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Abstract: The purpose of this study was to examine the types of leadership styles of allied health deans in academic health centers and the relationship of the perceived leadership styles to department chairpersons’ job satisfaction. A correlational research design was utilized. A Kruskal-Wallis test indicated a significant difference in department chairpersons’ satisfaction scores as a function of deans’ leadership style ($X^2 = 62.4$, $DF = 3$, $P = .001$). A pairwise Wilcoxon Rank Sum test was performed on all combinations of satisfaction scores by leadership style. The results indicated that when department chairpersons perceived that their deans possessed a management style with high consideration behavior as one component, they derived more satisfaction on the job. A high task/high consideration management style was associated with significantly higher satisfaction levels for chairpersons when compared to all other styles.
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There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define it. In a fundamental sense, leadership is also fellowship. People tend to follow those in whom they see means for satisfying their own desires. The task of leadership is one of encouraging people to contribute effectively in accomplishment of predetermined organizational goals (Koontz, O'Donnell, & Weihrich, 1984).

There is substantial evidence that leadership behaviors of supervisors have a significant impact on employees. A longitudinal study by Green and Schriesheim (1977) suggested that leadership can contribute to good group relations. Numerous studies have been conducted of industrial leadership behavior. House and Filley (1971) found that the leadership aspect of consideration related significantly to employees' freedom of action. Fleishman and Simmons (1970) found that supervisor effectiveness was positively related to several components of leadership behavior. Hedge (1976) found a positive correlation between subordinates' need satisfaction and managers' leadership styles.

Within the educational sphere, Halpin (1956) found that superintendent effectiveness was related to aspects of task and consideration behavior. Mathews (1963) reported that two aspects of principals' leadership behaviors were related to teacher participation. Mansour (1969) found that discrepancies between expected and actual leadership behavior of principles was negatively related to teacher job satisfaction and participation. Satisfaction of employees on the job is a by-product of effective leadership.
Vroom (1964) cited evidence that there were other changes in employee job satisfaction following changes in supervisors. This is not difficult to imagine. New supervisors with new styles of leadership are likely to introduce changes which require individuals to change their habitual ways of behaving. Gruneberg (1979) contended that the relationship between supervision (leadership) and job satisfaction is unclear and that past research has had mixed results.

A number of researchers examined the relationship between leadership and employee satisfaction. Nealey and Blood (1968) found that for both first and second level supervision, subordinate satisfaction was related to the leadership component of consideration. Weed, Mitchell, and Moffitt (1976) also found that leader consideration was related not only to employee satisfaction but also to group productivity. Osborn and Hunt (1975) found that most aspects of member satisfaction in sixty businesses were positively associated with two aspects of supervisory behavior. Bass, Burger, and Daktar (1979) found that employees were more satisfied when working with managers who demonstrated participative leadership styles. Duxburg, Armstrong, and Drew (1984) found that supervisor consideration was related to employee satisfaction. Fiedler (1967), Heller (1969), and Vroom and Yetton (1974) contended that to study leadership and its relationship to other constructs may be studied only if the environment, organization, and particular leaders are controlled. Because variables are not uniform among organizations, results of industrial studies or those done in primary or secondary school settings should not be generalized to postsecondary education settings.
Bass (1981) emphasized that research conducted on leadership behavior and its relationship to various employee attitudes cannot be generalized beyond the organization, environment, and leaders studied. However, considerable generalization of leadership research in the industrial/business sector to other environments has occurred. Whereas, in education, research on leadership behavior has been limited and examination of relationships between leadership behavior of administrators and faculty job satisfaction has been very limited. Morgan (1984) stated that leadership behavior of deans can have significant impact upon faculty job satisfaction.

Colleges and universities face problems of various magnitudes. Issues such as decreasing enrollment, financial retrenchment, fewer faculty positions, curricular revisions, and decreasing public confidence plague academic administrators. Keller (1983) stated that quality and, in some cases, existence of various programs will depend upon abilities of academic managers to combat various forces impacting postsecondary education.

Academic deans have the difficult task of preserving collegiality via harsh choices. They are called upon to provide leadership which will yield effective outcomes, while protecting faculty from various incursions. Trying to sensitize academics to these new realities is a sensitive and oftentimes unpleasant task.

The role of academic administrators has become more difficult with the need to master increasingly heterogeneous functions. Expanding complexities and rapid changes in educational organizations require that managers understand myriad problems and approach change strategies more systematically than ever before.
Academic deans are expected to spend considerable time and thought on departmental relationships and, at the same time, help develop overall institutional emphases. Deans’ behaviors, when working with others to achieve specified goals, influence opportunities for departments and faculty to respond to change more positively.

Need for Study

Most research on managerial leadership style and employee job satisfaction during the last 66 years has been conducted in business and industry. Only within the last two decades have studies concerning job satisfaction of health care personnel in clinical settings emerged (Conrad, Conrad, & Parler, 1985; Madill, Macnab, Brintneel, Stewin, & Fitzsimmons, 1987; Noel, Hammel, & Bootman, 1982; Roberts, 1988; Sodano, Javian & Judd, 1984; Spencer, 1984; Stamps, Piedmont, Slavitt, & Haase, 1978). Schools of allied health are relatively new additions to higher education. Most appeared during the last two decades. Little research has been conducted in allied health administrative environments. Within such settings, there have been limited studies of chairpersons (Canfield, 1985; Detrich, King & Protos, 1980; Selker, Rozier, & Vogt, 1983; Selker & Vogt, 1978; Selker & Vogt, 1982) and virtually none regarding deans’ leadership styles and their relationship to chairpersons’ job satisfaction. Thus, the rationale for this study.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to contribute to understanding of relationships between subordinates’ perceptions of supervisors’ leadership behaviors (leadership style) and their job satisfaction. More specifically, the relationship of perceived leadership behavior
(leadership style) of deans of schools of allied health and job satisfaction of department chairpersons was examined. From the stated purpose, two research questions were developed:

1. What are the leadership styles of deans of schools of allied health as perceived by department chairpersons?

2. Do department chairpersons’ satisfactions with supervision vary with their perceptions of deans’ leadership styles?

Methodology

Population

Subjects were department chairpersons in schools of allied health in academic health centers in state universities in the continental United States. The Association of Academic Health Centers Directory (1986) was used to identify appropriate institutions. Twenty-nine schools of allied health were identified.

Telephone calls were made to each dean’s office to obtain mailing addresses of departments. One hundred and sixty-nine departments were identified in 29 schools. Questionnaires were mailed to the entire population of chairpersons in schools of allied health. Within three weeks, a follow-up mailing was done. The final return rate was 70%. At least one response was received from every school and only four schools of allied health had less than a 50% return rate from department chairpersons.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire divided into three sections: (a) demographic, (b) job descriptive index, and (c) leaders behavior descriptive questionnaire, was developed to gather the data. The first section consisted of demographic information: age, gender, years in current
position, years in academia, rank, and tenure status. The second section contained the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). The JDI was developed at Cornell University in 1969 to measure satisfaction with work (task), supervision, promotional opportunities, pay, people on the job, and overall satisfaction. Only the measure of satisfaction with supervision was used in this study. The instrument consisted of a group of adjectives or descriptive phrases. Respondents indicated whether the adjectives described their supervisors or not. The psychometric properties of the JDI have been addressed in detail by Smith, et al. (1969). They reported the Spearman-Brown coefficient ranged from .80 to .88. Using the JDI, Young (1982) found an average coefficient of internal consistency of .79. In a review of studies over a 16 year period using the JDI, Cook, Hepworth, Wall, and War (1981) found the psychometric properties to be within acceptable range for social science research.

The third section of the questionnaire contained the Leaders Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) developed by Halpin and Wirier (1957). The LBDQ addressed four factorially defined aspects of leaders’ behavior: consideration, initiating structure (task), production emphasis, and sensitivity. In many studies completed since 1957 utilizing the LBDQ, only questions on consideration and task were used because they seemed to account for the greatest variance in leader behavior. For this study, only the two subscales of consideration and task were used to measure leadership style. The subscales consisted of 30 questions, 15 to measure each leadership dimension.

Reliability and validity. The reliability and validity of the LBDQ have been demonstrated by numerous investigators. Halpin and
Wirier (1957) indicated that the split half reliability was .86 for task and .93 for consideration. Seeman (1957) found reliability of .89 for consideration and .87 for task. Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) considered the LBDQ to be a valid measure of subordinate perceptions of leader behavior.

**Data Analysis**

This study employed a correlational research design. Chairpersons were assigned to one of four groups according to perceptions of their deans' leadership style.

Research question one, "What are the leadership styles of deans of schools of allied health as perceived by department chairpersons?" was answered utilizing descriptive statistics. To determine leadership style, the mean score for task and consideration behavior served as the cutoff. Scores above the mean indicated high levels of the specific behavior and scores at or below the mean indicated low levels of the specific behavior. Given the two dimensions of leader behavior, with the mean serving as the dividing point, the four possible leadership styles or behaviors were: high task/low consideration, high task/high consideration, low task/high consideration, and low task/low consideration.

Research question two was converted into a null hypothesis: \( H_1 \)

Department chairpersons' satisfaction with supervision will not change with deans' leadership behavior. Measured scores of chairpersons' satisfaction with supervision for four groupings of deans' leadership behavior were compared in nonparametric statistical analysis.
Results and Discussion

One hundred and eighteen responses represented 70% of the department chairpersons in academic health centers in the United States. Sixty-nine respondents (63%) were women and 41 (37%) were men. Eight respondents did not respond on their gender. The mean age was 44 years and the average length of time in current position was six years. Four chairpersons’ (3%) highest degree was the baccalaureate, while 57 (48%) held masters. Forty-nine (42%) had a doctoral degree and eight (7%) held a professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., or D.M.D.). Seventy-eight chairpersons (66%) were tenured and 13 (11%) were not in tenure track positions, and 17 were in tenure track position but had not submitted applications for tenure.

The first research question was addressed by determining the mean for consideration (54.2) and task (52.0). The Ohio State Leadership Studies (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1974), from which the LBDQ was derived, utilized a leadership grid to represent four leader behaviors or styles. Table 1 depicts a characterization of chairpersons’ perceptions of their deans’ leadership styles and their mean scores for satisfaction with supervision (JDI X). The greatest number of chairpersons (44 or 37%) perceived their deans to be utilizing a high task/high consideration style. The second most predominant style (39 or 33%) was low task/low consideration. Twenty-three (20%) perceived their deans to be utilizing low task/high consideration style. Twelve (10%) characterized their deans as high task/low consideration.

Before attempting to test the null hypothesis derived from the second research question, a univariate procedure was performed on the
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Their Dean’s Leadership Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 23 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI $\bar{x} = 32.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 44 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI $\bar{x} = 35.8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x} = 54.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 39 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI $\bar{x} = 20.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 12 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI $\bar{x} = 25.2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

satisfaction data using SAS software to test for normality. This was done to determine the appropriateness of utilizing parametric statistical analysis, which assumes a normal distribution. The univariate procedure indicated the distribution of satisfaction scores had a -1.16 skewness, which represented a severe negative (or left) shift of the data. The $W$ statistic for the normality test was .85 with $P = .0001$. Thus, the null hypothesis of no difference between a normal distribution and the satisfaction scores could not be rejected. The stem and leaf diagram in Table 2 visually confirms the notion that the distribution is not normal. Even a logarithmic transformation of the
Table 2

Stem and Leaf Plot: Satisfaction with Supervision Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data (log [40 - satisfaction score]) yielded a non-normal distribution (W = .88, Prob < W = .0001). Thus, nonparametric statistical analysis was utilized to examine chairpersons’ satisfaction with supervision by deans’ leadership style.

Although nonparametric statistics may seem to sacrifice too much basic information, Hollander and Wolfe (1973) contended that theoretical investigations have shown that nonparametric procedures are only slightly less efficient than parametric when distributions are normal. When distributions are not normal, nonparametric statistics “can be mildly and wildly more efficient than their counterparts.”
Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance by rank indicated a significant difference in department chairpersons' satisfaction as a function of deans' leadership style ($X^2 = 62.4$, DF = 3, $p = .0001$). Thus, the null hypothesis of no difference in satisfaction with supervision by deans' leadership style was rejected. To determine what the differences were, a pairwise Wilcoxon Rank Sum test was performed on all combinations of satisfaction scores by leadership groupings. Chairpersons who perceived their deans to be utilizing high task/high consideration styles were significantly more satisfied with their supervision than were those who characterized their deans as using high task/low consideration ($X^2 = 19.3$, DF = 1, $p = .0001$), low task/high consideration ($X^2 = 7.6$, DF = 1, $p = .005$), or low task/low consideration ($X^2 = 50.1$, DF = 1, $p = .0001$). Those who perceived their deans as having low task/high consideration styles were significantly more satisfied with their supervision than were those who characterized their deans as using high task/low consideration ($X^2 = 6.5$, DF = 1, $p = .01$) or low task/low consideration ($X^2 = 13.8$, DF = 1, $p = .0002$).

Conclusions and Recommendations

In a Delphi study designed to generate a set of characteristics common to outstanding schools of allied health, deans' leadership skills were identified as very important (Blayney & Rodgers, 1981). What skills are exhibited (i.e., what leadership behaviors are predominant and what are their relationships to satisfaction levels of department chairpersons?). Table 1 indicates that department chairpersons perceived their deans to be exhibiting two prevalent leadership styles: high task/high consideration (37%) and low task/low
consideration (33%). These are opposites. Although there is not universal agreement on the best style, much research in the social and behavioral sciences has indicated that most people need “strokes,” i.e., reasonable levels of consideration behavior both on and off the job.

In postulating a hierarchy of needs, Maslow (1954) considered esteem or need to be recognized for good work to be a major component of self confidence. Thirty-three percent of the chairpersons sampled saw their deans as low in both consideration and task behavior. Stogdill (1983) contended that educational institutions drift because of widespread laissez-faire leadership. This leads to organizations characterized by lack of clear purpose and no strongly felt commitment. Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1960) saw a laissez-faire leader behavior as absence of leadership (low consideration/low task) with few policies or procedures established, people left alone, and no attempts to influence anyone in goal achievement. Blake and Mouton (1978), who developed the concept of the managerial grid, called this impoverished management. They characterized such managers as emotionally resigned and indifferent with motivation directed at doing only enough to keep the organization operational.

In special situations, certain persons may have valid reasons for using such leadership styles. But, given the professional nature and productivity demands of their work, that a large percentage of chairpersons in the sample use such styles, is troubling. Such behavior may be appropriate in a collegial setting, but even in the most democratic environments, administrators need to reexamine goals, promote diversity of ideas and practices, and encourage innovation at
the risk of occasional errors and instability. Thus, it seems that at least a modicum of consideration and/or task behavior is required.

The other predominant style was high task/high consideration (37%). Blake and Mouton (1978) likened this style of leadership to team management and considered it the most effective. They see it as characteristic of managers who have a desire to contribute to organizational success, coupled with a commitment to the people with whom they work. They characterize managers who use this style as emphasizing teamwork in decision making processes. Likert’s (1967) large-scale research supported a similar view. After numerous studies carried out over a span of thirty years that included more than 220,000 managers and employees, he concluded that a high task/high consideration leadership style was most effective. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) call this style one of “selling” in which managers demonstrate a reasonable amount of task behavior while providing supportive behavior to reinforce their willingness and enthusiasm. They call this style selling because direction is provided by the leader. Through two-way communication and explanation, the leader tends to get the followers to “buy into” desired behavior. While there may not be agreement among theorists regarding one best style of leadership, it is reassuring to see a large percentage of chairpersons perceive their deans as concerned for organizational goals and tasks as well as the people needed to achieve them.

Only a small percentage (10%) of chairpersons in the sample perceived their deans as using high task/low consideration style. There may be valid reasons for using such styles in various circumstances. Used continuously, such styles may be effective in the
short run, but will produce detrimental effects to employee satisfaction and organizational performance in the long run (Lawler & Hackman, 1977). Blake and Mouton (1978) called such styles authority-obedience. Efficiency in operations results from analyzing conditions of work such that human elements interfere minimally. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) characterized such styles as "telling." Managers define rules and tell people what, how, when, and where to do various tasks—They emphasize directive behavior.

Twenty percent of chairpersons in the sample perceived their deans as using low task/high consideration styles. Blake and Mouton (1978) called such styles "country club management." Such styles are characterized by attention to needs of people and satisfying relationships which lead to comfortable, friendly organizational atmospheres and work tempos. Managers believe that attitudes and feelings of subordinates are of utmost importance. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) called such styles "participatory." Leaders utilize supportive non-directive behaviors. In academic settings, such styles may be appropriate if faculty performs tasks well on their own while support and encouragement provide esteem and motivation to continue good performance.

Deans' leadership behaviors have significant relationships with chairpersons' satisfaction with supervision. That leadership behavior influences employees' job satisfaction is not surprising. The relationship of various styles to levels of satisfaction is important. Bass (1981) suggested that the impact of a leaders' behavior on employee satisfaction depends upon the organization in which it occurs. Studies in business and industry cannot be generalized to academic
settings. In this study, an attempt was made to control within reason the organizational environment by sampling only chairpersons in schools of allied health at academic health centers.

The post hoc analysis demonstrated that chairpersons who perceived their deans as possessing high task/high consideration style were significantly more satisfied than others. This finding lends support to Blake and Mouton's (1978) theory that such a style is most effective in terms of goal achievement and providing positive employee morale (satisfaction). Within academic settings, use of a leadership style that emphasizes teamwork is consistent with the concept of collegiality.

The analysis also demonstrated that chairpersons who perceived their deans as using low task/high consideration style were more satisfied with their supervision than were those who characterized their deans as using low task/low consideration or high task/low consideration style. High consideration styles, regardless of task behavior, were viewed by a majority of chairpersons as more satisfying than low consideration styles.

It is simplistic to contend that utilizing a specific leadership style alone is the answer to effective leadership. Certainly characteristics of leadership are important. Molly (1988) stated that five personality characteristics are important to successful leaders: motivation, initiative, energy, impact, and tolerance for stress. With the possible exception of impact, most employers desire the above traits in all employees. In discussing leaders and influence, Ross (1988) stated that leadership is both an art and a science, that leadership skills are inherited (personality) and acquired (learned),
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and that one must possess the personality traits that lend themselves
to working successfully with people and accomplishing desired goals to
be a successful leader. Sergiovanni (1984) contended that because
educational organizations are very complex, effectiveness may not be
attributed to any single dimension, but leadership quality may be
responsible for a great portion of effectiveness.

Deans’ leadership behavior seems to be related to chairpersons’
satisfaction with supervision. More specifically, styles that have
high consideration components are associated with significantly
positive satisfaction levels. High task behavior in conjunction with
high consideration behavior is viewed by chairpersons as most
satisfying.

Interactions between deans and department chairpersons in allied
health are important to meeting educational goals. Administration
involves complex processes of managing human and material resources
while making decisions to accomplish planned and desired outcomes. In
the midst of new and emerging issues, deans’ leadership behaviors and
their impact on department chairpersons are significant determinants of
organizational stability and effectiveness.

The following recommendations are based upon findings and
conclusions of the current study and the literature on leadership and
job satisfaction. Because there have been few students of leader
behavior of deans of schools of allied health at academic health
centers and chairpersons’ job satisfaction, the study should be
replicated. Also similar studies utilizing different instruments to
measure leader behavior and job satisfaction should be conducted.
Instrumentation is the source of variance in validity and reliability.
Relationships between job satisfaction and leadership behavior should be examined in light of situational variables. Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) situational theory of leadership contends that the most effective style is dependent upon the situation. This leads to a question which may be studied, "Do chairpersons’ satisfaction change with leadership style and if so, which styles are not effective under which conditions?"

On the basis of the findings of this study, an assessment of leadership or managerial style would be one area that may be useful in evaluating administrative performance. It could also be one tool utilized in providing information when screening applicants for administrative positions.
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