), was conducted 9 to 40 months after participants completed the workshops.

The data collected immediately after training, were used to answer the following research questions:

1. How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials after each of the workshops?
2. How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of the workshops?
3. How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of the workshops?
4. How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the workshops?
5. What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide?
6. How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials for each workshop module?
7. How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of each workshop module?
8. How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of each workshop module?
9. How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing each workshop module?

10. What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide for each workshop module?

The data collected from the follow-up questionnaire were used to answer the following research questions:

11. Is there a difference between the two levels of gender (male and female) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

12. Is there a difference between the four levels of prior employment *position* (academic administrator, non-academic administrator, faculty, and other) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

13. Is there a difference between the three levels of prior employment *affiliation* (non-profit higher education institution, for-profit higher education institution including DeVry, and industry) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

14. Is there a difference between the three levels of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation (less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

15. Is there a difference between the two levels of program format of NALOP sessions (5 day in-person and 3 day in-person plus an online component) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

In addition, data from the second survey were used to collect demographic data to describe the population of NALOP participants including, time between assuming dean duties and NALOP attendance, gender, age when attended NALOP, session attended, position prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, employment affiliation prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, position when attended NALOP, current employment position, whether currently employed at DeVry, responsible curricular areas, and whether currently teaching at DeVry.

Descriptive Analysis of NALOP Participants' Perceptions Immediately Following Workshops

The New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) is a workshop designed to prepare and support mid-level academic administrators in their roles and responsibilities at DeVry University. The workshops consist of six modules, or units, encompassing the following topics: (a) Introduction to DeVry University, (b) Faculty Leadership and Supervision, (c) Program Development, Implementation, Management, and Evaluation, (d) Academic Leadership, (e) Operations, and (f) Student Success.

A total of 112 deans, associate deans, directors, and mid-level administrators participated in the six NALOP workshops conducted during May 2001, August 2001, November 2001, May 2002, December 2002, and December 2003. Twelve other individuals also were in attendance as observers.

The first four workshops consisted of a 5-day onsite program. The fifth and sixth workshops consisted of a 3-day onsite presentation and an interactive online component prior to and following the onsite sessions.

Immediately following each workshop, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire to determine their perceptions of the workshop. They were asked to rate the content, materials, and delivery for the workshop on a four-point scale and to comment on the most useful and least useful aspects of the program, feelings of confidence in being a dean upon completing the workshop, and other comments and suggestions. In addition, for some of the workshops, participants were asked to similarly rate and comment on each individual workshop module.

This section analyzes data regarding evaluations of the workshop overall from the questionnaires completed immediately following the workshops conducted during May

2001, November 2001, December 2002, and December 2003. Data for the workshops presented during August 2001 and May 2002 are not available. Evaluative data for individual workshop modules are available only for the two workshops conducted during May 2001 and November 2001.

Content, Delivery, and Materials

Question 1: How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials after each of the workshops? Frequencies and means were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Table 4.1 shows that evaluations for content, delivery, and materials were positive for each workshop with all of the ratings falling between good (3) and excellent (4).

Table 4.1

Mean Ratings for Content, Delivery, and Material by Workshop and for all Workshops Combined

Workshop Date	*N*	Content	Delivery	Material
May 2001	13	3.52	3.12	3.63
November 2001	13	3.62	3.58	3.54
December 2002	9	3.44	3.78	3.22
December 2003	18	3.33	3.39	3.17
All workshops combined	53	3.48	3.47	3.39

Note. Ratings based on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, and 4 = excellent.

Overall ratings for content and delivery were slightly higher, with ratings of 3.48 and 3.47, than those for material, with a rating of 3.39. Overall, the three areas rated between good and excellent.

Most Useful Aspects of the Workshops

Question 2: How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of the workshops? Frequencies and percentages were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Responses measuring the most useful aspects of the workshop content were open-ended. Individual responses were compiled into categories with the results depicted in Table 4.2. The most useful aspects were discussions regarding "Faculty development

Table 4.2

Frequencies and Percentage of Respondents to "Most Useful Aspects of NALOP"

Comment	Frequency[a]	%[b]
Faculty development/policy	16	30
Deans' role, functions, responsibility	13	24
Budget	11	20
Peer interaction and communication	11	20
General leadership/management issues	9	17
Operations, procedures (except budget)	9	17
Curriculum development, assessment, review	9	17
DeVry's mission, organizational structure, vision	6	11
Student success	6	11
Student advising	5	9
Institutional research, reports	4	7
Information binder, handouts (for future reference)	3	6
All areas important	2	4
Nothing (already know material)	2	4

[a]N=54
[b]Percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses

and policy," as mentioned by 30% of respondents. "Deans' role, functions, and responsibilities" was second with 24% of respondents commenting on the usefulness of this topic. Interestingly, 8% of respondents are equally divided between two opposite

ends of the spectrum with those who feel everything was useful, 4%, and those who feel nothing was useful, 4%, because they already knew the material.

Some participants commented that the most useful aspects of the workshops were other than topic related. Eleven participants (20%) mentioned the opportunity to interact and communicate with peers as being the most useful aspect of the workshops.

Least Useful Aspects of the Workshops

Question 3: How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of the workshops? The statistical methods used to report these data were frequencies and percentages.

Responses measuring the least useful aspects of the workshops were open-ended. Individual responses were compiled into categories with the results depicted in Table 4.3. The least useful aspects of the workshops were "Program structure, format, handouts, length" with 33% of participants commenting on this category. "Nothing (all information useful)" ranked second with 26% mentioning this category. Of special interest are the two lowest rankings of the least useful aspects, "Faculty development and policy," 2%, and "Deans' role, functions, and responsibilities," 2%. These rankings inversely correlate to the comments made regarding the most useful aspects of NALOP with 30% of respondents indicating the "Faculty development and policy" category as most useful, and "Deans' role, functions, and responsibilities" as the second most useful topic with a response rate of 24%.

Table 4.3

Frequencies and Percentage of Respondents to "Least Useful Aspects of NALOP"

Comment	Frequency[a]	%[b]
Program structure, format, handouts, length	15	33

Nothing (all information useful)	12	26
General leadership/management issues	7	15
Curriculum development, assessment, review	6	13
Operations, procedures (except budget)	5	11
DeVry's mission, organizational structure, vision	4	9
Budget	3	7
Student success	3	7
Focus too specific (e.g., new campus vs. established campus)	2	4
Faculty development/policy	1	2
Deans' role, functions, responsibility	1	2

[a]*N*=46
[b]Percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses

Increased Feelings of Confidence in Being a Dean After Completion of NALOP Workshops

Question 4: How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the workshops? The statistical methods used to report these data were frequencies and percentages.

Responses measuring increased feelings of confidence in being a dean after participation in NALOP were open-ended. Individual responses were compiled into categories with the results depicted in Table 4.4. The overwhelming majority of participants, 80%, experienced increased feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the NALOP workshops. Comments focused on having a better understanding of expectations regarding duties and responsibilities, feelings of increased support, and positive aspects of peer interaction and networking.

Of the 8% who experienced no increase in feelings of confidence, comments include feeling overwhelmed and overburdened and not feeling supported in the position. The 12% who were unsure or undecided attribute those feelings to wanting more

specifics on day-to-day operations and feeling overwhelmed but better informed. One respondent felt that the sessions were not timely as he or she had been in the position for one year prior to the training session.

Table 4.4.

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to "Increased Feelings of Confidence"

Comment	Frequency[a]	%
Yes	41	80
No	4	8
Unsure or Undecided	6	12

[a]*N*=51

Other Comments and Suggestions

Question 5: What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide? Frequencies and percentages were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Respondents' comments or suggestions to improve NALOP were open-ended. Individual responses were compiled into categories with the results depicted in Table 4.5. The majority of the participants (68%), focused on the delivery of the program with 65% (20/31) of these suggestions requesting more time for question and answer sessions, group discussion, interactive learning, and less lecture.

Comments regarding content focused on spending more time on certain topics such as finances and budgeting, new technology, dean's role, and faculty and academic policies. Comments regarding materials included providing a daily summary of sessions and discussions, and providing pre-conference information (e.g., list of attendees, and presentation materials) with 78% (7/9) of respondents making this suggestion.

Table 4.5

Frequencies and Percentage of Comments and Suggestion for Improvement

Comment	Frequency[a]	%
Delivery/Facilitation	31	68
Content	11	24
Materials	9	20

[a]*N*=45
[b]Percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

Description of NALOP Workshop Modules

The workshop format was divided into six modules comprising the following topics: (a) Introduction to DeVry University (e.g., university mission, purpose and organizational structure), (b) Faculty Leadership and Supervision, (c) Program Development, Implementation, Management and Evaluation, (d) Academic Leadership, (e) Operations, and (f) Student Success. Participants were asked to evaluate the content, materials, delivery method, most useful aspects, least useful aspects, increased feelings of confidence in being a dean, and suggestions for improvement for each workshop module. Evaluative data for individual workshop modules are available only for the two workshops conducted during May 2001 and November 2001.

Content, Delivery, and Material for Each Workshop Module

Question 6: How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials for each workshop module? The statistical methods used to report these data were means and frequencies.

Participants' evaluations of program content, delivery, and materials for each workshop module are depicted in Table 4.6. Evaluations for content, delivery, and materials were positive for each session with all of the ratings falling between good and

excellent. The highest ratings for each of the three criteria exceeded 3.50, with Academic Leadership ranking the highest in the two categories of content and delivery with scores of 3.59 and 3.62, respectively. Faculty leadership ranked the highest for material with a score of 3.60. Academic Leadership and Faculty Leadership both scored over 3.50 in each of the three categories.

Table 4.6

Evaluations of Content, Delivery, and Material by Workshop Module

	Content		Delivery		Material	
Workshop Module	*N*	Mean	*N*	Mean	*N*	Mean
Introduction to DeVry University	18	3.44	17	3.34	17	3.43
Faculty leadership and supervision	35	3.51	34	3.51	34	3.60
Program development, implementation, management, and evaluation	73	3.51	73	3.42	73	3.48
Academic leadership	37	3.59	37	3.62	37	3.51
Operations	25	3.56	25	3.48	25	3.18
Student success	32	3.31	32	3.45	32	3.28
All session components combined	220	3.49	218	3.47	218	3.41

Note. Ratings based on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, and 4 = excellent.

Note. Multiple ratings were made for Content, Delivery, and Material for the modules on "Program development, implementation, management, and evaluation" for the May 2001 and November 2001 workshops and the module on "Academic Leadership" for the November 2001 workshop because some participants made separate ratings for each of 2 or more presenters. The ratings for all other modules are based on a maximum of 37 participants for the May 2001 and November 2001 workshops.

Most Useful Aspects of Each Workshop Module

Question 7: How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of each workshop module? Frequencies and percentages were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Table 4.7 presents participants' perceptions of the most useful aspects of each of the six modules presented in the workshops. Responses were open-ended and compiled into categories for analysis.

The most useful aspect of the module on "Introduction to DeVry University" was the discussion of "organizational structure and culture" with 17 of 19 respondents, or 89%, mentioning this facet. Respondents noted, "Understanding the culture and organization will help understanding ways to achieve its objectives," and "Helps clarify campus and OBT roles and responsibilities and their interaction."

Table 4.7.

Frequencies and Percentages of the Most Useful Aspects of Each Workshop Module

Workshop Module	Most Useful Aspect	N^a	n^b	%
Introduction to DeVry University	Organizational structure and culture	19	17	89
Faculty leadership and supervision	Faculty training and development	35	22	63
Program development, implementation, management, and evaluation	Curriculum review and assessment	70	36	52
Academic leadership	Leadership vs. management	39	12	31
Operations	Budget	21	15	71
Student success	Academic policy	33	12	36

[a]Total number of comments on workshop module from May 2001 and November 2001 workshops.
[b]Number of comments on most useful aspect of workshop module from May 2001 and November 2001 workshops.

The discussion on "faculty training and development" was mentioned by 22 of 35 respondents (63%) as being the most useful aspect of the module on "Faculty Leadership and Supervision." Sample comments were:

> An important responsibility of the dean and one that helps in the success of students and affects the quality of the program.

See this process as a mentoring, positive activity.

The topic of "curriculum review and assessment" was mentioned as the most useful aspect of the module on "Program Development, Implementation, Management, and Evaluation," by 36 of 70 respondents (52%). Sample comments were:

> Curriculum evaluations and review process. It is a burning issue at my campus.
>
> General outline of the program review helps to demystify the process.
>
> The explanation of assessment—how it's done and why. I've always been foggy about assessment—it's finally clear to me that it's an assessment of how well our program is meeting the students' and employers' needs—not student assessment per se.

The most useful aspect of the module on "Academic Leadership" was the discussion of "leadership vs. management" with 12 of 39 respondents (31%) mentioning it. Sample comments were:

> Defining manager/leader more completely...helps to set personal goals and understanding.
>
> Difference [between] leadership and management, being an advocate, learning to inspire...excellent refresher of successful management and leadership techniques.

The discussion on "budget" presented under the "Operations" module was considered the most useful by 15 of 21 respondents, or 71%. Sample comments were:

> A part of the budgeting process will become my responsibility—this is an excellent start.
>
> Budgeting process is an important part of our operation and we should know how to do it effectively.
>
> Budgeting—helps me understand the big picture of revenue and expenses.

The most useful aspect of the module on "Student Success" was the discussion on "academic policy" as mentioned by 12 of 36 respondents (36%). Sample comments were:

> Academic appeal exercises—learned several ways/processes used by other campuses.
>
> Ideas of what other campus deans use to evaluate appeals.
>
> [Academic appeal exercise]--showing all are making very similar decisions—shows there is a uniformity in the system (important).
>
> Hearing how others would rule in given scenarios for the appeal process

Least Useful Aspects of Each Workshop Module

Question 8: How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of each module presented in the workshops? Frequencies and percentages were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Participants' responses regarding the least useful aspects of each of the six modules presented in the workshops were open-ended and compiled into categories for analysis. For all but one of the six modules analyzed, the majority of responses indicated that "nothing was not useful," or, in other words, "everything was useful." The remaining responses are too diverse to depict in tabular form; however, they do provide insight into respondents' perceptions of the least useful aspects of the workshop modules.

Introduction to DeVry University. While comments were limited to 10 respondents, 40% (4) of those indicated that the organizational structure discussion was the least useful aspect of this module. Interestingly, this contradicts 89% of respondents who indicated organizational structure was the most useful aspect of the module.

Comments centered on the topic as being "dry—albeit necessary" and "information already known."

Faculty leadership and supervision. Of the 19 respondents, 7, or 37%, indicated "nothing was least useful—all was important." A number of comments regarding the least useful aspects of the module were provided. Among these were the ineffective process in distributing session materials and lack of standardized forms. Other comments addressed the assignments and class exercises: "faculty assignment not applicable at this point—not enough specific training given to new deans to be able to complete the assignment," and "it's just not applicable in practice at this point." The remaining respondents focused on content related issues, "although informational, did not provide innovation on how to better lead faculty," "lot of good ideas...but too prescriptive...can't always be used at my campus," and "need more focus on practical applications."

Program development, implementation, management, and evaluation. Of the 29 respondents, 16, or 55%, said "nothing was least useful—all was important." Three respondents, or 10%, indicated the least useful aspects focused on the delivery of materials saying one of the presentations was "confusing," topics should be prioritized, and requesting more interactive participation "rather than just reading from slides." Comments by the remaining 10 participants, or 34%, focused on the content indicating that it was too detailed and program specific, "detail and specific examples...did not apply broadly," or too theoretical, "we need to focus on what happens...so...get the reality in line with the theory." Another respondent disagreed stating, "the fact that it was general was unhelpful. An example of a good document would have been better."

Academic leadership. The majority of respondents, 15, or 54%, indicated that all aspects of the module were useful. The next largest group of comments, 10, or 36%, focused on content-related aspects:

> Perhaps an over-emphasis on the negative side of change. Anyone who has survived the last 10 if not 20 years accepts that the only constant is change. We could focus more on the execution side of the equation.
>
> Presentation did not adequately differentiate between individual leadership and organizational leadership.
>
> Would have liked to have seen more on developing a collegial atmosphere among faculty and on campus as a whole.

Operations. Of the 9 responses regarding this module, 3, or 33%, indicated all aspects were useful. The remaining 6, or 66%, of respondents indicated they already had knowledge regarding scheduling classes and accessing student records, or that the amount of information provided was overwhelming, "some of the number crunching was overkill...led to too much confusion/distraction."

Student Success. The majority of respondents, 7, or 70%, indicated that none of the topics presented in this module were least useful, or all aspects were useful. The remaining 3 responses, or 30%, indicated that some procedures that were presented were unclear, of little value, or not workable.

Increased Feelings of Confidence in Being a Dean

Question 9: How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing each workshop module? The statistical methods used to report these data were frequencies and percentages.

Table 4.8 indicates that 79% of all respondents felt that NALOP increased feelings of confidence in being a dean at DeVry. The two areas concentrating on

leadership, Faculty Leadership and Supervision, and Academic Leadership, garnered the greatest number of "yes" responses with 89% for Academic Leadership and 84% for Faculty Leadership and Supervision.

Commenting on the value of the module on Academic Leadership, respondents wrote:

> It has increased confidence in the following ways: shared knowledge, shared experiences, new perspectives, information on what we do and why we do it.
>
> It's encouraging to see the premium placed on leadership as a criteria for success at this functional level—rather than the administrative aspects or management only.

Table 4.8

Frequencies and Percentages of Increased Feelings of Confidence in Being a Dean at DeVry

		Yes		No		Unsure or Undecided	
Workshop Module	*N*	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Introduction to DeVry University	15	11	73	3	20	1	6
Faculty leadership	31	26	84	1	3	4	13
Program development, implementation, management, and evaluation	54	42	78	5	9	7	13
Academic leadership	36	32	89	2	6	2	6
Operations	16	10	63	2	13	4	25
Student success	24	18	75	4	17	2	8
All modules combined	176	139	79	17	10	20	11

Note. Multiple ratings were made for the modules on "Program development, implementation, management, and evaluation" for the May 2001 workshops because some participants made separate ratings for each of 2 or more presenters. The ratings for all other modules are based on a maximum of 37 participants in the May 2001 and November 2001 workshops.

Participants sharing their thoughts on the value of Faculty Leadership and Supervision wrote:

> I wish I had this type of training much earlier in my position. It has enabled me to understand the general dynamics of faculty leadership as well as theoretical understanding. Exercises proved to be an excellent tool to gain conceptual ideas and experience practical applications.
>
> The reinforcement of my management style increased my confidence.
>
> I have a better understanding of working with faculty and the importance of a collaborative approach.

Two common themes emerged from those who said "no" and those who were "unsure or undecided." The first theme was that the respondents "already knew or were familiar with the material" with 25% of both groups mentioning this as a reason why feelings of confidence in being a dean at DeVry were not increased. The second theme centered on "too much information presented in too short a time" with the result that "many uncertainties still remain," "too much left up in the air," "a lot of unanswered questions," that makes it "difficult to visualize the whole process." This type of response was given by 22% of respondents falling into the "no" or "unsure or undecided" categories.

Other Comments and Suggestions

Question 10: What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide for each workshop module? Frequencies and percentages were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Participants' other comments and suggestions were open-ended and compiled into categories for analysis. The comments and suggestions are too diverse to depict in

tabular form; however, they do provide additional insight into respondents' perceptions on ways to improve the workshop modules.

Respondents' comments and suggestions were approximately equally divided into three main categories: (a) content, 33%; (b) delivery, 37%; and (c) materials, 30%. Except for comments and suggestions regarding "content," which focused on specific subject areas in Faculty Leadership and Supervision, Academic Leadership, or Student Success modules, the comments regarding delivery and materials were general in nature and applicable to all subject areas.

Comments focusing on content from the "Faculty Leadership and Supervision" modules included: "exploring the role of adjuncts," "how to help full-time faculty recognize the need for continuous growth," and "how to re-energize long-established faculty." Future suggested topics for inclusion in the "Academic Leadership" module were "how to move away from managing day-to-day activities and into the leadership role" and "working with peers and other deans." Respondents commenting on "Student Success" modules suggested "classroom management as related to student success" and "orientation for first term students."

The majority of comments or suggestions regarding delivery included taking a more interactive approach, providing more hands-on exercises, less lecture, more questions and answers and less theory, and more time for discussion of day-to-day experiences. Participants commenting on materials requested handouts of materials presenters used (e.g., certain budgeting and other financial reports, bibliography of sources referenced during leadership discussion, and group exercises). These

supplemental materials were requested in addition to the materials already provided as part of the workshops.

Comparative Analysis of Participants' Perceptions 9 to 40 Months Following Attendance at NALOP Workshops

The second part of this study was conducted 9 to 40 months after participants attended the NALOP workshops to examine the relationship after time between the application and understanding of NALOP concepts, role conflict, and role ambiguity with selected personal, positional and program-related variables of gender, employment affiliation just prior to becoming a dean or associate dean, employment position just prior to becoming a dean or associate dean, amount of time between becoming a dean or associate dean and program participation, and workshop format. This section presents the results of the descriptive and comparative statistics used to analyze those data.

Descriptive Statistics

The NALOP Participant Questionnaire contained eleven questions used to collect demographic information regarding NALOP participants. Discussion of the demographic data is divided into three categories: (a) personal characteristics (e.g., gender, and age when participated in NALOP), (b) employment information (e.g., position prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, employment affiliation prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, current employment position, current employment at DeVry, academic curricular areas employed in, and current teaching activity at DeVry), and c) NALOP participation information (e.g., time between participation and assuming dean duties, format of workshop attended, and position held when participated).

Twenty-six questions were designed to measure role conflict, role ambiguity, understanding NALOP concepts, and applying NALOP concepts. Participants' scores for these constructs are presented.

Personal Characteristics

Information was gathered regarding participants' personal characteristics of gender and age when attended NALOP. The statistical methods used to report these data were frequencies and percentages.

Gender. Of the 44 study participants, 24 (54.5%) were male, and 20 (45.5%) were female. See Table 4.9 for these results.

Table 4.9

Frequencies and Percentages of Participants' Gender

Gender	Number[a]	Percent
Male	24	54.5
Female	20	45.5

[a] $N = 44$

Age. Approximately 90% of participants were between the ages of 35 and 54 when they attended NALOP, with more than half (54.5%) between the ages of 45 to 54, and nearly one-third (31.8%) 35 to 44 years old. Fewer than 15% of participants were less than 35 years of age (4.5%) or older than 55 years of age (9.1%). Table 4.10 depicts these results.

Table 4.10

Frequencies and Percentages of Participants' Age When Attended NALOP

Age	Number[a]	Percent
Less than 35	2	4.5
35-44	14	31.8
45-54	24	54.5
55+	4	9.1

[a] $N = 44$

Employment Information

Employment information was gathered for each of the respondents regarding prior employment position, prior employment affiliation, current employment position, current employment at DeVry, current academic curricular areas of responsibility, and current teaching responsibilities at DeVry. The statistical methods used to report these data were frequencies and percentages.

Prior employment position. Participants' employment position prior to becoming a dean at DeVry was divided into four categories. Half of the participants were administrators before accepting a dean or associate dean position at DeVry, with more (38.6%) having been academic rather than non-academic (11.4%) administrators. Nearly one-third (31.8%) came from the ranks of faculty. Approximately one-fifth (18.2%) of participants were employed as managers, consultants, and directors, or held other positions in industry or in other professions. See Table 4.11 for these results.

Table 4.11

Frequencies and Percentages by Prior Employment Position

Position	Frequency[a]	%
Academic administrator	17	38.6
Non-academic administrator	5	11.4
Faculty	14	31.8
Other	8	18.2

[a]$N = 44$

Prior employment affiliation. The majority of participants (73.8%) were previously employed in higher educational institutions prior to becoming a dean at Devry. The respondents previously employed in for-profit educational institutions, including DeVry (38.1%), slightly out-numbered those from non-profit higher educational institutions (35.7%). Over one-fourth (26.2%) of respondents previously held positions in industry. Table 4.12 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 4.12.

Frequencies and Percentages of Prior Employment Affiliation

Affiliation	Frequency[a]	%
Non-profit higher educational institution	15	35.7
For-profit higher educational institution (including DeVry)	16	38.1
Industry	11	26.2

[a]$N = 42$

Current employment position. Table 4.13 displays respondents' current employment positions. Of the 44 respondents, 41 (95.4%) still retain the position of dean or other administrator at DeVry. Two respondents (4.6%) no longer function as

academic administrators with one having returned to faculty and one having left the field of education. Additionally, one participant did not provide this information.

Table 4.13.

Frequencies and Percentages of Current Employment Position

Affiliation	Frequency[a]	%
Academic dean	27	62.8
Academic associate dean	10	23.3
Other dean or administrator	4	9.3
Faculty	1	2.3
Other	1	2.3
Missing	1	

[a] $N = 44$

Currently employed at DeVry. Of the 41 academic administrators who answered this question on the survey, 40, or 97.6%, remain currently employed at DeVry. One participant left the institution and 3 participants declined to provide this information. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14.

Frequencies and Percentages of Participants Currently Employed at DeVry

Current Employment at DeVry	Frequency[a]	%
Yes	40	97.6
No	1	2.4
Missing	3	

[a] $N = 44$

Current academic curricular areas of responsibility. Administrators whose positions were in the academic area were asked to identify their curricular areas of responsibility. That data is displayed in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15

Frequencies and Percentages of Current Curricular Areas of Responsibility

Curricular Area	Frequency[a]	%[b]
Biomedical Engineering Technology	3	6.8
Biomedical Informatics	3	6.8
Business Administration	17	38.6
Computer Engineering Technology	8	18.2
Computer Information Systems	18	40.9
Electronics and Computer Technology	10	22.7
Electronics Engineering Technology	8	18.2
General Education	14	31.8
Health Information Technology	7	15.9
Information Technology	1	2.3
Network and Communications Management	9	20.5
Network Systems Administration	12	27.3
Technical Management	15	34.1

[a]*N*=34

[b]Percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

Many deans have multiple areas of curricular responsibility, especially on the newly established campuses. The three most frequently mentioned areas of responsibility were in Computer Information Systems, 40.9%, Business Administration, 38.6%, and Technical Management, 34.1 %. Two of the least frequently mentioned areas of responsibility were Biomedical Engineering (6.8%), and Biomedical Informatics (6.8%), both of which are new programs and not yet available on all campuses. The least frequently mentioned area, Information Technology, was a program that is no longer offered.

Currently teaching at DeVry. Table 4.16 indicates the number of participants who are currently teaching classes at DeVry. Nearly half the respondents, 19, or 43.2%, are currently teaching at DeVry in addition to their administrative responsibilities.

Table 4.16

Frequencies and Percentages of Participants Currently Teaching at DeVry

Currently teaching at DeVry	Frequency[a]	%
Yes	19	43.2
No	25	56.8

[a] N=44

NALOP Participation Information

Participants were asked to indicate the time elapsed between assuming dean responsibilities and NALOP attendance, the format of the session attended, and the administrative position held at the time of participation. The statistical methods used to report these data were frequencies and percentages.

Time between participation and assuming dean duties. Table 4.17 provides data regarding the time elapsed between participants assuming dean duties and attending NALOP. Responses were approximately equally divided among three time periods: (a) less than 6 months, 31.8%; (b) 6 months to 1 year, 36.4%; and (c) more than 1 year, 31.8%.

Table 4.17

Frequencies and Percentages of Time Between Assuming Dean Duties and NALOP Participation

Time Period	Frequency[a]	%
Less than 6 months	14	31.8
6 months to 1 year	16	36.4
More than 1 year	14	31.8

[a]*N*=44

Workshop format. The majority of respondents, 33, or 75%, attended the 5-day onsite workshop format while 11 respondents, or 25%, participated in the 3-day onsite presentation plus an interactive online component prior to and following the onsite sessions. See Table 4.18 for the data analysis.

Table 4.18

Frequencies and Percentages of NALOP Workshop Format Attended

Session Format	Frequency[a]	%
5 day on-site	33	75.0
3-day onsite + on-line	11	22.7

[a]*N*=44

Administrative position held at the time of participation. The majority of respondents, 41 (93.1%), held positions of academic dean or academic associate dean at the time of participation in NALOP. The remaining respondents held administrative positions in the student services, operations, or registrar areas. Table 4.19 provides the results of this analysis.

Table 4.19

Frequencies and Percentages of Administrative Position Held At Time of NALOP Participation

Position Held	Frequency[a]	%
Academic Dean	24	54.5
Academic Associate Dean	17	38.6
Other Dean or Mid-level Administrator	3	6.8

[a] N=44

Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, NALOP Understanding, and NALOP Application Scores

Table 4.20a presents participants' scores for role conflict, role ambiguity, understanding of NALOP concepts, and application of NALOP concepts. The findings indicate:

Role conflict. Of the 44 NALOP participants, 39% agreed they experienced feelings of role conflict in their positions as administrators while 32% indicated they did not. The mean score, 4.60, was between "neither agree nor disagree" (4) and "somewhat agree" (5), with it being closer to "somewhat agree."

Role ambiguity. The questions regarding role ambiguity were worded positively and, therefore, required an inverse interpretation; i.e., higher scores indicated lower role ambiguity. Over half (52%) of the 44 NALOP participants indicated they did not experience role ambiguity in their positions as administrators, while 18% indicated they did. The mean score, 4.75, was between "neither agree nor disagree" (4) and "somewhat agree" (5), with it being closer to "somewhat agree."

Understanding NALOP concepts. Of the 44 participants, 64% agreed they understood the concepts presented during the NALOP workshops while 7% did not. The

mean score, 5.30, was between " somewhat agree" (5) and "agree" (6), with it being closer to "agree."

Applying NALOP concepts. Nearly half (49%) of 43 participants agreed they were applying the concepts presented during the NALOP workshops while 23% were not. The mean score, 4.61, was between "neither agree nor disagree" (4) and "somewhat agree" (5), with it being closer to "somewhat agree."

Table 4.20a

Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations for Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, NALOP Understanding, and NALOP Application Scores

Score	*N*	% Agree	% Neither Agree Nor Disagree	% Disagree	*M*	*SD*
Role conflict[a]	44	39	30	32	4.60	1.14
Low role ambiguity	44	52	30	18	4.75	1.35
Understanding	44	64	30	7	5.30	1.02
Application	43	49	28	23	4.61	1.18

[a]Percentages total greater than 100% due to rounding.
Note. Scores based on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree.

Because of the differences in application of certain tasks and responsibilities in certain jobs, the individual questions used to compile the application of NALOP concepts scores were analyzed separately. Only scores for participants who were academic deans or academic associate deans and had responsibility for faculty and curriculum issues were further analyzed. The scores for those whose responsibilities were outside the academic area (e.g., registrar, dean of operations, dean of student services) were not considered in this analysis. The results are displayed in Table 4.20b.

Over 75% of the respondents agreed they were applying NALOP concepts in the following four areas with mean scores between "somewhat agree" (5) and "agree" (6): (a) Apply program development, implementation, and management (77.8%, 5.06); (b) Faculty growth and development (78.8%, 5.21); (c) Faculty performance evaluations (81.8%, 5.27); and (d) Developed vision and shared it (82.4%, 5.35). The mean scores for these areas were closer to "somewhat agree" than "agree."

Table 4.20b

Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations for Application of NALOP Concepts Scores (N=37)

Application Concepts	*n*	% Agree	% Disagree	*M*	*SD*
Apply program development, implementation, and management	36	77.8	14.0	5.06	1.43
Apply planning a budget	22	36.3	54.5	3.13	1.96
Apply submitting CEA	28	50.1	42.8	3.86	2.09
Helpful handouts	36	38.9	47.2	4.00	1.97
Conduct program review	33	72.7	24.3	4.94	1.92
Apply faculty growth and development	33	78.8	21.3	5.21	1.22
Apply faculty performance evaluations	33	81.8	9.0	5.27	1.38
Developed vision and shared it	34	82.4	11.7	5.35	1.61

Note. Scores based on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree.

. Nearly three-quarters (72.7%) of 33 respondents agreed they were applying NALOP concepts when conducting program reviews. The mean score of 4.94 was between "neither agree nor disagree" and "somewhat agree," with it being closer to "somewhat agree."

Slightly more than half (50.1%) of 28 respondents were applying NALOP concepts when submitting CEAs. The high number of respondents disagreeing (42.8%) resulted in a mean score of 3.86, which fell between "neither agree nor disagree" and "disagree," with it being closer to "neither agree nor disagree."

Over half (54.5%) of 22 respondents disagreed that they were applying NALOP concepts when planning a budget. The mean score of 3.13 was between "neither agree nor disagree" and "disagree," with it being closer to "disagree."

More of the 36 respondents disagreed (47.2%) than agreed (38.9%) that the handouts were helpful in performing tasks and responsibilities. The mean score of 4.00, however, fell within the "neither agree nor disagree" rating.

Comparative Statistics

The data collected by the researcher from NALOP participants 9 to 40 months after attending the workshops were also analyzed using inferential statistics. Independent *t* tests were conducted to determine whether differences occurred between males and females and between the in-person program format and in-person plus online component program format for each of the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity, application of NALOP concepts and understanding of NALOP concepts.

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine whether differences occurred between levels of prior employment affiliation, prior employment position, and length of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation for each of the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity, application of NALOP concepts and understanding of NALOP concepts.

Gender

Question 11: Is there a difference between the two levels of gender (male and female) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores? The statistical methods used to report these data were independent samples *t* tests.

Levene's test indicated that the assumption of equality of variances was not violated and equal variances were assumed. The results as displayed in Table 4.21 indicate:

1. There is no significant difference between males and females regarding role conflict scores.
2. There is no significant difference between males and females regarding role ambiguity scores.
3. There is no significant difference between males and females regarding NALOP application scores.
4. There is no significant difference between males and females regarding NALOP understanding scores.

Table 4.21

Gender Differences in Role Conflict Scores, Role Ambiguity Scores, NALOP Application Scores, and NALOP Understanding Scores

	Male			Female				
Achieved Scores	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Role conflict	24	4.72	.93	20	4.46	1.37	.74	.46
Low role ambiguity	24	5.02	.99	20	4.43	1.65	1.48	.15
Application	24	4.88	.95	19	4.28	1.37	1.67	.10
Understanding	24	5.53	.81	20	5.03	1.19	1.64	.11

Prior Employment Position

Question 12: Is there a difference between the four levels of employment position (academic administrator, non-academic administrator, faculty, and other) just prior to becoming a dean in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores? One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Role conflict scores. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare deans' prior employment positions on role conflict scores. Table 4.22a displays the descriptive statistics for prior employment position on role conflict scores. Table 4.22b indicates there is no significant difference between deans previously employed as academic administrators, non-academic administrators, faculty, or in other capacities and their achieved role conflict scores, $F(3, 40) = .32, p = .81$.

Table 4.22a

Means and Standard Deviations for Role Conflict Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Position

Prior Employment Position	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Academic administrators	17	4.50	.98
Non-academic administrators	5	4.36	.61
Faculty	14	4.84	1.35
Other	8	4.55	1.44
Total	44	4.60	1.14

Table 4.22b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Position on Role Conflict Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	3	1.32	.44	.32	.81
Within groups	40	54.88	1.37		
Total	43	56.19			

Role ambiguity scores. Table 4.23a depicts descriptive statistics comparing prior employment position and role ambiguity scores. Table 4.23b presents the findings of the one-way ANOVA on the four levels of employment position just prior to becoming a dean on role ambiguity scores. As indicated, there is no significant difference between deans previously employed as academic administrators, non-academic administrators, faculty, or in other employment positions and their achieved role ambiguity scores, $F(3, 40) = .75, p = .53$.

Table 4.23a

Means and Standard Deviations for Low Role Ambiguity Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Position

Prior Employment Position	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Academic administrators	17	4.64	1.14
Non-academic administrators	5	5.60	.84
Faculty	14	4.69	1.62
Other	8	4.56	1.52
Total	44	4.75	1.35

Table 4.23b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Position on Role Ambiguity Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	3	4.16	1.39	.75	.53
Within groups	40	74.07	1.85		
Total	43	78.23			

Application scores. Descriptive statistics comparing prior employment position on NALOP application scores are displayed in Table 4.24a. The results of the one-way ANOVA regarding the four levels of employment position just prior to becoming a dean on NALOP application scores are reported in Table 4.24b. The differences in the NALOP application scores with respect to prior employment as academic administrators, non-academic administrators, faculty, or in other capacities were not significant, $F(3, 39) = 1.20, p = .32$.

Table 4.24a

Means and Standard Deviations for NALOP Application Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Position

Prior Employment Position	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Academic administrators	16	4.29	1.42
Non-academic administrators	5	5.36	.41
Faculty	14	4.59	1.17
Other	8	4.85	.82
Total	43	4.61	1.18

Table 4.24b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Position on NALOP Application Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	3	4.95	1.65	1.20	.32
Within groups	39	53.55	1.37		
Total	42	58.50			

Understanding scores. Table 4.25a displays results of the comparison of NALOP understanding scores and prior employment position. As indicated, there were no significant differences in the results of the one-way ANOVA comparing deans previously employed as academic administrators, non-academic administrators, faculty, or in other employment positions on NALOP understanding scores, $F(3, 40) = .68$, $p = .57$. These findings are illustrated in Table 4.25b.

Table 4.25a

Means and Standard Deviations for NALOP Understanding Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Position

Prior Employment Position	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Academic administrators	17	5.15	1.04
Non-academic administrators	5	5.90	.99
Faculty	14	5.27	1.08
Other	8	5.32	.95
Total	44	5.30	1.02

Table 4.25b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Position on NALOP Understanding Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	3	2.19	.73	.68	.57
Within groups	40	42.72	1.07		
Total	43	44.91			

Prior Employment Affiliation

Question 13: Is there a difference between the three levels of employment affiliation (non-profit higher education institution, for-profit higher education institution including DeVry, and industry) just prior to becoming a dean in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores? One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Role conflict scores. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare prior employment affiliation on role conflict scores. Table 4.26a displays the descriptive statistics for prior employment affiliation on role conflict scores. Table 4.26b indicates there is no significant difference between deans previously affiliated with non-profit higher education institutions, for-profit higher education institutions including DeVry, and industry, $F(2, 39) = 1.19, p = .32$.

Table 4.26a

Means and Standard Deviations for Role Conflict Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Affiliation

Prior Employment Affiliation	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Non-profit higher educational institution	15	5.02	.99
For-profit higher educational institution including DeVry	16	4.58	.79
Industry	11	4.46	1.29
Total	42	4.71	1.01

Table 4.26b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Affiliation on Role Conflict Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	2.42	1.21	1.19	.32
Within groups	39	39.62	1.02		
Total	41	42.04			

Role ambiguity scores. Table 4.27a depicts descriptive statistics comparing prior employment affiliation and role ambiguity scores. Table 4.27b presents the findings of the one-way ANOVA on the three levels of employment affiliation just prior to becoming a dean. As indicated, there is no significant difference between prior employment affiliation with non-profit higher education institutions, for-profit higher education institutions including DeVry, and industry and achieved role ambiguity scores, F (2, 39) = .38, p = .69.

Table 4.27a

Means and Standard Deviations for Low Role Ambiguity Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Affiliation

Prior Employment Affiliation	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Non-profit higher educational institution	15	4.84	.93
For-profit higher educational institution including DeVry	16	4.95	1.46
Industry	11	4.53	1.28
Total	42	4.80	1.23

Table 4.27b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Affiliation on Role Ambiguity Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	1.17	.59	.38	.69
Within groups	39	60.38	1.55		
Total	41	61.56			

Application scores. Descriptive statistics comparing prior employment affiliation on NALOP application scores are displayed in Table 28a. The results of the one-way ANOVA regarding the three levels of employment affiliation just prior to becoming a dean on NALOP application scores are reported in Table 4.28b. The differences in the NALOP application scores with respect to prior employment affiliation with non-profit education institutions, for-profit education institutions including DeVry, and industry were not significant, $F(2, 38) = .94, p = .40$.

Table 4.28a

Means and Standard Deviations for NALOP Application Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Affiliation

Prior Employment Affiliation	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Non-profit higher educational institution	14	4.84	1.28
For-profit higher educational institution including DeVry	16	4.35	1.14
Industry	11	4.84	.83
Total	41	4.65	1.12

Table 4.28b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Affiliation on NALOP Application Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	2.37	1.19	.94	.40
Within groups	38	47.84	1.26		
Total	40	50.21			

Understanding scores. Reported in Table 4.29a displays results of the comparison of NALOP understanding scores and prior employment affiliation. As indicated, there were no significant differences in the results of the one-way ANOVA comparing deans previously affiliated with non-profit education institutions, for-profit education institutions including DeVry, and industry on NALOP understanding scores, $F(2, 39) = .17, p = .85$. These findings are illustrated in Table 4.29b.

Table 4.29a

Means and Standard Deviations for NALOP Understanding Scores as a Function of Prior Employment Affiliation

Prior Employment Affiliation	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Non-profit higher educational institution	15	5.21	1.07
For-profit higher educational institution including DeVry	16	5.36	.99
Industry	11	5.42	.87
Total	42	5.32	.97

Table 4.29b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Prior Employment Affiliation on NALOP Understanding Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	.32	.16	.17	.85
Within groups	39	38.27	.98		
Total	41	38.59			

Length of Time Between Becoming a Dean and NALOP Participation

Question 14: Is there a difference between the three levels of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation (less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores? One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were the statistical methods used to report these data.

Role conflict scores. Table 4.30a displays the descriptive statistics for the length of time between assuming dean responsibilities on role conflict scores. Reported in Table

4.30b are the results of the one-way ANOVA comparing the three levels of length of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation on role conflict scores. The differences in the role conflict scores with respect to NALOP participation less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year after assuming dean responsibilities were not significant, $F(2, 41) = .03, p = .97$.

Table 4.30a

Means and Standard Deviations for Role Conflict Scores as a Function of Length of Time Between Assuming Dean Responsibilities and NALOP Attendance

Length of Time	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Less than 6 months	14	4.58	1.26
6 months to 1 year	16	4.66	1.26
More than 1 year	14	4.55	.95
Total	44	4.60	1.14

Table 4.30b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Time Between Becoming a Dean and NALOP Participation on Role Conflict Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	.09	.05	.03	.97
Within groups	41	56.10	1.37		
Total	43	56.19			

Role ambiguity scores. Table 4.31a depicts descriptive statistics comparing time elapsed between assuming dean responsibilities and role ambiguity scores. Table 4.31b presents the findings of the one-way ANOVA on the three levels of time between assuming the position of dean and participation in NALOP. As indicated, there were no

significant differences with respect to NALOP participation less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year after assuming the dean position on role ambiguity scores, $F(2, 41) = 1.99, p = .15$.

Table 4.31a

Means and Standard Deviations for Low Role Ambiguity Scores as a Function of Length of Time Between Assuming Dean Responsibilities and NALOP Attendance

Length of Time	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Less than 6 months	14	4.73	1.61
6 months to 1 year	16	4.31	1.43
More than 1 year	14	5.27	.73
Total	44	4.75	1.35

Table 4.31b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Time Between Becoming a Dean and NALOP Participation on Low Role Ambiguity Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	6.93	3.46	1.99	.15
Within groups	41	71.30	1.74		
Total	43	78.23			

Application scores. Descriptive statistics comparing time elapsed between NALOP participation and assuming dean responsibilities on application scores are displayed in Table 4.32a. There were no significant differences in the results of the one-way ANOVA with respect to NALOP participation less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year after assuming dean responsibilities, $F(2, 40) = .64, p = .53$. These results are depicted in Table 4.32b.

Table 4.32a

Means and Standard Deviations for Application Scores as a Function of Length of Time Between Assuming Dean Responsibilities and NALOP Attendance

Length of Time	n	*M*	*SD*
Less than 6 months	14	4.32	1.25
6 months to 1 year	15	4.75	1.16
More than 1 year	14	4.76	1.16
Total	43	4.61	1.18

Table 4.32b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Time Between Becoming a Dean and NALOP Participation on NALOP Application Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	1.81	.91	.64	.53
Within groups	40	56.69	1.42		
Total	42	58.50			

Understanding scores. A one-way ANOVA was performed on the three levels of time between becoming a dean and NALOP participation and NALOP understanding scores. Table 4.33a displays the descriptive statistics for elapsed time in assuming dean responsibilities and NALOP participation on understanding scores. The differences between NALOP participation at less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year after becoming a dean on achieved understanding scores were not significant, F (2, 41) = .16, p = .86. Table 4.33b displays these findings.

Table 4.33a

Means and Standard Deviations for Understanding Scores as a Function of Length of Time Between Assuming Dean Responsibilities and NALOP Attendance

Length of Time	n	*M*	*SD*
Less than 6 months	14	5.40	1.15
6 months to 1 year	16	5.19	.82
More than 1 year	14	5.34	1.15
Total	44	5.30	1.02

Table 4.33b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Time Between Becoming a Dean and NALOP Participation on NALOP Understanding Scores

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	2	.34	.17	.16	.86
Within groups	41	44.57	1.09		
Total	43	44.91			

Program Format

Question 15: Is there a difference between the two levels of program format of NALOP sessions (in-person and in-person plus an online component) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores? The statistical methods used to report these data were independent samples *t* tests.

Levene's test indicated that the assumption of equality of variances was not violated and equal variances were assumed. The results as displayed in Table 4.34 indicate:

1. There is no significant difference between program format regarding role conflict scores.
2. There is no significant difference between program format regarding role ambiguity scores.
3. There is no significant difference between program format regarding NALOP application scores.
4. There is no significant difference between program format regarding NALOP understanding scores.

Table 4.34

Program Format Differences in Role Conflict Scores, Role Ambiguity Scores, NALOP Application Scores, and NALOP Understanding Scores

	5-Day In Person			3-Day + On-line				
Achieved Scores	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Role conflict	33	4.64	1.17	11	4.47	1.12	.43	.67
Role ambiguity	33	4.68	1.44	11	4.97	1.03	-.62	.54
Application	32	4.65	1.25	11	4.51	1.00	.34	.74
Understanding	33	5.29	1.06	11	5.34	.95	-.13	.89

Ancillary Data

NALOP participants were asked to comment on any other aspect of the NALOP program they felt was important. Twenty-four, or 55%, of the 44 respondents provided comments. The comments are very similar to those mentioned after the initial workshop and are generally positive regarding the content, delivery, and materials provided. Responses reiterate the value of the workshops, express a need for training as soon as possible after assuming dean responsibilities and request follow-up programs. Other comments noted the difficulty in implementing some of the concepts presented because

of the fast pace and heavy workload inherent in the dean position, leaving little time for reflection on NALOP materials and long-range planning. The diverse nature of the comments precludes statistical analysis but are included in their entirety in Appendix G.

Summary

The data analysis comprised two parts. The first part consisted of descriptive analyses of archival data regarding overall ratings of the content, delivery, and material presented at the NALOP workshops conducted during May 2001, November 2001, December 2002, and December 2003. Participants' perceptions overall regarding the most useful and least useful aspects of the program were gathered for analysis in addition to feelings of confidence in being a dean after participation in the program. Similarly, comparable evaluative data for individual workshop modules, available only for the May 2001 and November 2001 workshops, were analyzed. The data analysis indicated satisfaction with the workshop content, delivery, and material and increased feelings of confidence in being a dean for the workshops overall and for the individual workshop modules.

The second part of the analysis examined data gathered 9 to 40 months after participants attended the NALOP workshops. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze demographic data regarding the workshop participants. The data were divided into three categories: (a) personal characteristics (e.g., gender, and age when participated in NALOP), (b) employment information (e.g., position just prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, employment affiliation just prior to becoming a dean at DeVry, current employment position, current employment at DeVry, academic curricular areas of responsibility, and current teaching activity at DeVry), and (c) NALOP participation

information (e.g., time elapsed between assuming dean responsibilities and participation, format of workshop attended, and position held when participated).

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze participants' perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity in their positions as administrators as well as their understanding and application of NALOP concepts. Results indicated participants felt some degree of role conflict, low degrees of role ambiguity, medium to high degrees of understanding NALOP concepts, and medium degrees in application of NALOP concepts.

Comparative statistics, independent samples *t* tests and one-way ANOVAs, were performed to examine the relationship after time between the application of NALOP concepts, understanding of NALOP concepts, role conflict, and role ambiguity with selected personal, positional and program related variables. These variables included gender, employment affiliation just prior to becoming a dean, employment position just prior to becoming a dean, time elapsed between assuming dean responsibilities and NALOP participation, and workshop format.

Results of the independent samples *t* tests indicated there were no significant differences between genders or workshop formats on role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, NALOP application scores, or NALOP understanding scores. Likewise, results of the one-way ANOVAs indicated there were no significant differences between prior employment positions, prior employment affiliations, and time elapsed between assuming dean responsibilities and workshop participation on role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, NALOP application scores, or NALOP understanding scores.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to examine participants' perceptions of an in-house training program designed to prepare them for their roles in assuming the responsibilities associated with being a mid-level academic administrator in a for-profit higher education institution. This chapter presents a discussion of the findings as they relate to the literature, limitations of the study, implications for practice in higher education, and recommendations for future research.

Overview

The setting was DeVry University, a for-profit post-secondary educational institution that offers undergraduate degrees in the fields of technology, business, and health services, and graduate degrees in management. The New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) was developed to prepare the university's mid-level administrators to function effectively in their positions. Participants in the program included deans, associate deans, directors, and other mid-level administrators.

Two self-reporting questionnaires were developed to gather data for this study. The first questionnaire, New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) Course Evaluation (Appendix F) was administered immediately after the conclusion of each workshop. This instrument was designed to gather participants' perceptions as to the effectiveness of the program regarding content, delivery, and materials, as well as other factors that may influence these perceptions.

The follow-up questionnaire, NALOP Participant Questionnaire (Appendix A) was administered 9 to 40 months after participants completed the workshops. The purpose of this instrument was to analyze participants' application and understanding of NALOP concepts presented during the workshops and their perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity in their roles as mid-level administrators after completing the workshops.

Discussion of the Findings Immediately Following Workshops

A total of 112 deans, associate deans, directors and other mid-level administrators participated in the six NALOP workshops conducted during May 2001, August 2001, November 2001, May 2002, December 2003, and December 2003. Immediately following the workshops, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire to determine their perceptions of the workshop. They were asked to rate the content, materials, and delivery for the workshops and to comment on the most useful and least useful aspects of the program, feelings of confidence in being a dean upon completing the workshops, and other comments and suggestions. Participants in two of the workshops were asked to provide ratings and comments for individual workshop modules.

Question 1: How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials after each of the workshops?

The evaluations submitted by NALOP participants after the four workshops conducted during May 2001, November 2001, December 2002, and December 2003 were positive. For each workshop, all of the average ratings for the content, delivery, and materials fell between good and excellent. The positive reaction to the program is important from two perspectives. First, a positive reaction is an indication to program

developers that the participants are satisfied with the program and its content. This is important to ensure the continuation of the training program (Kirkpatrick, 1998). Second, a positive reaction to the program implies a commitment to learning on the part of the participants to improve their knowledge or increase their skills. As Kirkpatrick (1998) notes, "positive reaction may not ensure learning, but negative reaction almost certainly reduces the possibility of its occurring" (p. 20).

Question 2: How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of the workshops?

The most useful aspects of the workshops were discussions regarding "Faculty development and policy," as mentioned by 30% of respondents. In studies of the roles and responsibilities of department chairs, Carroll and Gmelch (1992) identified four main areas of chair responsibility, one of which, Faculty Developer, involves recruitment, selection, and evaluation of faculty. Further research indicated that chairs considered this their most important area of responsibility (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Nardi, 1996; Tucker, 1993). The results of the NALOP workshops further support these findings.

Question 3: How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of the workshops?

A number of participants (33%) indicated that the least useful aspects of the program were format rather than content related (e.g., lecture vs. discussion, lack of handouts, and program length). An additional 26% of respondents indicated that "all information was useful," or "nothing" was least useful. In other words, the participants found the content relevant to their needs. Again, a positive reaction to the program

content implies a commitment to the learning and application objectives of the training program by the participants (Kirkpatrick, 1998).

Question 4: How did the NALOP participants describe the feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the workshops?

The overwhelming majority of participants, 80%, experienced increased feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing the NALOP workshops due to having a better understanding regarding duties and responsibilities of the position, feelings of increased support for the position, and positive aspects of peer interaction and networking. The results of this analysis are important in that they support the findings of Burns and Gmelch (1992) who concluded that conditions of role ambiguity and role conflict can be ameliorated when chairs clearly understand the expectations of the position and can perform effectively in this role.

Question 5: What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide?

The majority of comments and suggestions (68%) focused on the delivery of the program, specifically requesting more time for question and answer sessions, group discussion, interactive learning, and less lecture. These comments underscore the importance of providing a format that enhances a program's effectiveness. A question and answer discussion promotes greater spontaneity and engages participants in the learning process to a greater extent than that which is achieved through straight lecture (Oches & Nkomo, 2000). As noted by Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993), "leaders learn through other people whose performance as leaders provides a continuous source of ideas, information, and examples" (p. 24).

Question 6: How did the NALOP participants evaluate the content, delivery, and materials for each workshop module?

Participants' evaluations of the individual workshop modules for the two workshops conducted during May 2001 and November 2001 were positive with all of the ratings for the content, delivery, and materials for each of the modules falling between good and excellent. The modules on Academic Leadership and Faculty Leadership and Supervision received the highest ratings of over 3.50 on a 4-point scale in each of the three categories. These positive reactions indicate that the participants are receiving the knowledge and skills they need to function successfully in their new roles as deans (Kirkpatrick, 1998).

Previous research indicated that these two areas were considered among the most important of the numerous roles and responsibilities expected of chairs (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Jackson, 1994; Nardi, 1996; Tucker, 1993). Additionally, these two areas rank highest among chairs requesting training in certain areas (Jackson, 1994). The results of the NALOP workshops further support these findings.

Question 7: How did the NALOP participants describe the most useful aspects of each workshop module?

Participants were asked to comment on the most useful aspect of each of the six modules presented during the NALOP workshops. Each of the modules consisted of a sub-set of topics discussed within the broader context of the module subject heading.

NALOP participants indicated that the most useful aspect of the workshop model on "Introduction to DeVry University" was the organizational structure and culture of the

organization. These findin gs are consistent with the literature that indicates an effective way to alleviate role ambiguity is to relate an individual's position and relationships with others within the organizational structure and the organization as a whole (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978).

It is not surprising that the participants rated the sub-topics of "faculty training and development" (63%) and "leadership vs. management" (31%) as the two most useful elements of the modules on "Faculty Leadership and Supervision" and "Academic Leadership." Both of these topics rated among the most important and challenging areas in previous studies on the chairpersons' roles and responsibilities (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Jackson, 1994; Nardi, 1996; Tucker, 1993).

Over 70% of respondents indicated that the presentation on "budget" in the "Operations" module was the most useful. With limited budgets, expectations to deliver courses in multiple delivery modes, student demands for utilization of the latest technology, and the expectation to do more with less, it is no surprise that the participants indicate a strong need to need to know and understand the intricacies of the budgeting process in order to fulfill their responsibilities in this area.

Approximately 36% of respondents commented that learning how deans are applying and evaluating academic appeals was the most useful aspect of the module on Student Success. These comments underscore the importance of learning from others who share the same responsibilities (Bennett, 1989; Seagren et al., 1993).

Question 8: How did the NALOP participants describe the least useful aspects of each workshop module?

The majority of participants answering this question indicated that "nothing was not useful," or "all was useful" in the individual modules presented during the workshops which is a strong indication that the workshops were achieving their purpose. However, much can be learned from the participants who provided comments on the least useful aspects of each workshop module.

For two of the modules, "Introduction to DeVry University" and "Operations," some participants commented that they were already familiar with the information presented. This may be due to the fact that 68% of participants had been in the dean position for more than 6 months to over 1 year before participating in the training sessions. In fact, almost one-third held the position for more than one year before participation. To alleviate this issue, future workshops might be conducted closer to the date individuals assume the responsibilities of the dean position.

Some participants commenting on the "Faculty Leadership and Supervision," "Student Success," and "Program Development, Implementation, Management, and Evaluation" modules requested that less theoretical and more practical applications and solutions be provided for the topics presented. It is possible that these issues may be addressed by incorporating more group discussion and interactive learning strategies during the workshops. In another section of this study, 20% of participants mentioned the opportunity to interact and communicate with peers as being the most useful aspects of the workshops. Bennett (1989) reported that chairs often overlooked consulting with other chairs in addressing common problems.

Question 9: How did the NALOP participants describe feelings of confidence in being a dean after completing each workshop module?

The participants indicated increased feelings of confidence in being a dean after completion of each workshop module. Overall, 80% indicated increased feelings of confidence. The two modules concentrating on leadership, "Faculty Leadership and Supervision" and "Academic Leadership," garnered the greatest number of "yes" responses with 89% for Academic Leadership and 84% for Faculty Leadership and Supervision. As these two areas are ranked as being among the most important areas of responsibility and most often mentioned as needed for training in studies about the chairperson's roles and responsibilities (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Jackson, 1994; Nardi, 1996; Tucker, 1993), it is noteworthy that the NALOP participants feel confident in handling these important areas of responsibility.

Question 10: What other comments and suggestions did the NALOP participants provide for each workshop module?

As with the comments and suggestions for the workshops overall, the greatest number of comments and suggestions (37%) focused on the delivery of the program, specifically requesting more time for question and answer sessions, group discussion, interactive learning, and less lecture. These comments underscore the importance of providing a format that enhances a program's effectiveness. Activities such as those requested by the participants provide a greater opportunity for learning than a straight lecture format (Oches & Nkomo, 2000). The benefits from learning by example and sharing ideas and information among a peer group cannot be stressed enough (Bennett, 1989; Seagren et al., 1993).

Discussion of the Findings 9 to 40 Months After Participation in Workshops

These findings are the results of the analysis of the follow-up questionnaire completed by NALOP participants 9 to 40 months after participating in the NALOP workshops. The data returned from 44 (39%) of the 112 deans who participated in the NALOP workshops were analyzed comparing gender, prior employment position, prior employment affiliation, length of time between becoming a dean and NALOP participation, and program format on each of the factors of role conflict, role ambiguity, application of NALOP concepts, and understanding of NALOP concepts.

Question 11: Is there a difference between the two levels of gender (male and female) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

The findings indicated no significant difference between males and females regarding role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores. The findings regarding no differences in role conflict scores and role ambiguity scores are not surprising as previous research reported similar results (Grau, 1997; Hamilton, 2002). Tucker (1993) notes that the stresses associated with role conflict and role ambiguity are inherent in the chairperson's role regardless of gender.

Kirkpatrick (1998) does not distinguish between genders when discussing participants' commitment to the learning and application objectives of a training program's effectiveness implying there is no need to differentiate format, structure, or content based on participants' gender. Likewise, the results of this research indicate there

are no significant differences in the understanding and application of the NALOP concepts presented in the workshops based on gender.

Question 12: Is there a difference between the four levels of prior employment position (academic administrator, non-academic administrator, faculty, and other) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

The findings indicated no significant differences between participants' prior employment positions and their role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores. The literature reports that one-quarter of the nearly 80,000 department chairs nationwide are replaced each year (Gmelch & Burns, 1993), yet, the majority of individuals have little or no training prior to accepting the position, or continuing professional development for the duration of their term in the position (Bennett & Figuli, 1990; Diamond, 1996; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Leaming, 1998; Seagren & Dockery, 1996; Seagren et al., 1993; Spangler, 1999). The majority of chairpersons are drawn from the ranks of faculty, and while they may have expertise in their academic disciplines, have little administrative experience (Tucker, 1993). In contrast, 68% of NALOP workshop participants were administrators in academe, industry, or other professions prior to accepting a dean or associate dean position at DeVry. Previous administrative experience by these participants may account for the lack of differences in the four categories of prior employment position and participants' achieved scores.

The findings suggesting that there is no difference between those with previous administrative experience and faculty may be explained by the fact that 64% of

participants previously employed as faculty held the dean position for between 6 months to over 1 year before participating in the NALOP workshops. These respondents may have received sufficient informal training in learning and applying the roles and requirements of the job.

Question 13: Is there a difference between the three levels of prior employment affiliation (non-profit higher education institution, for-profit higher education institution including DeVry, and industry) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

Results indicated there were no significant differences between the three levels of prior employment affiliation and the analyzed scores. Unlike many universities where the chair is appointed from within the existing faculty or elected by faculty (Tucker, 1993), at DeVry the dean is specifically hired to perform these duties. Given that nearly 75% of deans participating in the NALOP workshops were experienced administrators and not solely selected from the ranks of faculty may be an explanation for this phenomenon.

Surprisingly, the scores of the nearly 30% of participants whose previous experience was outside academe showed no significant differences compared to the scores of the participants whose previous prior affiliations were in higher education institutions. The structure of higher education institutions is significantly different than that of other organizations and the expected management style of the chairs is a more shared experience with an expectation that faculty be advised, if not consulted, before any major decisions are made (Seagren et al., 1993). But the more hierarchical structure

of for-profit education institutions (Ruch, 2001) may be more like those outside academe than those within traditional higher education.

Question 14: Is there a difference between the three levels of time between becoming a dean at DeVry and NALOP participation (less than 6 months, 6 months to 1 year, and more than 1 year) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

Surprisingly, there were no significant difference between the length of time between becoming a dean and NALOP participation and the four scores analyzed. More than 68% of respondents participated in the workshops from 6 months to more than 1 year after assuming administrative duties. Research indicates the length of time a chair is in the position may be a contributing factor to low levels of role ambiguity and role conflict. As chairs become more experienced, they become more effective in their roles resulting in higher levels of job satisfaction and reduced levels of role conflict and role ambiguity (Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Simpson, 1984).

It may be that on-the-job training even in the first 6 months was sufficient instruction for deans to adequately learn and perform their duties and feel comfortable in doing so. Nardi (1996) found that 75% of chairs surveyed in the Pennsylvania University systems reported that informal methods of on-the-job training, discussions with faculty, or discussions with former chairs or deans were the only form of training presented to them with 95% of those indicating this type of training was beneficial in learning the requirements of the position.

Regardless of the type of training received, whether formal or informal, the research indicates that training is of considerable importance in alleviating occurrences of

role conflict and role ambiguity for academic administrators (Burns &Gmelch, 1992; Gmelch & Torelli, 1994; Grau, 1997). Further research is needed comparing formal and informal methods of training as to their effectiveness in preparing academic administrators in learning the requirements of the position and in alleviating occurrences of role conflict and role ambiguity associated with the position.

Question 15: Is there a difference between the two levels of program format of NALOP sessions (5 day in-person and 3 day in-person plus an online component) in regard to the average role conflict scores, role ambiguity scores, application of NALOP concepts scores, and understanding of NALOP concepts scores?

No significant differences were found between the two methods of program format on the four scores analyzed. These results may have been of significance before on-line learning became as prevalent as it currently is. Not only are individuals more comfortable with interacting via modern technology (less face-to-face contact) but the prevalence of providing courses on-line to distance students makes it apparent that face-to-face is not the only effective way to learn and communicate. However, one of the main strengths of the NALOP program as indicted by participants' comments is the opportunity to interact and communicate with peers from other campuses. This important element is evident in both of the NALOP workshop delivery formats.

Differences between conducting training sessions using only face-to-face delivery, a combination of face-to-face and on-line, and solely via on-line are beyond the scope of this research. Further research in this area may prove beneficial in providing initial or subsequent training sessions to a widely dispersed population where it is not

economically or geographically feasible to meet face-to-face, or to provide training sessions in a more timely manner or on a more frequent basis.

Limitations

The following limitations are applicable to this study:

1. This study was limited to academic administrators employed at a for-profit higher education institution. Specific findings cannot be generalized or applied to other two-year or four-year institutions.
2. The study relied on the self-reported perceptions of participants as to their understanding and application of NALOP concepts. It is possible that participants did not accurately report their competencies regarding these concepts.
3. Pre-tests were not conducted to determine participants' levels of role ambiguity, role conflict, understanding of NALOP concepts, and application of NALOP concepts. Comparisons between scores prior to NALOP training and post-training scores were not possible.
4. The sample size is limited. Out of 112 participants in the NALOP workshops, only 44 deans, or 39%, completed the NALOP Participant Questionnaire that was administered 9 to 40 months after participants completed the workshop so the power of the inferential statistics to detect any real differences was relatively low.
5. The evaluative data collected immediately after the workshops via the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) Course Evaluation questionnaire was incomplete. Evaluative data for the workshops overall was available for only four of the six workshops conducted and the raw data for

individual participants was not easily identified. Data evaluating the individual workshop modules are available for only two of the workshops.

Implications for the Field of Higher Education

The following implications for the field of higher education are offered:

1. Training is essential for academic administrators in order for them to understand their role in the institution and effectively perform their responsibilities. The training should encompass both formal and informal methodologies including workshops and mentoring by experienced administrators.
2. Training for new chairs should address the immediate skills they need in order to perform with understanding and confidence.
3. Training should be an on-going part of the chairperson's professional growth and development activities and should not be provided only when the chair assumes the position.
4. Solicit input from chairs and upper-level administrators to determine which topics are of most value to the position. Sessions should include general leadership and management skills but should also address the institution's unique requirements.
5. Training sessions should make limited use of the straight lecture format and instead incorporate question and answer sessions, group discussion, and interactive learning strategies as these methodologies enhance a program's effectiveness by engaging participants in the learning process to a greater extent than does a straight lecture format.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are offered for consideration for future research:

1. The current study examined participants' perceptions of a training program designed to prepare them for their roles and responsibilities in being an academic administrator in a for-profit higher education institution. A future study could examine similar programs at non-profit institutions.
2. The current study used two different delivery methodologies in presenting the workshops, face-to-face and a combination of face-to-face and on-line. Given the growing usage of on-line course instruction in higher education, it would be useful to study the impact of this delivery method on training for mid-level academic administrators.
3. Further research is needed comparing formal and informal methods of training as to their effectiveness in preparing academic administrators in learning the requirements of the position and in alleviating occurrences of role conflict and role ambiguity associated with the position.
4. This study was designed to measure participants' perceptions as to their understanding and application of the concepts presented in the training program. A study could be developed to determine how well participants achieved the expected outcomes of the program as perceived by upper-level academic administrators.
5. A similar study could be conducted with participants who complete future NALOP workshops to assess their perceived levels of role conflict and role ambiguity. A pre-training questionnaire and a post-training questionnaire should

be administered in order to compare levels of role conflict and role ambiguity prior to and after NALOP training.

REFERENCES

American Council of Education, Department Chair Online Resource Center. (n.d.). *Where can I find help for learning the job?* Retrieved May 1 2004, from http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/showsubsection.cfm?subsectionID=5

Bennett, J. B. (1989, October). About department chairs. *AAHE Bulletin,* 9-11.

Bennett, J. B., & Figuli, D. J. (1990). *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Booth, D. B. (1982). *The department chair: Professional development and role conflict.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

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

Breaugh, J. A., & Colihan, J. P. (1994). Measuring facets of job ambiguity: Construct validity evidence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 191-202.

Burns, J. S., & Gmelch, W. H. (1992, April). *Stress factors, role conflict and role ambiguity for academic department chairs.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting in San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 630).

Byrne, J. P. (1997). *Chairs and change in the evolving community college* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Report No. ED428781).

Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). An analysis of job satisfaction and job satisfier factors among six taxonomies of agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 33,* 9-16.

Carroll, A. B. (1974). Role conflict in academic organizations: An exploratory examination of the department chairman's experience. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 10,* 51-64.

Carroll, J. B. (1991). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education, 32,* 669-688.

Carroll, J. B., & Gmelch, W. H. (1992, April). *A factor-analytic investigation of role types and profiles of higher education department chairs.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting in San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 629).

Chieffo, A. M. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership teams. *Community College Review, 19,* 15-24.

Coll, K., & Rice, R. (1990). Job satisfaction among community college counselors. *Community/Junior College Quarterly, 14,* 83-91.

Creswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). *The academic chairperson's handbook.* Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Davis, F. A. (1995). Role expectations of learning resources program directors in comprehensive community colleges. *Community College Review, 23,* 45-57.

DeVry University (2003). *New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) handbook.* Oak Brook Terrace, IL: Author.

Diamond, R. M. (1996, Spring). What it takes to lead a department. *The Department Chair, 6,* (4), 1, 20, 23.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys* (2nd ed). New York: Wiley.

Dyer, B. G., & Miller, M. (1999). *A critical review of literature related to the department chair position.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED432193).

Fife, J. D. (1982) Foreword. In D. B. Booth, *The department chair: professional development and role conflict.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Filan, G. (1999). The need for leadership training: The evolution of the Chair Academy. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 47-55.

Fisher, C. D., & Gitelson, R. (1983). A meta-analysis of the correlates of role conflict and ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 320-333.

Fogg, P. (2001, October 19). Can department heads be trained to succeed? *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. A10.

Freeman, B., & Coll, K. M. (1997). Factor structure of the role questionnaire (RQ): a study of high school counselors. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 30,* 32-40.

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

Gillett-Karam, R. (1999). Midlevel management in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 5-11.

Gliner, J. A., & Morgan, G. A. (2000). *Research methods in applied settings: an integrated approach to design and analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1993). The cost of academic leadership: Department chair stress. *Innovative Higher Education, 17,* 259-70.

Gmelch, W. H., & Houchen, B. C. (1994, September). The balancing act of community college chairs. *Academic Leadership: Journal of the National Community College Chair Academy, 2,* (1) 5-11.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1993). *Leadership skills for department chairs.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Gmelch, W. H., & Torelli, J. A. (1994). The association of role conflict and role ambiguity with administrator stress and burnout. *Journal of School Leadership, 4,* 341-356.

Grau, M. R. (1997). An investigation of the job-related stressors of department chairpersons in a selected community college system (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 58, 3379.

Green, J. (2000). Job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 61 (10A), 3864, (UMI No. 9991273).

Grumbles, K., & Bregman, N. J. (1994, June). *The academic department head: Duties and compensation.* Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum in New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 655).

Hamilton, P. C. (2002). A comparison of faculty role ambiguity and role conflict at freestanding and component community and technical colleges in West Virginia. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 63 (09A), 3068. (UMI No. 3064589).

Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

Jackson, M. (1994). Analysis of the role of the division chairperson in the Alabama College System. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56 (06A), 2060.* (UMI No. 9536784)

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36,* 16-78.

Jennerich, E. J. (1981). Competencies for academic chairpersons: myths and realities. *Liberal Education, 67,* 46-70.

Jimmieson, N. L., Terry, D. J., & Callan, V. J. (2004). A longitudinal study of employee adaptation to organizational change: The role of change-related information and change-related self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9,* 11-27.

Joyce, W. F. (1986). Matrix organization: a social experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 29,* 536-61.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* New York: Wiley.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York: Wiley.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Kotter, J. P. (2001). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review, 79, 11,* 85-91.

Kouzas, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krayer, K. J. (1986). Using training to reduce role conflict and ambiguity. *Training and Development Journal, 40,* 49-52.

Kremer-Hayon, L., & Avi-Itzhak, T. E. (1986). Roles of academic department chairpersons at the university level: Perceptions and satisfaction. *Higher Education, 15,* 105-112.

Leaming, D. R. (1998). *Academic leadership: A practical guide to chairing the department.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

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

Maclin, R. (1995). A chair's dilemma: Stress, conflict and ambiguity (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56,* 3472.

Matusek, L. R. (1997). *Finding your voice: Learning to lead...anywhere you want to make a difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McAdams, R. P. (1997, February). Revitalizing the department chair. *AAHE Bulletin,* 10-13.

McBride, S. A., Munday, R. G., & Tunnell, J. (1992). Community college faculty job satisfaction and propensity to leave. *Community/Junior College Quarterly, 16,* 157-165.

McDade, S. A. (1987). *Higher education leadership: Enhancing skills through professional development programs.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, J. R., & Malpass, L. F. (1975). Selected characteristics, roles, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen in state and land-grant institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 3,* 243-259.

Murray, J. P., & Murray, J. I. (1998). Job satisfaction and the propensity to leave an institution among two-year college division chairpersons. *Community College Review, 25,* 45-59.

Nardi, E.W. (1996). Self-perceptions of role, function, and preparedness of academic department chairpersons in higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57 (03),* 956A. (UMI No. 9621467)

Oches, N., & Nkomo, S. (2000). *The teaching bridge: A resource manual for part-time teachers in today's colleges and universities.* Davidson, NC: Arizona Mission Press.

Owens, R. G. (1998). *Organizational behavior in education* (6th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pappas, E. J. (1989, April). The department chair in the 1990s: Confessions, concerns, convictions. *ACA Bulletin, 68,* 34-37.

Pettitt, J. M. (1999). Situating midlevel managers' training: Learning and doing in context. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 57-65.

Probst, T. M. (2003). Exploring employee outcomes of organizational restructuring: A Solomon Four-Group study. *Group & Organization Management, 28, 3,* 416-439.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15,* 150-163.

Roach, J. H. L. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities. *Educational Record, 57,* 13-23.

Ruch, R. S. (2001). Higher Ed, Inc.: The rise of the for-profit university. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schuler, R. S., Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A. P. (1977). Role conflict and ambiguity: A scale analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20,* 111-128.

Seagren, A. T., & Dockery, M. A. (1996). Academic leadership: Past, present, and future. *Academic Leadership, 3,* 33-34.

Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: new roles, responsibilities and challenges.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education, Report No. 1. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Development.

Seedorf, R. G., & Gmelch, W. H. (1989, March). *The department chair: A descriptive study.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Convention Annual Meeting in San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 713).

Shepherd, C. D., & Fine, L. M. (1994). Scaling and measurement: role conflict and role ambiguity reconsidered. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 14,* 57-56

Simpson, W. M. (1984). Division heads and role strain perception. *Community College Review, 12,* p. 21-26.

Singleton, B. S. (1987). Sources and consequences of role conflict and role ambiguity among department chairs. *Capstone Journal of Education, , VII,* 39-50.

Smart, J. C. & Elton, C. F. (1976). Administrative roles of department chairmen. In J. C. Smart & J. R. Montgomery (Ed.) *New directions for institutional research: Examining department management,* No. 10 San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Smith, A. B., & Stewart, G. A. (1999). A statewide survey of new department chairs: Their experiences and needs in learning their roles. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 29-36.

Spaid, R. L., & Parsons, M. H. Meeting the millennium's challenge: Leading from where you are. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 13-20.

Spangler, M. S. (1999). The practitioner's guide to midlevel management development. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 21-28.

Tucker, A. (1993). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (3rd ed.). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

Van Sell, M., Brief, A. P., & Schuler, R. S. (1981). Role conflict and role ambiguity: Integration of the literature and direction for future research. *Human Relations, (34),* 43-71.

Wheeler, D. W. (2002) . Chairs as institutional leaders. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Field Guide to academic leadership* (pp. 451-468). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Wood, V. V. (1992). An investigation of job related tension as a function of role conflict and role ambiguity in department chairpersons in selected Texas community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54,* 410.

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

Yamasaki, E. (1999). Understanding managerial leadership as more than an oxymoron. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 67-74.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

NALOP Participant Questionnaire

NALOP Participant Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions based on your experiences with the NALOP program. Circle the number for the response that best describes your level of agreement or disagreement for each statement using the scale below:

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Somewhat disagree
(3) Disagree
(4) Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(5) Somewhat agree
(6) Agree
(7) Strongly Agree

1. I am currently applying the concepts presented in the NALOP session regarding *program development, implementation, and management.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

2. I am currently applying the information presented in the NALOP session regarding *planning a budget.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

3. I am currently applying the information presented in the NALOP session regarding *submitting CEAs.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

4. The NALOP *handouts* are helpful to me in performing my tasks and responsibilities.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

5. Since NALOP, I am able to effectively *conduct a program review.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

6. I am currently applying the concepts presented in the NALOP session regarding *faculty growth and development.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

7. I am currently applying the concepts presented in the NALOP session regarding *faculty performance evaluations.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

8. I am now able to understand common student issues and apply appropriate processes, policies, and procedures to address them.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

9. NALOP assisted me in understanding the relationship between the centralized home office and the administrative structure of individual campuses.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

10. NALOP assisted me in understanding DeVry's mission and its role in higher education.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

11. I now understand the difference between my leadership and managerial roles.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

12. Since NALOP, I *developed a vision* for my department *and shared it* with department members.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Please answer the following questions about Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity in your position as an administrator at DeVry.

13. I know what is expected of me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I work on unnecessary things.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I know that I have divided my time properly.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I receive an assignment without the proper manpower to complete it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I know what my responsibilities are.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I feel certain about how much authority I have.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I have to do things that should be done differently.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please select the appropriate category for the information requested in the following section.

27. Please indicate the time between assuming dean or administrator responsibilities and participation in NALOP.

□ Less than 6 months □ 6 months to 1 year □ More than 1 year

28. Please indicate your gender.

□ Male □ Female

29. Please indicate your age when you attended NALOP.

□ less than 35 □ 35-44 □ 45-54 □ 55+

30. Please indicate the NALOP session you attended.

□ 5 day in-person □ 3 day + on-line

31. Please indicate your employment *position just prior* to becoming a dean or administrator at DeVry.

□ Academic administrator
□ Non-academic administrator
□ Faculty
□ Other (please provide) _____

32. Please indicate your employment *affiliation just prior* to becoming a dean or administrator at DeVry.

□ Non-profit higher educational institution
□ For-profit higher educational institution (including DeVry)
□ Industry
□ Other (please provide) _____

33. Please indicate your position *when you participated* in NALOP.

□ Academic Dean
□ Academic Associate Dean
□ Other Dean or Administrator (please specify) _____

34. Please indicate your *current* employment position.

□ Academic Dean
□ Academic Associate Dean
□ Other Dean or Administrator (please specify) _____
□ Faculty
□ Other (please specify) _____

35. Is your current position at DeVry?

□ Yes □ No

36. If your current position is in the academic area, what curricular area(s) are your working in (please check all that apply).

□ BET □ CET □ EET □ IT □ TECH MGMT
□ BIN □ CIS □ GEN ED □ NCM
□ BUS ADMIN □ ECT □ HIT □ NSA

37. Are you currently teaching any classes at DeVry?

□ Yes □ No

38. Please comment on any other aspect of the NALOP program you feel is important.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

Cover Letter Included with NALOP Participant Questionnaire

Colorado State University

School of Education
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523-1588

Dear Colleague:

Catherine Carter and I are conducting a dissertation research project on *Participants' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of an In-House Training Program for New Mid-level Academic Leaders at DeVry University*. Catherine is the Library Director at the DeVry Chicago campus.

You previously participated in DeVry's New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) and provided your impressions of the program immediately after the training sessions through the completion of an evaluation questionnaire, administered by the Academic Affairs Department, to examine your perceptions as to the effectiveness of the program regarding course content, delivery, and materials. The responses from that initial questionnaire were provided to the researchers, without any names or other identifying marks, thus ensuring anonymity of the respondents.

Additionally, as a follow-up to those sessions, we are studying the program's effectiveness from the perspective of the participants and student measures of role conflict and role ambiguity as they apply to your role as a dean or other administrator. To that end, we are requesting that you take approximately 15 minutes and complete the attached questionnaire and return it to Catherine in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope within the next two weeks. Your participation, while valuable, is strictly voluntary. You are not asked to identify yourself either on the survey or the return envelope in order to maintain your complete anonymity and the confidentially of your responses. While there are no known risks to you in completing the questionnaire, it is not possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researcher(s) have taken reasonable safeguards to minimize any known and potential, but unknown, risks.

Since you have already participated in NALOP, the results of this study may not benefit you directly; however, findings may indicate additional training needs for you as previous participants or may provide practical implications to DeVry in enhancing and refining NALOP training for future participants. Additionally, participants in similar programs at other higher educational institutions may benefit from the findings of this study.

Should you have any questions, please contact Catherine Carter at (773) 929-8500 ext. 2215 or Dr. George A. Morgan at (970) 491-0608.

The Colorado Governmental Immunity Act determines and may limit Colorado State University's legal responsibility if an injury happens because of this study. Claims against the university must be filed within 180 days of the injury. Questions about participants' rights may be directed to Celia S. Walker at (970) 491-1563.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation.

Sincerely,

George A. Morgan, PhD
Professor, School of Education
Colorado State University

Catherine Carter
Library Director
DeVry University, Chicago

Appendix C

Letter from DeVry University Doctoral Research Review Committee

June 28, 2004

Dr. Timothy Davies
School of Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523

Dear Dr. Davies and CSU Human Research Committee:

DeVry University

DeVry Inc.
One Tower Lane
Oakbrook Terrace
Illinois 60181-4624
630-571-7700
800-733-3879
www.devry.com

This is to convey to you the decision of the DeVry University Doctoral Research Review Committee to approve the data collection plan set forth in the dissertation proposal of Catherine Carter. Since DeVry University is exclusively a teaching university, we do not have an Institutional Review Board, but have instead substituted the Doctoral Research Review Committee to perform some of the same functions, albeit on a more limited basis. The Committee consists of Marilynn Cason, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, Jerry Murphy, Senior Vice President of Operations, and me, as Vice President for Academic Affairs. DeVry University has a matrix organizational structure under which all of our campus operations report to campus presidents and they to regional vice presidents, all of whom report to Jerry Murphy. On each campus are program deans and deans of academic affairs, who have direct line responsibility for supporting and managing the faculty and academic programs, and all of these academic administrators have dotted line relationships to the program directors and the dean of curriculum, who reports to me.

In supporting Catherine Carter's dissertation research, we understand that the questionnaire is to be administered voluntarily, with all responses to be anonymous, to those academic deans who participated in the university's New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP). The survey will be mailed directly to the participants and returned directly to the researcher. No identifying marks will appear on either the survey instrument or the return envelope.

In conclusion, Catherine Carter is a highly regarded administrator at DeVry, and we believe her project will help us continue to improve as an institution. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Pat Mayers

Patrick Mayers
Vice President, Academic Affairs

CC: Marilyn Cason
Jerry Murphy

Appendix D

Follow-up Email Regarding NALOP Participant Questionnaire

Dear Colleague:

A questionnaire regarding the New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) was sent to you approximately two weeks ago.

Thank you if you have already responded.

If you have not already done so, please complete the questionnaire and return it to me at the address below.

For your convenience, I am attaching another copy of the questionnaire.

Catherine Carter
433 Lindley Rd.
Westmont, IL 60559

<NALOP Participant Questionnaire>

Appendix E

Permission from Dr. John Rizzo

-----Original Message-----
From: John Rizzo [mailto:johnrriz@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2004 6:59 AM
To: cjcarter@Chi.DeVry.edu
Subject:

Dear Ms. Carter

Peter Kobrak forwarded your email to me.....I no longer have any copies of the questionnaire you wish to use. However, you can construct one by going to the original articles, one of which contains all the items. You should easily be able to identify which items refer to role conflict and which refer to role ambiguity. One item was inadvertently duplicated on the original questionnaire, so you can delete that one. All you need to do is write questionnaire instructions as described in the articles, including of course the rating scale to indicate the degree to which each item applies to the respondent. I am sure you can get help from this if needed from one of your committee members or other faculty.

You may also consider this as permission to use the questionnaire in your research which your committee will likely require.

John Rizzo

Appendix F

New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP) Course Evaluation

New Academic Leaders Orientation Program (NALOP)
Course Evaluation

What aspects of the course do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry? Why?
What aspects of the course do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry? Why?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has the NALOP increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry? Why or why not?

What aspects of Chapter 1 do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
What aspects of Chapter 1 do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has this course increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry?
Please make any further comments and/or suggestions for improving this course.

What aspects of Chapter 2 do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
What aspects of Chapter 2 do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has this course increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry?
Please make any further comments and/or suggestions for improving this course.

What aspects of Chapter 3 do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
What aspects of Chapter 3 do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has this course increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry?
Please make any further comments and/or suggestions for improving the NALOP.

What aspects of Chapter 4 do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
What aspects of Chapter 4 do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has this course increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry?
Please make any further comments and/or suggestions for improving this course.

What aspects of Chapter 5 do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
What aspects of Chapter 5 do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has this course increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry?
Please make any further comments and/or suggestions for improving this course.

What aspects of Chapter 6 do you think will be most useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
What aspects of Chapter 6 do you find to be the least useful to you as a new Dean with DeVry?
Please rate the following using the scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent Content/Subject Matter ☐ Delivery/Facilitation ☐ Materials Provided ☐
Has this course increased your feeling of confidence in being a Dean at DeVry?
Please make any further comments and/or suggestions for improving this course.

Appendix G

Responses to NALOP Participant Questionnaire, Question 38: Please comment on any other aspect of the NALOP program you feel is important

Responses to NALOP Participant Questionnaire, Question 38: Please comment on any other aspect of the NALOP program you feel is important

The training was a great idea, but I felt that those offering the training had little knowledge about the day-to-day realities of being a dean. They seemed very out of touch with how little time deans have to devote to planning, evaluation and assessment. Most of the plans that have been set in motion are aimed at full-time faculty and their deans. eCollege is quite a burden for adjuncts and those hiring adjuncts. On the other hand, the training was organized and allowed me time with other deans to ask questions and see how other programs work.

There was a Dean Guidebook handed out during the Orientation Programs that I found very useful. I still refer to it today. It had sample letters and other documents. Great for new managers & deans.

Make it practical. Include "scheduling" training.

More discussion of classroom management issues—both student and faculty related problems. The former are pretty straight forward while the latter often require more in-depth leadership and managerial skills.

Treat participants more like students than staff—this is an opportunity to build relationships. Don't use it to build walls.

The pace of my job is such that I have barely any reflective time to go back to NALOP materials. I wok on things that should be a smaller part of my job (i.e., scheduling). This was a part of NALOP (the importance of carving out time for longer range planning), and is truly the challenge of this position. Also, the volume of near term issues makes planning and laying foundations for long term strengths difficult at my level. The 6 session calendar is introducing at this point so many new acad. operational concerns that there's an incessancy challenge for deans. On bad days I feel like a shift manager. On good days I am high about the quality of education we work hard to create and deliver. NALOP could recognize the work of surviving bad days and weeks more directly.

It might have help to attend a LOT sooner than 9 months into the job. I already figured out quite a bit of what was presented out of necessity/survival.

This seems like such a very long time ago—it's difficult to recall the presentations. Regarding the manual it would have been helpful for us to get it before the meeting, to help us identify concerns and questions.

I was involved in the first NALOP, which at times was poorly focused.

When we were asked to evaluate our sessions, I think we offered some useful ideas. Since some attendees were strong in management and others had an academic background, the sessions were not helpful to the entire group. The sessions should have been more audience-specific.

Much of the material was already known to me because I had been at DeVry for 14 years. Some material---like the budget and faculty development—was unrelated to my job at that time. That material may, however, become important in the future.

I believe that overall the program was a good idea with valuable materials. Unfortunately as with many good ideas, their reality & usefulness in the actual workplace failed to improve working conditions. Leadership training is important, but without adequate support staff to carry out the tasks at hand, administrative leaders are too busy putting out fires to implement the ideas, concepts & programs detailed at NALOP.

Certain questions were ambiguous and could lead to unreliable data. 5. Yes. I can conduct a program review; but not because of NALOP training 6. Not much was presented in this area. 7. Faculty performance evaluations changed with new faculty policy that was published last year. I no longer use process taught at NALOP. 11 & 12. Yes, but not because of NALOP. 25. I developed them on my own initiative. They were not the result of existing processor or NALOP training.

The DeVry I am affiliated with has a culture problem & a leadership problem. It may not truly represent the DeVry culture & values.

This was a great opportunity for me to meet the academic leaders at the corporate office. It is always nice to put a face with a name and find out they are real, personable, and very easy to work with.

Need to have 2 part training! 1. Nuts and bolts (how to! everyday tasks) 2) Leadership (faculty and program development)

Too much, too fast. No opportunity to digest & assimilate information. Not enough practical examples of how to apply. ISIS has consumed so much time that little if any practical management is being achieved quickly. Falling behind.

Took NALOP in 2001. 80% focus on faculty, 20% focus on admissions. No focus on DeVry campus org, CEA's, career svcs, finance, industry boards, program reviews, etc. Assumed all attendees were previous DeVry faculty moving to admin or assoc deans moving to full deans.

I found the NALOP program to be essential in conveying the DeVry organizational culture, structure, lines of authority and division of responsibility.

NDOP (as it was called in July or August 2001) painted a rosy and inaccurate picture of life at DeVry—one where faculty and deans were empowered to pursue academic excellence & professional development. Reality is that there are few opportunities or support for either. We must do the best we can with very limited (& dwindling) resources.

Most of the material is outdated with all the system/policy changes that have occurred. An update would be good.

This program was a very important part of my DeVry orientation and continues to pay dividends.

NALOP provides a forum for new and aspiring administrators to learn from and interact with the "best of the best" at Devry University. It is indicative of DeVry concern for the future of its academic leadership.

Training should be done within 3 months of hire.

Appendix H

Letter from Colorado State University Human Research Committee

Colorado State University

Office of Regulatory Compliance
Office of Vice President for Research
and Information Technology
Fort Collins, CO 80523-2011
(970) 491-1553
FAX: (970) 491-2293

MEMORANDUM

TO: George Morgan, School of Education, 1588
FROM: Janell A. Meldrem, Administrator for the Janell Meldrem
Human Research Committee
SUBJECT: **PROJECT APPROVAL**
Title: Participants' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of an In-House Training Program for New Mid-Level Academic Leaders at DeVry University
Protocol No.: 04-212H
Funding Agency: N/A
DATE: August 13, 2004

I am pleased to inform you that the above-referenced project was approved by the Human Research Committee on August 13, 2004 for the period August 13, 2004 to August 5, 2005. Because of the nature of this research, it will not be necessary to obtain a signed consent form. However, all subjects must receive a copy of the approved cover letter printed on department letterhead. The requirement of documentation of a consent form is waived under § _ _.117 (c) (2). **Approval is for 112 participants.**

A status report of this project will be required within a 12-month period from the date of approval. Renewal is the Principal Investigator's responsibility, but as a courtesy you will be sent a reminder approximately two months before the protocol expires. The Principal Investigator will report on the number of subjects who have participated this year and project-to-date, about problems encountered, and provide a verifying copy of the consent form or cover letter used. The necessary form (H-101) is available from the Regulatory Compliance web page (see below). Should the protocol not be renewed before expiration, all activities must cease until the protocol has been re-reviewed.

It is the responsibility of the investigator to immediately inform the Committee of any serious complications, unexpected risks, or injuries resulting from this research. It is also the investigator's responsibility to notify the Committee of any changes in experimental design, participant population, or consent procedures or documents. This can be done with a memo which completely describes the changes and their consequences (new consent form or cover letter, or altered survey instrument, for example). Students serving as Co-Principal Investigators may not alter projects without first obtaining PI approval. The PI is ultimately responsible for the conduct of the project. Upon completion of the project, an H-101 form should be submitted as a close-out report.

This approval is issued under Colorado State University's OHRP Federal Wide Assurance 00000647 issued July 1, 2001. If approval did not accompany a proposal when it was submitted to a sponsor, it is the researcher's responsibility to provide the sponsor with the approval notice.

Please direct any questions about the Committee's action on this project to me for routing to the Committee.

Attachment
xc: Catherine Carter w/attachment