

ABSTRACT

INGERSON, KATHARYN ANNA. Leadership Effectiveness of Agricultural and Extension Education Department Heads. (Under the direction of Dr. Jacklyn Bruce).

Effective leadership is necessary at all levels of an institution of higher education. The position of department head has been regarded as one of the most challenging positions to hold in academia because of the various roles one must play in the university setting (Bennett & Figuile, 1993; Stanley & Algert, 2007). While many people admire the responsibilities that department heads have, there is a general lack of research associated with department head leadership (Knight & Holen, 1985; Leaming, 2007). The purpose of this study was to discover a holistic view of factors influencing the leadership effectiveness of agricultural and extension education department heads from 1862 land-grant universities. This basic qualitative study took place in three steps: document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and a comparison of the two.

© Copyright 2013 Katharyn A. Ingerson

All Rights Reserved

Leadership Effectiveness of Agricultural and Extension Education Department Heads

by
Katharyn Anna Ingerson

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Extension Education

Raleigh, North Carolina

2013

APPROVED BY:

Dr. K.S.U. Jayaratne

Dr. Mark Kistler

Dr. Jacklyn Bruce
Chair of Advisory Committee

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my mom, Sharon Hutchison. I would not be who I am today without her. Mom, thank you for your unconditional love and support in everything I do. You are the strongest woman I know and I'm so proud to be your daughter. Thank you for always pushing me to do my best and encouraging me to dream big. I love you.

BIOGRAPHY

Katharyn A. Ingerson (Kati) grew up in Williamsport, Indiana. She attended Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana where she received her bachelor's degree in public relations and advertising. She was active in her sorority, Sigma Kappa, and helped co-found the Collegiate 4-H Club on campus. During all of the summers of her undergraduate degree, Kati worked in her county's extension office. In addition to 10 years in 4-H, the summers in the extension office just strengthened Kati's passion for 4-H and the extension program. After graduating from Ball State, Kati came to NC State to receive her Master's degree in Extension Education. Kati plans on graduating and working as a county 4-H agent. After a few years in the field, she hopes to return to school to attain her PhD and eventually work at the state level dealing with 4-H and youth development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are so many people that have helped and guided my path as a graduate student. Although there will never be enough words to say thank you, I am going to try.

Mom, thank you for everything. Thank you for always being willing to listen to me. Whether I'm crying or mad or excited about something, you always are there to listen. You've done nothing but encourage me to do my best throughout life. Moving away from home wasn't easy, but having your support meant the world to me. Thank you for helping me chase my dreams and being a friend when I needed it, a counselor when I wanted it and my mom when I didn't think I needed it, but really did.

Chris Ingerson, thank you for being a fantastic brother. Thank you for letting me call you and talk to you those many late nights I had in the grad office because no one else was awake at those crazy hours. You are doing such amazing things with your life and I'm so proud to call you my brother. Thank you for always being my rock, even though I'm the older sibling. You really are the best.

Mike Hutchison, thank you for always picking up the phone when mom didn't and being my sounding board. I know we've had our ups and downs, but I'm glad to have you in my life and be able to say you are my stepdad. Thank you for always listening to me and being the rational one, even when mom and I don't really know what we are talking about. I appreciate all of the love and support you have shown me, especially since coming down to NC State. Being able to call you and talk through things has been a huge help and I will never be able to repay you.

To my grandparents – Bill (Pop) and Kay (Nanny) Powell – thank you both for listening to me when I call to randomly talk. Thank you for looking over my conceptual framework to make sure it made sense and giving me honest feedback. I’m so blessed to have you as grandparents and I look up to you (and have since I was younger). You are both amazing people and have supported me in everything I do. Thank you.

Thank you to the rest of my family for all of your love and support. Without your help and encouragement, my life would have been a lot rougher. I know our family is crazy, especially when getting together and Skyping me, but I love every one of you and couldn’t imagine our family any different. Thank you for all of the texts, emails, phone calls, letters, etc. to show your support. It means so much to have a family that is so loving.

Thank you to my “office wifey,” Lizz Joseph, for all of the awesome memories in the grad office. I’m glad we could go through this together and support each other through the process. I’m so blessed to have you as a friend. The fact that we can just look at each other and understand what the other is thinking is both crazy and awesome. Thank you for always being there to listen to me cry, complain or just vent. You are the best office wifey ever and we will never give back our stapler!

To the current grad students: Ginger Bushey and Caroline Sheffield– thank you both for all of your support throughout the thesis process. Thank you for being Lizz and my’s sounding boards and always being willing to feed us if needed. Matt Agle – thank you for being my “beer debriefer” and always being willing to answer my silly questions.

To all of the past graduate students: Byron Green, Michael Coley, Katie Mills, and Kristen Baughman – thank you for your continual encouragement. I now have a much deeper

understanding (and appreciation) of what you all went through last year. All of your tweets, Facebook posts, and visits were much appreciated! Byron, thank you for reminding me it's all about me. Thank you all!

Thank you Dr. Sara Brierton for having an awesome tower that I could always retreat to if needed. Thank you for listening to me, giving me ideas, and always making sure I have at least one good laugh when I'm with you. I have so much respect for you and am so grateful to be able to call you friend. Also, thanks for being judgy-judgerton and helping me pick out an awesome defense outfit.

To all of the staff at Learning Express, thank you for being so flexible with me and my thesis schedule. You all are the greatest and I'm glad to have you all as, not only co-workers, but friends. Thank you for understanding the stress I've been under and being willing to work with me about scheduling.

A huge thank you to all of my friends in the Midwest that have supported me through these past few years. There are way too many of you to name, but I appreciate all of the love, support, and encouragement you have shown either through phone calls, Skype time, emails, Facebook, texts, or letters. I'm grateful to have so many awesome friends that support me even though I'm miles away.

To my committee – a gigantic thank you. Thank you for all of your support and hard work this past year. Dr. Mark Kistler, thank you for always being willing to answer the random questions I come up with. Dr. Jay Jayaratne, thank you for sharing all of your knowledge with me and always being willing to give advice. You both are great people and I'm grateful for your time spent on my committee.

Finally, to my chair, Dr. Jackie Bruce – words cannot describe how thankful I am to have you in my life. When I look back on my first year at State, I realize how lucky I am for you to have taken me under your wing and shown me the dark side, I mean awesome side, of qualitative research. Not only did you give me the chance to step out of my comfort zone and start teaching my second semester here, but you gave me the chance to see the world differently. I appreciate the chance to continue teaching along side you. It's given me more confidence in front of people and has helped me work on my patience. Thank you for always being there for me and knowing the perfect things to say. I'm so grateful for the time you have invested in me. I know you have a lot on your plate and as much as I'd like to think (as Byron would say) it's all about me, I know that you really do take time out of your day to listen and help me when you don't have to. I have the utmost respect for you and everything you do. The fact that you opened up your home to me and gave me the privilege of getting to know DB and AM means the world to me. You all are a fantastic family and have certainly help me become a better person through the love you have shown. Thank you for introducing me to ALE, always listening to me, the amazing food you have cooked for me, and of course, the Glee parties. You truly are an amazing person and the best thesis chair anyone could ask for.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptual Framework	2
Leadership	2
Dichotomous Leadership	2
Behavioral Complexity	3
Leadership Effectiveness	4
Department Head Leadership	6
Contextual Framework	7
The University	7
Agricultural and Extension Education in the Field of Higher Education	8
Department Heads and University Personnel	10
Purpose	12
Definitions	13
Assumptions	15
Limitations	15
Chapter Summary	15
CHAPTER 2	17
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF SALIENT LITERATURE	17
Theoretical Framework	17
Competing Values Framework	17
Competing Values	18
Effectiveness Models	20
Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles	21
Direct Set	22
Relational Set	23
Instrumental Set	24
Connective Leader	25
Literature Review	25
Varying Roles of Leadership	25
Leadership in the Managerial Role	28
Leadership in Higher Education	32
Department Heads & Leadership	34
Land Grant Universities and Department Chair Leadership	38
Chapter Summary	42
CHAPTER 3	44
METHODOLOGY	44
Guiding Research Questions	44
Epistemological Position	45
Bias Statement & Researcher Contextual Connection	45
Research Design	46

Population	47
Participant Selection	48
Data Collection	49
Data Analysis	50
Trustworthiness.....	52
Credibility	52
Transferability.....	54
Dependability	55
Confirmability.....	57
Chapter Summary	57
CHAPTER 4	60
FINDINGS	60
Introduction to Department Heads.....	61
Research Question One.....	62
Recruitment & Retention	62
Evaluations.....	63
Fiscal Responsibility.....	64
Strategic Plan	65
Goal Setting	65
Meeting Attendance	66
Balancing Act.....	66
Policy Regulation & Paperwork	66
Research Question Two:	67
Recruitment and Retention	68
Evaluations.....	69
Fiscal Responsibility.....	70
Strategic Planning	71
Goal Setting	72
Meeting Attendance	74
Balancing Act.....	76
Policy Regulation & Paperwork	77
Research Question Three:	78
The Role of Administrator	78
The Role of Resource Allocator	80
The Role of Academic	81
The Role of Outreach Coordinator	84
The Role of Collaborator	86
The Role of Department Advocate	87
The Role of Researcher.....	88
The Role of Leader	90
The Role of Manager	92
The Role of Decision Maker.....	93
Research Question Four:.....	96

Types of Communication.....	97
Conflict Resolution	98
Research Question Five:	100
Formal Interactions	102
Informal Interactions.....	103
Faculty Development	105
Research Question Six:	106
Stakeholders/Clientele	106
Departmental Environment.....	108
University/Professional Required Attributes	110
Research Question Seven:.....	111
Strengths	111
Weaknesses	113
Personality.....	114
Beliefs	115
Values	117
Past Experiences in Context.....	118
Leadership Library	120
Research Question Eight:.....	121
Necessary Skills/Attributes	122
Perceptions of Self in Position	122
Advice for Future Department Heads	124
CHAPTER 5	126
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	126
Summary of Theoretical Framework	126
Summary of Review of Literature	127
Summary of Methodology	131
Summary of Key Findings and Conclusions for each Research Question	133
Research Question One:.....	134
Research Question Two:	135
Research Question Three:	139
Research Question Four:	142
Research Question Five:	144
Research Question Six:	145
Research Question Seven:.....	147
Research Question Eight:.....	148
Recommendations.....	149
Further Research Suggestions.....	150
Suggestions for Practice.....	151
REFERENCES	155
APPENDICESAPPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	165
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	166
APPENDIX B: EMAIL TO PROSPECTIVE INTERVIEWEES	169

APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM 170
APPENDIX D: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #1 173
APPENDIX E: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #2..... 175
APPENDIX F: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #3..... 178
APPENDIX G: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #4 186
APPENDIX H: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #5 200
APPENDIX I: AUDIT TRAIL 213
APPENDIX J: ADDITIONAL CODING INFORMATION..... 214

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Thoughts of leadership have transformed since formal theories of leadership were first developed in the 1950s (Conger, 1999). People's desire for leadership that reflects an organization's work in a unique manner has led to increased studies of leadership at different levels of power (Fiedler, 1981; Burns, 1978). Leadership has also been studied to understand the influential process that happens when a person engages other people to accomplish tasks including goal attainment (Vardiman, Houghston, & Jinkerson, 2006; Yukl, 2006; Amagoh, 2009; Spendlove, 2007).

Through the study of leadership, the concept of leadership effectiveness and its importance has emerged. Effective leadership contributes to successful organizations (Amagoh, 2009; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). Conger (1999) said "today strong leadership is often viewed as one of the most important keys to organizational growth, change, and renewal" (p. 1). Because of an organization's constantly changing context and social needs over time, leaders must be prepared to change and adapt, or move on (Leithwood et al., 1999; Weinberger, 2009). Effective leadership is needed at all levels of an organization including an academic department (Yamasaki, 1999). The leader of an academic department is the department head and is considered a challenging position because of the roles they hold and the responsibilities they have (Olson, 2008; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Stanly & Algert, 2007). According to Gordon & Yukl (2004), because of such a constantly changing environment, it is important to continue research in the leadership and leadership effectiveness fields, especially when it comes to leadership in academia.

Conceptual Framework

Many researchers have attempted to define leadership throughout history. Early leadership research revolved around figuring out how people became leaders (Fiedler, 1981). More recent studies of leadership can be broken down into a variety of sub-dimensions including: how leaders ensure worker task completion (Amagoh, 2009), behavioral studies (Yukl, 1999), and leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 1999).

Leadership

“Leadership has been built into the human psyche because of the long period we need to be nurtured by parents for our survival” said Bass and Bass (2009, p. 3). The earliest studies on leadership included the interaction between leader and followers (Gardner, 1987). Hickman (1998) described leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 108). Lipman-Blumen (1996) said “without the supporters’ consent, the aspiring leader cannot lead” (p. 32). Beyond the idea that leaders influence followers, various researchers have gone on to say that leadership is based on numerous factors including traits (Stogdill, 1948), charisma (Weber, 1927), influence (Katz & Kahn, 1966) and situations (Selznick, 1957). According to Hevesi (1996) “leadership is a mix of skills, attitude, will, and motivation” (p. 11).

Dichotomous Leadership

Quinn (1988) pointed out that “in making sense of the world, people tend to favor one of two very different ways of thinking” (p. 79), thus starting the dichotomous way of

thinking. Many theories of leadership rely on dichotomous traits or skills. In McGregor's (1967) Theory X and Theory Y, he stated managers fell into one of two categories and they should examine which type they are in order to become more effective. The difference between the two could be explained thus: "Theory X places exclusive reliance upon external control of human behavior, while Theory Y relies heavily on self-control and self-direction" (McGregor, 1989, p. 322).

Today, leaders in organizations have to "react to a variety of new challenges, including decentralized organizational forms, globalization, rapidly changing environments, diverse workforce, and new work arrangements" (Yukl, 2004, p. 364). Because of these responsibilities, a majority of leaders' roles usually involve a combination of various behaviors and not simply a dichotomous relationship (Bruno & Lay, 2008). According to Lewis (2000), "the more complex organizations become, the more traditional either/or thinking oversimplifies management practices and demands" (p. 769). Kaiser, Overfield, and Kaplan (2010) believed similarly and said in order to achieve organizational effectiveness; leaders must "be 'both/and' when it comes to paradoxical demands... 'either/or won't do'" (p. 6).

Behavioral Complexity

The concept of behavioral complexity often works in concert with paradoxical leadership (Lawrence, Lenk, & Quinn, 2009; Dension, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995). Satish (1997) said "complexity theorists are concerned with the structure of human information processing" (p. 2051) and, in more recent years, have been focused more on how people see

the world and their perceptions of others in their world. According to Wangler (2009) behavioral complexity is defined as “the number of behaviors a manager has in his or her behavioral repertoire: the more behaviors, the greater the manager’s level of behavioral complexity” (p. 12). In other words, it is the ability to complete a multitude of tasks with a variety of abilities or behaviors.

Behavioral complexity links many leadership effectiveness studies together, including Bass (1985) and Hersey and Blanchard (1969), to convey the concept that leadership is more effective when leaders’ behavior goes along with the situation or activity. Denison, Hooijberg, and Quinn (1995) believed “effective leaders are those who have the cognitive and behavioral complexity to respond appropriately to a wide range of situations that may, in fact, require contrary or opposing behaviors” (p. 526). The idea of behavioral complexity suggests that because environments can be complex, managerial leaders must possess behaviors that can adapt, react and correspond to the environment in order to be effective (Wangler, 2009). Dennison et al. (1995) believed that behavioral complexity contributed to “a simple definition of effective leadership as the ability to perform the multiple roles and behaviors that circumscribe the requisite variety implied by the organizational or environmental context” (p. 526).

Leadership Effectiveness

Leadership effectiveness is viewed as an “evolutionary process of interconnected events and responses to events” (p. 994) according to Amagoh (2009). Gardner (1987) said “effective leaders deal not only with the explicit decisions of the day – approving budget,

announcing a policy, disciplining a subordinate – but also with the partly conscious, partly buried world of needs and hopes, ideals and symbols. They serve as models; they symbolize the group’s unity and identity” (p. 188). Hart & Quinn (1993) argued “that effective leadership requires a balancing and simultaneous mastery of seemingly contradictory or ‘paradoxical’ capabilities” (p. 544). Research has shown that leaders who are not simply an either/or style of leader but rather multidimensional have been successful and have a better comprehension of effectiveness as leaders (Mitroff, 1983; Torbert, 1987; Cameron & Quinn, 1988; Quinn, 1988).

In order to meet the demands of an ever-changing society, leaders can no longer rely on only one skill of leadership (Leithwood et al., 1999; Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004). In fact a balance of versatile leadership styles should be desired (Kaiser et al., 2010). Further, Kaiser et al. (2010) told us leadership “versatility can be a more powerful concept when you pair skills and behaviors that seem contradictory, but in fact are complementary” (p. 4). It is important to consider a balanced form of leadership since many different facets of the leader’s life influence leadership effectiveness (Kaiser et al., 2010). Personality (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002), leadership styles (Bass, 1985), and relationship between follower and leader (Amagoh, 2009) play key roles in establishing a person’s leadership effectiveness. Further, a leader’s effectiveness is influenced by gender, intelligence, motivation, daily behaviors and emotional stability (McCauley & Douglas, 2004; Kim, 2007; Conger, 1999; Manz & Sims, 2001; Amagoh, 2009). Denison, Hooijberg and Quinn (1995) theorized that greater emphasis has been placed on the “paradox, contradiction, and complexity, suggesting that many phenomena may, in fact, fit multiple opposing categories

simultaneously” (p. 525) when it comes to effective leadership. Effective leadership is needed at varying levels in an organization. Yamasaki (1999) said “an effective leader can inspire members of her department to a shared vision that in turn motivates them to pick up the slack when the chair falls behind in managerial tasks” (p. 70).

Department Head Leadership

As with any organization, effective leadership is necessary at all levels in the higher education institution as well. Deans are viewed as effective “by informal assessments of their leadership style, the performance of their duties and responsibilities, and even, at times, their individual traits or qualities” (Rosser, Johnsrud, & Heck, 2003, p. 3). Many of these same assessment factors trickle down to the role of the department head. The position of department head has been regarded as one of the most challenging positions to hold in academia because of the various roles one must play in the university setting (Bennett & Figuile, 1993; Stanley & Algert, 2007). These roles include gatekeeper, academic, faculty developer, administrator or manager, and leader (Berdrow, 2010; McLaughlin, Montgomery, & Malpass, 1975; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). Knippenberg (2011) asserted that department heads are important because they “make decisions regarding promotions, tenure, educational opportunities, job assignments, resources and so forth” (p. 1083). A strong leader is one that has “a big picture vision that is effectively shared and decision making that is clear and decisive based on assessment of available information” (Hughes, 2009, p. 1029).

Department heads are viewed as having a challenging position because they have “a foot in two very different worlds” (Olson, 2008, para. 2). Department heads are “the chief

advocate for...faculty both to the administration and externally...within the department, however, [they] are the frontline administrator, the supervisor of all personal, and the primary fiscal agent” (Olson, 2008, para. 3-4). With internal personnel looking to department heads for guidance and support as well as external partners seeking funding and administrative work, it is important that department heads be effective leaders (Stanley & Algert, 2007). Gmelch and Miskin (1993) said “effective chairs influence the future of their departments” (p. 9). Stanley and Algert (2007) stated that “unprecedented pressures including declining public funding for higher education, increasing student enrollments, increasing external demands for accountability, and rising expectations for increased external funding require superior leadership” (p. 49-50).

Contextual Framework

This study focused on leadership in self-sustaining agricultural and extension education departments at 1862 land grant universities. In order to put the study in context, three areas must be considered: the university setting today, agricultural and extension education in the field of higher education, and department heads and university personnel.

The University

Universities are considered the main way to develop knowledge in society (Gumport & Snyderman, 2002). However, “higher education has been under the scrutiny of policy makers, the press and the public for as long as it has existed in the United States” (Heller, 2009, p. 3). Due to economic and political factors, public universities and colleges have been

changing over the years. Legislation such as the Fast Track to College Act of 2013 and the Transforming Education through Technology Act encourage more interaction between universities and local educational agencies (H.R.521, 2013; H.R.551, 2013), thus, changing the constituents and participants of universities.

Many higher educational institutions have tightened enrollments and increased tuition (Weerts & Ronca, 2006). Although enrollment requirements have tightened, more and more of the population have attempted to enroll in higher education (Heller, 2009). Gumport and Snyderman (2002) said universities have “paradoxical imperatives faced by the U.S. higher education system to adapt to the changing needs of society while remaining a stable social institution” (p. 383). Since universities have to change to keep up with societal pressures, departments within universities have also had to change. Within university organizations, there are many different structural units including “departments and programs, faculty lines and budgets, course requirements and sequences. Together they make explicit the division of responsibilities, rules and roles, flows of information and resources” (p. 377). They also stated a department in a university is usually designed around a specific field of study and is responsible for many administrative duties including degree programs, faculty support and resources. Most departments are supervised by a department head or a department chair.

Agricultural and Extension Education in the Field of Higher Education

Most agricultural and extension education programs are in a land grant university. Thus, land grant universities must be studied to understand the context in which these department heads operate. According to the National Research Council (NRC) (1997)

“initiated in 1862 with the passage of the first Morrill Act, and expanded in 1890 with the passage of the second Morrill Act, the [Land Grant College of Agriculture] system was the first embodiment of a post-Civil War national philosophy about higher education – the concept of higher education for a practical nature for citizens of ordinary means” (p. 1610). Since the start of these Land Grant College of Agriculture (LGCA) systems, the nation has experienced changes in the economy and in the farming business (NRC, 1997). Ballenger and Kouadio (1995) stated that the three purposes of land grant colleges (teaching, research, and extension) are not so closely related anymore. They also found that students are choosing programs in natural resources above all other programs, followed by agribusiness, animal science, nonagricultural programs and finally plant sciences. The path which students choose for their major influences agricultural departments across the U.S. When students choose majors, they also dictate where funding and faculty go.

Although there have been some financial struggles in the LGCA system, the Agricultural Education National Research Agenda encourages improving leadership education, success of students and faculty development in colleges of agricultural and life sciences (Osborne, n.d.). Sink (1983) said “in the last several decades, increased attention has been focused within the academic agricultural system on efficiency, productivity, evaluation and accountability that relate the inputs...to the outputs” (p. 18).

Birkenholz and Simonsen (2011) found five factors that influenced how distinguished an agricultural education program was considered to be: Faculty of the department, research conducted, graduate program, undergraduate program and overall program. The stronger the

five factors Birkenholz and Simonsen established, the stronger the program within the profession, university and state. Thus,

“faculty and administrators with responsibility for agricultural education programs in colleges and universities throughout the U.S. should continually strive for program improvement by developing strategies to strengthen features that distinguish their local program in the context of peer institutions” (p. 24).

Those in charge of guiding the agricultural and extension education departments and making sure they continue to grow based on the changing needs of the university and society are those in the position of department head.

Department Heads and University Personnel

The position of department head is one that not many people consider their career goal (Gillespie, 1998; Wescott, 2000). Most department heads started out as graduate students in their field of interest, became faculty members in that same field, went through the ranks of faculty and then became department head (Carroll, 1990). Many department heads assume the position in their mid-40s (Wescott, 2000; Carroll, 1990). However, women in the position are usually younger when they enter the role of department head (Carroll, 1990). There are also far fewer women in the role of department head than there are men – 1 in 10 are female (Carroll, 1990). Regardless of gender, “today’s department chair has one of the most paradoxical roles in the institution” (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch & Tucker, 1999, B-1).

Department heads play a very important role in the success of universities since they are held accountable for a wide range of responsibilities (Collinson & Collinson, 2009).

Their roles have become more challenging due to obstacles like budget cuts, competition and accountability pressures (Majeski, 2004). Bennett (1982) said:

“The chair job is the most difficult on campus in many respects. First, the continuous need for attention to details, second the need to make decisions which have an impact on the lives of those with whom you also deal on a personal basis, and third, when things go wrong the chair carries directly or indirectly a good share of the responsibility” (p. 52).

Lucas (1994) explained that many department heads group their responsibilities into two categories: leadership and administrative. Duties that fall into these two categories run a gamut of items. Wescott (2000) said department heads serve as the “go-between” for administrators, faculty and students, provide authority over faculty and staff issues, and make decisions. In order to be successful, leaders in the university today will “need to be able to face complexities, volatility and the new rules of the global marketplace” (Fritz & Brown, 1998, p. 57).

Agricultural and extension education is no different. According to a North American Colleges & Teachers of Agriculture article, department heads in the agricultural field “come in all sizes and forms, with all types of personalities and...the full spectrum of abilities” (Gries, 1968, p. 6). With so many different types of department heads, the way in which responsibilities are handled varies among individuals in the role. Thus, effective leadership of Agricultural and Extension Education academic programs at land grant universities must be understood and attained.

Purpose

Even with numerous studies and research about general leadership, “widespread improvement in leadership effectiveness remains elusive” (Development Dimensions International, 2012, p. 3). Further, while many people admire the responsibilities that department heads have, there is a general lack of research associated with department head leadership (Knight & Holen, 1985; Leaming, 2007). Knight and Holen (1985) insisted that for many years, department chairpersons have gained recognition due to their role, function and evaluation; however, educational researchers have not given the position much attention. Research has been conducted focusing on “departments and their role in the large university...by observation and reflection...such statements provide educators with insights into university administration which no other source could provide” (Dressel, Johnson, & Marcus, 1970, p. 241-242). More and more, department heads are being pushed to be more effective leaders due to technology updates, political policy changes and social ideals (Cacioppe, 1998). McCorkel and Archibald (1982) said that department chairs should be appraised to be sure they are effectively meeting the ever changing needs and objectives of the organization.

Smith and Tushman (2005) claim “organizations can excel when top management teams effectively balance strategic contradictions” (p. 525). The same can be said about departments and department heads – effective department heads lead to effective departments (Berdrow, 2010; Stanley & Algert, 2007).

Since both faculty and students consider the department head the highest leadership position in the department and the head’s leadership influences the success or failure of a

department (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993), department heads' leadership effectiveness must be investigated.

The purpose of this study was to discover a holistic view of factors influencing the leadership effectiveness of agricultural and extension education department heads from 1862 land-grant universities. In order to accomplish this purpose, eight guiding questions were established:

1. According to university expectations, what are the responsibilities of a department head in an AEE department?
2. According to department heads, what are the responsibilities of their position?
3. What roles do department heads take on?
4. What communication strategies are employed by department heads?
5. How do department heads interact with faculty members?
6. What external factors influence what roles and responsibilities department heads undertake?
7. What internal factors influence the roles and responsibilities of department heads?
8. How do department heads perceive effective leadership in their position?

Definitions

In order to provide a full understanding of departmental head leadership, a few definitions must be recognized.

“Agricultural and Extension Education Field” – For this study, the department heads came

from “stand-alone” departments of agricultural and extension education. In order to be considered a stand-alone AEE department, the department must be self-sustaining and not be a part of another department. Therefore, agricultural and extension education departments that include other departments or are part of another department were not included in this study. Departments in this study were decided based on 1862 land-grant status. 1890 and 1994 land-grant universities were excluded.

“Department Head” – According to Smith’s (2005) study, a departmental “chair” is one that is “often perceived as a choice of the faculty, but chairs are clearly appointed by the dean” (p. 1). However, a department “head” is a person who “is perceived as principally the appointee of the dean, but deans clearly acknowledge that department heads would not be appointed without input from relevant faculty (Smith, 2005, p. 1). For this study, “department chair” can be interchanged with “department head” but for consistency purposes, the researcher used “department head.”

“Leader” – Birchfield (2012) said that “good leaders are paradoxical characters who are ‘comfortable dealing with paradoxes.’” (para. 2). According to Birchfield (2012), “individuals who balance these contradictions have the right stuff” (Birchfield, 2012, para. 2). This study will define the term leader based on Birchfield’s (2012) research; a leader is a person who can deal with numerous paradoxes at one time while looking out for the betterment of their followers.

“Leadership” – For this study, the term leadership will be defined, based on Denison,

Hooijberg and Quinn (1995), as “the ability to perform the multiple roles and behaviors that circumscribe the requisite variety implied by an organizational or environmental context” (p. 526).

“Leadership Effectiveness” – Leadership effectiveness for this study was defined based on Dension, Hooijberg, and Quinn’s (1995) research that stated effective leaders “have the cognitive and behavioral complexity to respond appropriately to a wide range of situations that may, in fact, require contrary or opposing behaviors” (p. 526).

Assumptions

It is assumed that the information described by the department heads interviewed were representative of the individuals. It is also assumed that all personal examples, anecdotes, etc. were truthfully and factually recounted to the researcher.

Limitations

This study was limited to department heads of agricultural and extension education departments. Consequently, some factors contributing to leadership style, values, work environment, and priorities may be unique to this group only. Therefore, this research may not be generalized to other department heads or areas of expertise.

Chapter Summary

Based on the concept that the study of leadership has evolved over time in different areas, continued research is important to the future of leadership. Leadership was once

thought of in terms of traits (Stogdill, 1948), charisma (Weber, 1927) and situations (Selznick, 1857). The education realm is no different. Strong leadership at the department head level is important to the university department. In order to determine a holistic view of leadership at that level, department head leadership should be researched. This study was conducted to determine factors (both internally and externally) influencing the leadership effectiveness of agricultural and extension education department heads from 1862 land-grant universities.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF SALIENT LITERATURE

This chapter will discuss the theoretical framework for this study as well as review salient and related literature. Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1981) Competing Values Framework (CVF) and Lipman-Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles were the theoretical frameworks used to ground this study.

Theoretical Framework

Competing Values Framework

The first portion of the theoretical framework for this study was Quinn & Rohrbaugh's (1981) Competing Values Framework. CVF "emerged from an empirical analysis of organizational effectiveness criteria" (Lawrence et al., 2009, p. 88). Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981) believed that many of the established leadership effectiveness theories would not work because they were paradoxical in the way they worked; leaders could only be one type of leader or another, but not both. In their study, they said a theoretical framework of leadership effectiveness should:

- 1) "Be at one level of analysis;
- 2) ...integrate theoretical perspective and thereby provide a more holistic view;
- 3) ...resolve the problem of multiple criteria by presenting a parsimonious and well-defined set;
- 4) ...provide assertions...about the relationships between criteria;
- 5) ...recognize the coalitional and dynamic nature of organizations and the variability of criteria across time and perspective;
- 6) ...provide an analytical tool that can be applied in specific settings, while facilitating comparison and generalization of findings across studies;
- 7) ...explicitly define effectiveness" (p. 124-125).

Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981) understood that many leadership effectiveness theories related leadership to the situation the leader was in, but argued that it was “possible to develop a theoretical framework within which situation specific aspects can be ordered” (p. 125).

The participants in Quinn & Rohrbaugh’s (1981) study took part in a two-stage research method to reduce criterion to only those that related to performance evaluations of an organization. The first stage included researching Campbell’s (1977) 30 indices and reducing it down. Participants were asked to “apply four decision rules for eliminating any criterion that was not at the organizational level of analysis...not a singular index but a composite of several criteria...not a construct but a particular operationalization...not criterion of organizational performance” (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981, p. 126-127).

The second stage of the research had participants “evaluate the similarity between every possible pairing of the remaining criteria” (p. 127). Of the thirty original criteria, sixteen remained. Once the participants compared the similarity between each criteria pairing, they had 120 comparisons. Using these comparisons, the researchers were able to build what seemed like contrasting ideas, but were actually effectiveness criteria.

Competing Values

Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981) then used Douglas Carroll and Ji Jih Chang’s (1970) INDSCAL algorithm to complete a multidimensional scaling for results of the study. Through analyzing the data, a multidimensional chart was created. Three dimensions were given to this chart:

- “The first dimension (the horizontal or x-axis) reflects differing organizational focus by representing the contrast between a person-oriented emphasis (toward the left) and an organization or task emphasis (toward the right).
- The second dimension (the vertical or y-axis) reflects differing organizational preferences for structure by representing the contrast between an interest in stability and control (toward the bottom) and flexibility and change (toward the top).
- The third dimension (a depth or distality axis) reflects the degree of closeness to desired organizational outcomes or means-ends continuum by representing the contrast between concern for ends (nearer and larger) and a concern for means (farther away and smaller)” (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981, p. 130).

The research done in Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1981) experiment suggested three values that are constantly competing in relation to organizational effectiveness. The authors went further to say the category of flexibility versus stability when dealing with structure emerged because

“differing viewpoints in considering order and control versus innovation and change are at the heart of the most heated debates in sociology, political science and psychology. While many social theorists have emphasized authority, structure, and coordination, others have stressed diversity, individual initiative, and organizational adaptability” (p. 132).

Organizations that are able to balance the structure of integration and differentiation are also the most effective.

The next set of competing values, people versus organization, is similar to the idea of task-oriented leaders versus people-oriented leaders. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) categorized the importance of these two values based on the research that said “On the one hand, the organization is a logically designed tool with the ultimate goal of getting its tasks accomplished...On the other hand, organizational participants have unique feelings, likes and

dislikes, and require consideration” (p. 132-133). Therefore, effective leaders are ones that have a balance between tasks and people in an organization.

The final set of competing values represents means versus ends. Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957) said that in an organization means and ends are important.

“It is our assumption that all organizations attempt to achieve certain objectives and to develop group products through the manipulation of given animate and inanimate facilities. Accordingly, definitions of organizational effectiveness must take into consideration these two aspects: the objectives of organizations and the means through which they sustain themselves and attain their objectives...In short,...means and ends” (p. 535).

Effectiveness Models

Once the Competing Values Framework research was finalized, Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981) noted that the sixteen criteria that was spaced between the three dimensions, defined four effectiveness models. The four models included Human Relations, Open System, Internal Process, and Rational Goal. Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981) said that “because each model is embedded in a particular set of competing values; it has a polar opposite model with contrasting emphases” (p. 135).

The Human Resources Model is one that “places a great deal of emphasis on people and flexibility and would stress the effectiveness criteria shown in the upper left section... [including] cohesion and morale (as means) and human resource development (as an end)” (p. 134). Open Systems Model reflects the effectiveness criteria in the upper right section and stresses the importance of organization and flexibility. Flexibility and readiness represent the means in this section and growth, external support and resource acquisition represent the ends. The Rational Goal Model is a reflection of the effectiveness criteria that are in the

lower right section and focus on organization and control. The means in this model include planning and goal setting with productivity and efficiency being the ends. The final model, the Internal Process Model relies on people and control in order to be effective. The effective criteria in this lower left section include information management and communication as the means and stability and control as the ends.

Quinn (1988) said “this scheme is called the *competing values framework* because the criteria seem to initially carry a conflicting message. We want our organizations to be adaptable and flexible, but we also want them to be stable and controlled” (p. 49).

Using the Competing Values Framework allowed researchers to have a consistent framework that covers a variety of values and skills. Since numerous things affect leadership effectiveness, the CVF “recognized that the emphasis placed on the effectiveness criteria will vary with shifting internal and external constraints and with the value that various coalitions place on alternative foci, structures and time horizon” (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981, p. 138). The fact is that leaders are faced with constantly changing situations and can no longer just sit in one leadership style or another. Denison, Hooijberg, and Quinn (1995) pointed out, “the ability to perform the multiple roles and behaviors circumscribe the requisite variety implied by an organizational or environmental context” (p. 526).

Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles

The other guiding theoretical framework for this study was Lipman-Blumen’s (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles Model. The Connective Leadership Model was formulated based on research completed by Leavitt and Lipman-Blumen in 1972 (Lipman-

Blumen, 1996). The researchers were interested in “differences between women and men in the behaviors they used to achieve their goals” (p. 116). They then developed an instrument called the L-LB Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI) to collect data on the measurements of achievement behavior of leaders, mostly corporate executives. After studying achieving styles, Lipman-Blumen became interested in “the different combinations of achieving styles reflected in the behavior of leaders, both in [the study] and in the world at large” (p. 118). It was found that achieving styles and connective leadership were linked together. Connective leaders use achieving styles in more ways and in more situations than leaders who focus merely on one style and use it over and over again. A connective leader is one that develops all of the behavior sets and achieving styles that they comprise of in order to best lead an organization or group of people.

Three overarching groups of behavioral sets make up the Connective Leadership Model with three achieving styles making up each of the sets: Direct (intrinsic, competitive, power), Relational (collaborative, contributory, vicarious), and Instrumental (entrusting, social, personal). Lipman-Blumen described achieving styles as “personal technologies for accomplishing our tasks or achieving our goals” (p. 24).

Direct Set

Direct achievers are leaders who are concerned with “the doing or mastery of a task and with the task itself. They perceive tasks as their own special challenge... [they] also treasure their individuality” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p. 141).

The Direct Set of leadership is made up of intrinsic, competitive, and power styles. People with an intrinsic style “see the beauty in the flawless execution of the task” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p. 142). They are also creative, individualistic, and self-reliant. Leaders that utilize the intrinsic style also “see their accomplishments as ends in themselves, not as the means to glory and fame or as routes to other opportunities” (p. 149). Competitive achievers are those leaders who are constantly comparing their own actions to that of the team, regardless of the fact that the team has the same goal. They “define the world as an endless set of contests” (p. 151). Those people that utilize the power style of leadership in this model are those that need and want to be in charge. People in this category tend to gravitate toward leadership roles and have an understanding of the importance of resources. They enjoy having control and coordinating everything – “people, tasks, resources, and situations” (p. 156). They are also not necessarily concerned with helping people to meet their own goals.

Relational Set

Relational achievers are concerned with “identifying with people and meeting one’s needs through close or even distant relationships” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p. 166). Lipman-Blumen said “team members, who can identify with one another, sharing the sweetness of the team’s success and the bitterness of its defeats, are using relational styles, regardless of their affection for one another” (p. 166). The three achieving styles that make up the Relational Set include collaborative, contributive, and vicarious.

For those that use the collaborative style of leadership, accomplishing tasks within a group setting is preferred. People working in a collaborative setting tend to have a higher

achievement rate, feel more positive about learning and have an advantage in decision-making (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p. 167-168). In this style of leadership, conflict resolution is important. Lipman-Blumen said “used with a connective sensibility, the collaborative style entails genuinely shared responsibility for success as well as failure” (p. 176). The next style, contributory, is based around the idea that these types of leaders help others achieve their goals. This type of leader is focused on helping others achieve their goals and define their own goals by the goals of others. Vicarious style is the final type of leadership defined in this set. Vicarious achievers “understand and identify with the dreams and goals of other leaders, as well as their own constituents” (p. 184). It was also stated that vicarious style leadership is key to the leader’s ability to act as a mentor.

Instrumental Set

Lipman-Blumen (1996) stated that leaders in the instrumental category have a social touch and believe information is important. Instrumental achievers have the ability to build community and act as maximizers. Within this set are three styles including personal, social and entrusting.

The first style, personal, is easily recognizable. Charismatic leaders are the type of people that fall into this category. They use everything they have to gain success (Lipman-Blumen, 1996). Personal achievers tend to be dramatic in the sense that they use many forms of props, symbolism and other gestures to gain followers. Humor also assists the leader to connect to supporters. Social style is the second part of the instrumental set. According to Lipman-Blumen, social leaders “focus on the connective tissue between people and groups”

(p. 209). They also have a strong political sense and often bring people together to reach a goal. The final style of leadership in the instrumental set is entrusting, which are leaders that “believe the world is simply filled with people ready and willing to help them achieve their ends” (p. 217-218). Entrusting achievers have a way of getting the most from supporters by making them think creatively to come up with solutions to issues.

Connective Leader

After reviewing the achieving styles and how they fit into leadership, Lipman-Blumen (1996) said the following about connective leaders:

“connective leaders understand that leadership embraces all the varieties of behavior [such as the achieving styles], they combine many strategies to achieve their goals... [they] perceive that interdependence means relationships of all kinds, among people, among organizations, and among nations. They therefore use relationships in multiple ways to accomplish their leadership tasks” (p. 229-230).

Connective leaders use a wide range of skill sets and leadership styles in order to be effective and take their leadership to a new level. The Connective Leadership Model provides an understanding of the dynamics of leadership.

Literature Review

Varying Roles of Leadership

Lawrence, Lenk, and Quinn (2009) wanted to study the relationship of behavioral complexity and managerial leadership. Their study specifically focused on behavioral repertoire and leadership effectiveness. The Behavioral Complexity Theory of Hooijberg and Quinn (1992) and the Competing Values Theory of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) were

the theoretical frameworks for the study. The population used for their study included 539 managers of an “international information services organization” (p. 90). Of the 539 managers that were contacted, 528 answered a survey consisting of 72 questions. The respondents were 79% male, and a majority (80%) of them was between the ages of 31 and 35. Although no racial demographics were collected, the managers worked in companies around the globe. Those that participated in the survey were measured in a 360 degree fashion which included having superiors, peers and customers evaluate them using the same instrument. 24 senior executives participated in follow up interviews to discuss what behaviors they thought would be important in developing their subordinates. The results from the research supported the CVF’s four-quadrant structure, specifically when applied to management. The researchers found that “greater flexibility and a more external focus [was] associated with a greater Ability to Lead Change” (p. 99). Further, they suggested that their study reinforced the importance of developing leadership from all four quadrants because it could help people recall on a broad array of behaviors based on the situation.

Wangler (2009) used the Competing Values Managerial Leadership Instrument and the L-BL Individual Achieving Styles Inventory to “determine focal managers’ behavioral complexity” (p. 46). The research “investigated the premise that managers who are able to utilize a wide variety of behaviors, that is, managers who are behaviorally complex, will be perceived as more effective than managers who utilize fewer behaviors” (p. 56). In order to accomplish that purpose, Wangler established nine hypotheses. The researcher used internet-based questionnaires to gather data. Participants in the study were chosen through a purposive, non-random sample and were managers at varying levels of positions and were all

part of a diverse organization. Data was collected from 322 participants, 233 of which were actual focal managers. The rest were peers, bosses and subordinates. Eighty-nine other individuals were surveyed, as well, based on their position as a role-set member for one or more of the focal managers. A role-set member is person who has a relationship with those being studied based on social status and social role. Focal managers were asked to complete two questionnaires (L-BL Individual Achieving Styles Inventory and the Competing Values Managerial Leadership Instrument) while the in the role-set category completed a questionnaire based on the Managerial Effectiveness Index.

After completing data collection, Wangler (2009) analyzed data and compared hypotheses to results. It was found that “connective leadership, behavioral complexity and managerial effectiveness were correlated” (p. 98). The researcher also found “a focal manager’s subordinates, peers, and bosses [to] associate different achieving styles with managerial effectiveness” (p. 100). Based on the findings, six of the nine achieving styles of the Connective Leader as well as all four of the competing values functions were associated with effectiveness (all but intrinsic direct, social instrumental, and entrusting instrumental styles). Finally, it was found that “subordinates associated a focal manager’s level of effectiveness with a wider array of preferred achieving styles than did either the peers or bosses of the manager, and in general, the degree of association between managerial effectiveness and preferred achieving styles also was stronger for subordinates than for the other two groups” (p. 146).

Wangler concluded that “particular role set constituencies do associate different achieving styles with managerial effectiveness” (p. 146). Similar to the achieving styles, the

research found that “particular role set constituencies associate different competing values functions with managerial effectiveness” (p. 148). Therefore, both achieving styles and competing values differ for leaders depending on the situation in which they are involved. The findings also indicated that “not only does each role set constituency associate specific behaviors with a focal manager’s level of managerial effectiveness; each individual within a manager’s constituency has his or her own needs and expectations that are unique” (p. 156). The needs of the constituents then reflect back and influence the responsibilities of the manager.

Leadership in the Managerial Role

Hart and Quinn (1993) attempted to create a model of executive leadership roles, and then use the model to test various hypotheses about the “relationship between leadership roles and firm performance, using data collected from a large sample of top managers” (p. 544). Using the Competing Values Framework as a theoretical base, Hart and Quinn established a model of four quadrants (similar to CVF) that could “be thought of as representing a domain of action, entailing a particular demand on the firm, with a corresponding role for top management” (p. 551). The four demands they established were innovation, commitment, efficiency and performance. Along with the demands, roles were given to each of the quadrants including roles of the motivator, the vision setter, the analyzer, and the task-master.

Once the roles were established, hypotheses were tested through a questionnaire containing 16 items (four for each role). Six hundred-four executive leaders of organizations

were questioned using a Likert Scale in order to determine effective leadership roles among the four quadrants established in the study: Vision Setter, Motivator, Analyzer, and Task Master” (Hart & Quinn, 1993, p. 569). And through their analyzing of results, they established that the Vision Setter and Motivator roles were deemed specifically important, it was the Task Master role that was performed most frequently. The researchers also found that High Complexity leadership, or leaders who are behaviorally complex, should perform best in an organization based on the levels in the study. Thus, a High Complexity leader was a predictor of organizational effectiveness.

In reflecting on the findings, Hart and Quinn said not only did the findings support the idea of paradoxical leadership; they also suggested that situation and context are associated with effective leadership:

“Executives with high scores on all four roles, achieve high levels of performance regardless of the nature of their firm’s size or competitive environment. This does not suggest that high performers can arbitrarily move from one firm or industry to another, but it does suggest that high behavioral complexity is a somewhat university capability” (p. 569).

With that in mind, in order for leaders to have the ability to balance competing demands and develop all four roles, it is suggested that hard work, lengthy experience, and the growth of relationships and knowledge over time is important (Hart & Quinn, 1993).

To understand the roles of managers at different levels, DiPadova and Faerman (1993) studied leadership at various managerial levels by using the Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1981, 1983) Competing Values Framework. DiPadova and Faerman conducted interviews to examine “similarities and differences between managerial roles at different levels of organizational hierarchy” (p. 145). By establishing a “common language” (p. 145), through

their research, DiPadova and Faerman hoped to use it to make “it possible for managers at each level to better understand their contribution to the organization, as well as to appreciate the contribution of others” (p. 145). The researchers interviewed 67 people in 15 different public organizations from all levels of management. After explaining the framework, participants were then asked to “describe managerial tasks and responsibilities at his or her hierarchical level, and then the other managers were asked to compare their level’s tasks and responsibilities with what was just described” (p. 146).

The researchers found that there were many similarities throughout the managerial positions, both in roles and in general. For example, all managers no matter what level indicated that they perform a supervisory role in their duties. It was also found that after managers were promoted from one level of hierarchy to another, “they not only had to learn new behaviors, but...also needed to unlearn behaviors that were considered effective managerial behaviors in their previous position” (p. 147).

Digging into the various models of the CVF, DiPadova and Faerman (1993) found similarities in duties among all managers. Organizations that follow the Rational Goal Model are considered effective if they meet their goals. All managers described responsibilities such as goal setting, planning and motivating at this level. It was found that “managers at all levels sought to develop meaningful goals in order to give direction to their employees” (p. 149-150). The Internal Process Model views effective organizations as ones that are stable and document their organizational activities. Similar managerial responsibilities in this category included overseeing employees, attending to rules and having good writing skills.

Organizations that ascribe to the Human Relations Model are ones that utilize the talents and

thoughts of their employees. By doing so, “participation and involvement bring commitment and cohesion, and that commitment and cohesion lead to organizational effectiveness” (p. 154). Managers in the study discussed dealing with personal issues of employees, facilitating meetings, participating in conflict resolution and mentoring subordinates in this category. The final Model the researchers analyzed was the Open System Model. This Model views effective organizations as ones that “are able to anticipate and thrive when changes in the economic-socio-political environment occur” (p. 155). Managers at all levels found responsibilities such as managing change, being creative, and interacting with people outside of their department/organization to fall into this Model.

Further, DiPadova and Faerman found “managers at all levels are concerned with all aspects of organizational performance: goal setting, information management, dealing with employee problems, change, and much more” (p. 157). It was also found that team building is an important skill to have as a manager. However, managerial jobs are complex which makes evaluation of effectiveness difficult. The researchers suggested using the CVF as a frame to build evaluations upon. By doing so, managers are kept accountable and can further improve their leadership effectiveness. DiPadova and Faerman stated

“managers can work more effectively with their counterparts above and below them when they are given an appropriate opportunity to sit and listen to others describe what happens at their level of the hierarchy and provide feedback that does not defend a position, but challenges team members to think more deeply about their roles in the hierarchy” (p. 168).

The researchers finally concluded that managers at all three levels interviewed were able to learn from each other and their past experiences to improve the effectiveness of their job.

Leadership in Higher Education

Spendlove's (2007) study was conducted to describe the role of Pro-Vice-Chancellor Rector as well as understand the competencies that are associated with the job and effective leadership at that level of higher education. Bartram's (2005) validated competency model was the theoretical framework for the research. The study included semi-structured interviews with 10 UK university's Pro-Vice-Chancellors. Through the interviews, Spendlove found that "most respondents perceived that academic credibility and experience with university life were crucial for effective leadership in higher education, and continued with their research and teaching activities alongside their managerial roles" (p. 407). Leadership in the higher education setting usually involved "being seen and respected as a member of the academic community" (p. 414).

Spendlove concluded that academic leadership is different in many ways than other types of leadership and require different experiences and skills. The researcher found "the most common attributes cited for effective university leadership were openness; honesty; the need to consult others; the ability to listen, negotiate and persuade; the ability to think broadly/strategically; and to engage with people" (p. 411-412). Leadership competencies such as credibility, experience, and people skills such as team building and communication skills were also found to be needed in order to be an effective academic leader. After reviewing the findings, it was suggested that in the future, leadership development should start early in the career of academic scholars so success can have a solid foundation.

Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006), completed research to answer three questions involving community college administrators' leadership and roles: "How do community

college administrators self-report their leadership role at their institutions? Do female and male administrators use similar language and categories when describing themselves as leaders? Do administrators have varying views of their leadership based on administrative position?” (p. 6-7). The researchers completed a stratified random sample of 1,700 administrators of community college within 14 areas. The sample was provided a survey to complete and return. The survey used open-ended questions that asked why administrators considered themselves leaders. The researchers then completed a content analysis to analyze the responses. Eddy and VanDerLinden found categories such as “change agent...knowledge...fulfilling mission of the college...teamwork... [and] authority” (p. 13). The researchers reported that administrators see themselves in 11 different categories of leadership. The categories were

1. “Positional, responsibilities, committees, decision making, related to job function, experience, leader within area,
2. Change agent, initiate change, create environment for change
3. Provide vision, shape direction,
4. Knowledge, personal mastery, expertise, frequently asked or consulted because of expertise, other personal traits,
5. Other see me as a leader, people trust me and/or respect me,
6. Fulfilling mission of the college, working for the good of the organization,
7. Empower others, advocate for others, provide support, mentor, motivate others, role models, set example,
8. Me-centered, I am successful, I have the ability to make things happen,
9. Teamwork, inclusiveness, collaboration, building consensus
10. Influence, power, authority, control financial resources
11. Not a leader, experiencing barriers to being a leader, or too new in the position to be a leader” (p. 13).

The researchers also found few differences of leadership based on gender. For example, more men than women described their leadership based on position or responsibilities. Although slight, males were also found to be more “me-centered” than women. Finally, the researchers

found that there were differences among the varying positions of administrators. Provosts and presidents were most likely to relate to promotion of vision of the college. Academic affairs administrators more often noted that other people saw them as leaders and that they acted as change agents for their area.

Department Heads & Leadership

Department heads have also been studied in order to understand leadership effectiveness at the university level. Wolverton, Ackerman, and Holt (2005) set out to “identify what department heads need to know to be effective leaders” (p. 228). Based on a population from University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV), the researchers started gathering information about past leadership effectiveness in department heads and skills needed for the job. 56 department heads took part in a web survey. Along with department heads, Deans were interviewed to get a holistic view of departmental leadership. According to Wolverton et al. the results showed that “deans, chairs, and prospective chairs all mentioned the need for good interpersonal skills, the ability to deal with difficult people, the ability to collaborate, and the willingness to serve as the interface between faculty and administration” (p. 233) when discussing perceptions of the job. When interviewed, deans expressed the importance of people skills for a department chair. Communication was deemed especially important when dealing with conflict. One dean in the study said “chairs must listen, adapt, and be flexible, but they must also be able to deal with issues, not ignore them or deal with everything...through email” (p. 230). Deans in this study also found budget and financial issues to be their own concern and not that of the department chair: “From the perspective of

deans, budgets are fixed, handed down to the chairs with little opportunity to add resources or move money around; managing budgets is but an accounting function requiring little time” (p. 230).

On the other hand, department chairs unearthed three themes that they believed they faced in their job – budget issues, personnel management and balance of roles. All respondents of the survey in this study discussed at least two of those three topic areas. Budget issues involved deciding how and which faculty to fund for different events as well as understanding the need for record keeping. Personnel issues involved doing assessments and understanding how to manage people. Department Chairs faced a balance issue in two different ways. First, they struggled to balance between administration and faculty followed by the struggle to balance the duties of fulfilling their position and still remaining a scholar. In general it was found that department chairs struggled to fully understand their role and “wished they had additional information regarding the complexity of the chair position to help them prepare for balancing the unique roles of the chair” (p. 232).

Edwards (2006) studied roles and responsibilities of department heads at the community college level. Edwards’s study was a “qualitative investigation [which examined] two community colleges in the state of North Carolina as a specific context of institutional change” (abstract). The purpose of the study was to answer the research question: “given the constraints placed on the department chair by the college and by global influences, how does the department chair view his or her role within the community college?” (p. 8-9). Edwards did qualitative interviews with 13 department chairs in two different community colleges. He also utilized observations and documentation to complete his study. After completing and

transcribing the interviews, a content analysis was completed in order to discover out the roles of department heads as perceived by the department head.

Four overarching findings were described after the research was complete. These four findings included:

- “1) The work of North Carolina community college chairs is influenced by global economic forces;
- 2) department chair power is limited by centralized decision processes in the college;
- 3) technology has changed how department chairs work in the classroom and in the office; and
- 4) technology-intensive departments receive proportionally more resources instructor-intensive departments” (p. 44).

According to Edwards, “the bureaucracy and centralized decision-making in these colleges create a climate where chairs spend a major portion of their day with the ‘administrivia’ associated with running a department, such as the day-to-day details associated with running the department, the endless meetings, the paperwork, and the general minutia that come across the department chair’s desk” (p. 78). Edwards also found that technology has influenced department chairs and how they work both in the classroom and the office.

In addition to the four major findings, the researcher discovered that “North Carolina community college department chairs engaged in a variety of roles as they completed their duties” (Edwards, 2006, p. 91). Roles that were studied included the department chair as supervisor, troubleshooter, scheduler, informed disseminator, evaluator, resource allocator, liaison, teacher, developer, recruiter, advisor, and advocate. Department heads interact with a variety of people on a daily basis. Nellis and Harrington (n.d.) completed a paper about “developing and maintaining good, honest relationships with those entities outside the

department” (p. 1). In the reflective paper, the authors found four frames in which department heads view their organization:

“The **structural frame** sees an organization as a set of roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships...The **human resources frame** sees the same organization primarily as a group of human being show share motivations of being valued and of finding satisfaction in their work and in the rest of their lives...The **political frame** recognizes that even small changes in an organization require that key decisions makers *and* other influential entities back the change...The **symbolic frame** is aware that every group (the department, the college, the faculty) operates on the basis of shared expectations and norms, which are often expressed in and shaped by stories and symbols” (p. 3).

The researchers said “as the chair or head of an academic department, you’ll spend most of your time working directly with your faculty colleagues and administrative staff...Your communication and presence is important in their understanding of events and trends in the department, discipline, and college or university” (Nellis & Harrington, n.d., p. 1). However, the researchers went on to say that there are more people the department heads should take into consideration when discussing stakeholders and interactions. People such as the dean, associate dean, provost and vice president are people who “directly control the bulk of resources you [as a department head] need; from faculty positions and teaching assistantships to operating funds and new infrastructure” (p. 1). Nellis and Harrington wrote a paper on developing and maintaining relationships with people outside of the department. In their paper, they claimed that the dean of a college is probably the most important person that can influence a department. Therefore, meeting with the dean is an important responsibility of the department head. In order for departments to allocate resources for their use, department heads should “learn how to obtain the resources your department needs within the formats and framing that appeal to the deans or others” (p. 3).

It was found that a good leader is one that leads through all four of the frames and responds to situations with the appropriate frame. Leadership communication was also found to be a principle of effective leadership. According to Nellis and Harrington “what defines outstanding organizations is effective leadership demonstrated by shared responsibilities for moving a unit...forward” (p. 4). It was found that individuals and the roles they play in the department must be utilized in order for department heads to move the department forward. In order to be an effective communicator, a department head must

“have a vision, focus on positives, treat others with respect, maintain integrity, be a good listener, work in multi-dimensional ways to communicate, be decisive, lead by example, maintain a genuine, caring attitude toward others, and be strategic in thinking and actions” (p. 5).

Groups within the university were not the only ones that the researchers found important to advocate to as a department head – “with limited public resources for higher education, departments at some universities are being expected to take a more active role in developing relationships with alumni and corporate sponsors” (p. 8). By developing relationships outside of the department and university, department head will be looked upon favorably and can promote the department to a wider group of stakeholders.

Land Grant Universities and Department Chair Leadership

McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass (1975) conducted a study to “examine some characteristics, rules, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen” (p. 244) in state and land-grant universities. 32 universities participated with 1,198 out of 1,646 questionnaires completed. The surveys included questions about “biographical information, departmental

organization, goals, duties, and satisfaction of the department chairmen” (p. 244). After the data was collected, correlation procedure, content analysis and factor analysis was completed to analyze the responses. It was found that a majority of the department chairs were male with a median of 15 years experience in the academic realm. About one-third of those surveyed had been appointed to their position for a set term. An average of 16 people made up the departments that were studied and roughly one-half of the departments had doctoral degrees.

After analyzing the data, it was found that department chairs have three major roles – academic, administrative and leadership. The academic role included responsibilities such as “teaching, advising, conducting, and encouraging research, development of curriculum, faculty development, and related activities” (p. 246). The administrative role consisted of responsibilities relating to both the department and to other organizations in the university. Within the department, administrative duties included “maintaining records, administering budget, managing staff employees” (p. 247). Finally, the leadership role was divided into two categories: development of faculty and program development. Leadership toward the development of faculty included “selecting, supporting, developing, and motivating faculty members” (p. 252). Program development revolved “around the ability to help a department obtain a high level of professional excellence” (p. 252). McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass (1975) said the effectiveness of department chairs can be enhanced by giving them more autonomy and resources. They also suggested providing some department chairs with administrative assistants “in order to relieve them of some of the reported onerous administrative detail” (McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass, 1975, p. 258).

Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey (2010) conducted a study “to explore how department heads in Colleges of Agriculture at Land-Grant universities perceive, conceptualize, and have experienced leadership development” (p. 82). The basic qualitative research study had a population of 10 current and past department heads from across the U.S. in land grant institutions specifically in colleges of agriculture. The three methods used for the study were interviews, observations and document analysis. Data analysis took place through unitization, which is “the process of teasing out information from interview transcripts, observation field notes, and documents analyzed” (p. 83). After reviewing data and forming categories, the researcher discussed conclusions and findings.

The researcher found that of the 10 department heads surveyed, six of them had no prior leadership training or development before entering the role of department head. Seven of the department heads said they “believed that being a faculty member was their leadership preparation before becoming department head” (p. 84). Leadership training through two forms – national programs and on campus training - was also found as being important to department head roles in this study. The two national programs that were described were National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and Harvard Academic Managers Development Program. As for the campus training, all 10 department heads “mentioned activities at their home institution that were geared towards the training of department heads” (p. 85). Leadership education was another category that emerged during research. This category explained that the department heads had all “learned leadership from different areas in their professional career” (p. 86). Observation of other department heads, leadership books and “learning by doing” (p. 87) were ways in which

department heads established their leadership knowledge base. Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey said “all 10 of the participants in this study said they felt like they learned how to be a good academic leader by doing the job” (p. 87).

Faculty development at land grant universities has been studied in many ways (Dressel, 1981; Knight and Holen, 1985; Wilhite, 1990). Wilhite’s (1990) study was conducted to “identify specific behaviors and practices used by effective academic department chairpersons to enhance the professional growth and development of faculty in their teaching, research, and service roles” (p. 17). In the study, 30 male department chairs from 10 land grant colleges participated in phone interviews about faculty development. The nonscheduled structured interview contained 20 questions that included information about background, behaviors, methods of development, information sources, satisfaction/dissatisfaction with their roles, and advice they would give new department heads.

According to Wilhite (1990) the results of the interviews showed that department chairs were in charge of, on average, 30 people. 43-percent of those that took part in the study had been in an administrative position prior to their role as department chair. It was found that a large majority of the department chairs were also satisfied with their job. When discussing faculty development, the department chairs used four main sources to gather information and help faculty: “journals, books, and newsletters; workshops, courses, and conferences; on the job training; and trial and error” (p. 18).

Finally, department chairs expressed six areas of behavior that helped them manage and develop faculty. These included recruitment, communication, identification of goals,

support, evaluation, and recognition. Wilhite said department chairs viewed recruitment as “an opportunity to establish new directions in the department, and a chance to bolster faculty morale” (p. 18). Communication in both the formal and informal setting was found to be important: “While formal communication methods such as faculty meetings, newsletters, memos, and retreats are useful ways to regularly communicate with faculty, an open door policy which permits informal but frequent interaction is also very useful” (p. 18). Developing goals with the faculty and assessing opportunities was another way that department chairs effectively developed faculty members. The chairs in this study also “viewed providing frequent encouragement and support as essential to keeping faculty vital and productive members of the department” (p. 18-19). Evaluation of faculty members was another way for chairs to provide feedback to help faculty members develop. Recognition was the last category that department chairs discussed as being vital to faculty development. It was found that “recognizing and rewarding faculty was viewed as reinforcement for faculty productivity” (p. 19).

Chapter Summary

Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1981) Competing Values Framework (CVF) and Lipman-Blumen’s (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles were the theoretical frameworks used to base this study. Quinn & Rohrbaugh believed that many of the established leadership effectiveness theories would not work because they were paradoxical in the way they worked. The researchers said there were three dimensions to a leader that should be considered in order to decide effectiveness: organizational focus (people vs. task),

structure (flexibility vs. control), and closeness to desired organizational outcomes (means vs. ends). After comparing these three dimensions, four models of effective leaders emerged; Human Relations, Open System, Internal Process and Rational Goal.

The second piece of the theoretical frame was Lipman-Blumen's (1996) *Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles*. Lipman-Blumen described achieving styles as "personal technologies for accomplishing our tasks or achieving our goals" (p. 24). Three behavioral sets make up the Connective Leadership Model with three achieving styles making up each of the sets: Direct (intrinsic, competitive, power), Relational (collaborative, contributory, vicarious), and Instrumental (entrusting, social, personal).

Leadership has been studied in a variety of ways. It has been said that leadership is paradoxical in nature (Cameron & Quinn, 1988). Paradoxical leadership can also be found when dealing with behavioral complexity (Lawrence et al., 2009, Hooijberg & Quinn, 1992). This study used the definition of leadership based on Denison, Hooijberg and Quinn (1995) as "the ability to perform the multiple roles and behaviors that circumscribe the requisite varied implied by and organizational or environmental context" (p. 526). Leadership in its many forms can be seen in managerial roles as well as in executive positions, including higher education. An important element of leadership is effectiveness. Thus, effective leadership at the departmental level in a university setting can lead to successful departments and programs.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the methodology used in completing this study of the leadership effectiveness of Agricultural and Extension Education (AEE) department heads. The chapter will explain the researcher's bias and contextual connection; describe the research design, population, participant selection, data collection; and analysis strategies as well as demonstrate the trustworthiness of this study.

Guiding Research Questions

Using Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1981) Competing Values Framework and Lipman-Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership Model as the theoretical frames, a qualitative study of leadership effectiveness of Agricultural and Extension Education department heads was completed. In order to guide the research, eight questions were established:

1. According to university expectations, what are the responsibilities of a department head in an AEE department?
2. According to department heads, what are the responsibilities of their position?
3. What roles do department heads take on?
4. What communication strategies are employed by department heads?
5. How do department heads interact with faculty members?
6. What external factors influence what roles and responsibilities department heads undertake?
7. What internal factors influence the roles and responsibilities of department heads?

8. How do department heads perceive effective leadership in their position?

Epistemological Position

This study was conducted under the constructivist, or interpretive, philosophy. Because the purpose of this study was to understand and describe, constructivism was the most appropriate epistemology to guide the research. This epistemology outlines that symbolic interaction and experiences of a person are important. Merriam (2009) stated that constructivist/interpretive research is “where qualitative research is most often located [and] assumes that reality is socially constructed, that is, there is no single, observable reality. Rather, there are multiple realities, or interpretations, of a single event” (p. 8).

Bias Statement & Researcher Contextual Connection

The researcher was a graduate student at North Carolina State University where she witnessed daily interaction between a department head and faculty members. Although the researcher worked with the department head of the Agricultural and Extension Education department at North Carolina State University, she had not worked with department heads in AEE departments at other universities. However, it is important to note that the researcher’s knowledge and experiences gained as a graduate student of the department influenced the reasoning and analysis of this study.

Research Design

Qualitative researchers are interested in “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). Patton (2002) said that qualitative research includes data from “excerpts, quotations, or entire passages” from documents as well as “direct quotations from people about their experiences” from interviews (p. 4). This study was designed as a three-step, basic qualitative research study using document analysis and semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 2009).

Document analysis is an unobtrusive way to collect information in a study (Berg, 2004). It is “a systematic procedure for describing the content of communications” (Merriam, 2009, p. 152). Document analysis was used to establish external influencers of department heads. Available job descriptions were obtained from each participant’s university. These job descriptions were considered “official documentary records” (Berg, 2004, p. 214) because they were taken from a school and were “originally produced for some special limited audiences, even if they eventually find their way into the public domain” (p. 214). Official documentary records are used because they often have information that researchers can use as data (Berg, 2004). Most job descriptions were available through human resource departments, with the remaining being available directly through the department head’s office.

The researcher followed up the job description document analysis with semi-structured interviews. Merriam (2009) said, “the main purpose of an interview is to obtain a special kind of information” (p. 88). Semi-structured interviews are conducted in a manner

that allows for flexibility and change by using questions that can be moved around based on the conversation or includes questions that are not as structured as a formal interview (Merriam, 2009). Because the researcher wanted to be able to respond to the flow of the discussion, a semi-structured protocol was created for the interviews based on the theoretical frameworks provided by Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1981) Competing Values Framework and Lipman-Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership Model as well as from information found from the document analysis. Both the frameworks and documents provided insight to external and internal influencers and expectations of the department heads.

Third, the researcher compared data from each of the first two steps. In this case, the data included the document analysis and semi-structured interview transcripts. Both manifest and latent content analysis took place (Berg, 2004). Berg explained manifest content analysis as reviewing the components of content that are "physically present and countable" (p. 269). Latent content on the other hand is when the "analysis is extended to an interpretive reading of the symbolism underlying the physical data" (p.269). When analyzing and discussing latent content, "researchers should offer detailed excerpts from relevant statements (messages) that serve to document the researchers' interpretations" (p. 270). Therefore, for this study, the researcher analyzed both manifest and latent content and prepared examples in order to create an understanding of how the researcher interpreted content.

Population

The population for this study was Agricultural and Extension Education Department Heads from the currently operating 1862 land-grant universities in stand-alone departments.

The department heads were chosen through the American Association for Agricultural Education's directory. Of the 13 individuals interviewed, both male and female department heads were represented. Years in the position of department head ranged from less than a year to more than 20 years. Most of the participants had backgrounds in an agricultural field (i.e. high school agriculture teachers, extension agents or production agriculture). In order to have a deeper understanding of the population, the researcher used "thick description" (Geertz, 1973). Ponterotto (2006) stated that in using "thick description" to describe a population, a researcher would fully describe the participants "without compromising anonymity" (p. 246). The use of a population that is thickly described "facilitates the reader's ability to visualize the sample including their relevant demographic and psychological characteristics" (p. 246).

Participant Selection

Purposive sampling was used in this study to maximize the discovery of knowledge about the population. A purposive sample is used when "researchers use their special knowledge or expertise about some group to select subjects who represent this population" (Berg, 2001, p. 32). Of the 50 land-grant colleges, 18 had a "stand-alone" Agricultural and Extension Education department, meaning, the department was self-sustaining and not a part of another department. Only those individuals representing these 18 departments were selected for this study, all others were eliminated from the population. The department heads represented both elected and appointed positions.

Data Collection

Creswell (1998) said data collection should be a “series of interrelated activities aimed at gathering good information to answer emerging research questions” (p. 110). Merriam (2009) said “qualitative inquiry, which focuses on meaning in context, requires a data collection instrument that is sensitive to underlying meaning when gathering and interpreting data” (p. 2). Humans tend to be the best instrument for research like qualitative inquiry. For this study, the researcher contacted the 18 universities with stand-alone AEE departments in the population in order to request the job description for the Department Chair. If departmental secretaries or human resource departments did not have access to the job description, the department heads were contacted directly via email to request the documents. The job descriptions were emailed to the researcher and were saved in an electronic file. Once received, the researcher created a coding system to allow for anonymity and organization. JD was the code used for job description with a number following to represent when the document was received.

After collecting all of the job descriptions available, the researcher re-contacted the department heads via email to inquire about an interest in participating in this study. An email was sent to every department head in the population requesting available times for interviews. A calendar was created with times and department head codes in order to maintain organization. Each department head was given the choice of a phone, Skype or Google Hangout interview. The researcher informed each of the department heads of their rights as a participant in the study. Each interview was coded, recorded and transcribed.

Codes used for the interview portion of data collection included DH (Department Head) and a number affiliated with the order in which corresponding job descriptions were received.

Data Analysis

According to Corbin and Strauss (1990), “analysis begins as soon as the first bit of data is collected” (p. 6). Corbin and Strauss suggested that the researcher use “the usual methods suggested in the interview and field work literature to assure credibility of respondents to avoid biasing their responses and observations” (p. 5). In order to maintain credibility and accuracy, data collection and analysis were intertwined by using the constant comparative method (Merriam, 2009). Once data collection began, analysis began as well. Bias was kept in check by constantly comparing new data to previously received data. Categories that were developed were constantly reviewed and combined to form more current categories that coincided with developing research.

Creswell (1998) studied various qualitative researchers including Bogdan and Biklen (1992), Huberman and Miles (1994), and Wolcott (1994) and found there are three ways to analyze qualitative data. First comes “a general review of all information, often in the form of jotting down notes in the margins of text” (Creswell, 1998, p. 140). The researchers started reviewing job descriptions as soon as they were received. Notes were taken throughout collection in order for the researcher to recall and relate specific points. Before, during and after each interview, the researcher noted different ideas or starred important information in order to create efficient analysis. For both document analysis and interview analysis, the researcher unitized the data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Merriam (2009) defines a unit of data

as any “meaningful (or potentially meaningful) segment of data” (p. 176). At the beginning of the study, the researcher may still be unsure of what would be “meaningful,” thus “a unit of data can be as small as a word a participant uses to describe a feeling or phenomenon, or as large as several pages of field notes describing a particular incident” (Merriam, 2009, p. 176-177). To unitize the data for this study, the researcher used crayons to color-coordinate emergent themes, ideas or categories. The purpose of unitizing the data is “to compare one unit of information with the next in looking for recurring regularities in the data” (Merriam, 2009, p. 177).

Second, Creswell (1998) recommended “reducing the data...to develop codes or categories and to sort text or visual images into categories” (p. 140). When analyzing the job descriptions and interview transcripts, the researcher was able to develop a color-coordinated form of coding in order to visually see the information presented. The researcher created a color key to guide research. The research key contained information referring to the color used and the meaning behind the color. While researching, the researcher would underline a statement and mark the coinciding color on the color key to remember what the color meant. (i.e. the word “budget” was underlined in lime green). The key was constantly changing and updating until a final list was completed. Corbin and Strauss (1990) said concepts or information relating to the same phenomenon may be grouped together to form categories at this stage. Some concepts that are found may not become categories (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Categories continue to form and combine and rearrange. Over time, categories that are related to one another may join to form a theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Therefore,

Creswell (1998) said the final step in analysis is to compare and relate categories to develop logical frameworks. Categories were combined and compared in order to form the large overarching themes of the data. The categories that emerged were then used to understand and complete a holistic view of AEE department heads.

As part of the constant comparative method, content analysis was completed. Creswell (1998) informed researchers that there are three parts to the content analysis process: open coding, axial coding and selective coding. For a more in-depth description of content analysis see Appendix J.

Trustworthiness

Qualitative research tends to be viewed as unverifiable because small sample size tends to not be “generalizable” (Dooley, 2007). Because of this challenge, qualitative researchers must take caution in proving the trustworthiness of their research. The researcher did this by increasing credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of this study.

Credibility

Dooley (2007) said that credibility is the “truth value” of qualitative research (p. 38). For this study, credibility was established using three different methods: triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checks.

Triangulation, according to Berg (2004) is the use of “multiple lines of sight” (p. 5). Berg stated that different types of research bring different “lines of sight” (p. 5) to fruition

and thus helps a researcher gain a “better, more substantive picture of reality” (p. 5). Patton (2001) advocated using triangulation because it “strengthens a study by combining methods” (p. 247). Mathison (1988) said “triangulation has arisen as an important methodological issue in the evaluation literature...in particular, naturalistic and qualitative approaches to evaluation have demanded attention to controlling bias and establishing valid propositions” (p. 13). By using both document analysis and semi-structured interviews, the researcher was able to compare information in order to triangulate the data and gain a deeper understanding of the findings that emerged in the research (Jick, 1979). Golafshani (2003) said “to improve the analysis and understanding of construction of others, triangulation is a step taken by researchers to involve several investigators or peer researchers’ interpretation of the data at [a] different time or location” (p. 604). Because of this, the researcher also used peer debriefing as a way to provide credibility to the research conducted.

Peer debriefing uses external sources to keep the research process in check (Creswell, 1998; Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993; Merriam, 1988). Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to the person doing the debriefing as someone that keeps the researcher honest. According to Dooley (2007), “peer debriefing allows the researcher to test working hypotheses and find alternative explanations” (p. 38). A panel of three leadership professionals familiar with the research methods was contacted by the chair of the thesis committee and asked to take part in the process of peer debriefing for this study. The panel guided the research throughout the process by suggesting revisions to categories and reviewing themes with the researcher. Corbin and Strauss (1990) said that writing memos are an important part of doing research: “Memos are not simply about ‘ideas.’ They are involved

in the formulation and revision of theory during the research process,” said Corbin and Strauss (p. 10). After each step in the analysis process, the researcher would create a memorandum to send to the peer debrief team updating them on the progress of the study and data analysis to date. Once feedback was provided, the researcher would correct and change the developing analysis. For more information on peer debrief memorandums that were sent to the peer debrief team, see Appendices D-H.

As stated by Lincoln and Guba (1985), “the most critical technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314) was member checks. Member checks are when a researcher takes the “data, analyses, interpretations and conclusions back to the participants so that they can judge the accuracy and credibility of the account” (Creswell, 1998, p. 203). For this study, after each interview was transcribed, the researcher sent the transcription back to the participants for review in order to check for accuracy of discussion. Participants were able to review rough drafts of the researcher’s work in order to correct or “provide alternative language” (Creswell, 1998, p. 203).

Transferability

Krefting (1991) explained that research is transferable when “the findings fit into contexts outside the study situation that are determined by the degree of similarity or goodness of fit between the two contexts” (p. 216). One method of establishing trustworthiness was creating “rich, thick description” which allowed readers “to make decisions regarding transferability” (Creswell, 1998, p. 203). Thick description means explaining more than just words. Denzin (1989) said “it goes beyond mere fact and surface

appearances. It presents detail, context, emotion, and the webs of social relationships that join persons to one another...It inserts history into experience” (p. 83). By using thick details of the interviews in this study, readers are able to “transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred” (Creswell, 1998, p. 203). Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993) said “thick description provides for transferability by describing in multiple low-level abstractions the data base from which transferability judgments may be made by potential appliers” (p. 145). Erlandson et al. (1993) described low level abstractions as “specific features of experience [that]can be groups into higher order abstractions, which, in turn, can be grouped into even higher order abstractions” (p. 23).

Krefting (1991) also said “transferability is more the responsibility of the person wanting to transfer the findings to another situation or population than that of the researcher and the original study” (p. 216). Therefore, as long as the researcher provides enough descriptive data to allow future researchers to compare, the original researcher constructs their information in a manner that can be considered transferable (Krefting, 1991).

Dependability

As explained by Golafshani (2003) the term “dependability” in qualitative research closely relates to the idea of “reliability” in quantitative research. Clont (1992) and Seale (1999) also believed that dependability is important in qualitative research because it shows consistency. Berg (2004) believed that in order to be trustworthy, verification had to take place. One part of verification according to Berg (2004) was that all procedures had been

clearly articulated and that “another researcher could potentially replicate the study and the analysis procedures and draw comparable conclusions” (p. 40).

The researcher took two steps to insure dependability in this study. First, the researcher constructed a dependability audit trail. Dooley (2007) said a dependability audit trail is used “to track the process by providing an audit trail with documentation on methodological decisions and reflections” (p. 39). In order for this study to be deemed dependable, the researcher took detailed notes throughout the process. These notes were later used to create a deeper understanding of exactly what transpired during the study. The first task the researcher completed was to create an Excel document that included information about when participants were contacted, interview details, and the researcher’s thoughts and decisions. The audit trail was updated after each step of the research process. Detailed and accurate record keeping helped ensure a thorough dependability audit (see Appendix I for summary of details).

Second, journaling helped maintain objectivity for the researcher, which is important in qualitative research (Dooley, 2007). By keeping a journal, the researcher was able to express thoughts and opinions of how interviews and data collection were conducted. Journal entries were completed before every interview, after every interview and throughout the week to keep researcher bias in check and keep the researcher on track. Journaling allowed the researcher to review data and reflect on personal variables that may have affected the interview/data collection.

Confirmability

According to Seale (1999), confirmability is “designed to replace the conventional criterion of neutrality or objectivity” (p. 468). As with dependability, a confirmability audit trail was constructed in order to authenticate the confirmability of the study. Seale (1999) said “auditing is an exercise in reflexivity, which involves the provision of a methodologically self-critical account of how the research was done” (p. 468). Dooley (2007) asserted “conclusions, interpretations, and recommendations should be traced directly back to their sources” (p. 39) in a confirmability audit trail. In order to help with the audit, the researcher kept accurate and detailed notes throughout the study. An audit trail “describes in detail how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry” (Merriam, 2009, p. 223). An Excel file was created to provide organization of the confirmability trail. Along with an Excel version of email records, a separate folder was created in the researcher’s email inbox to track communication to and from participants, peer debrief team members or other people involved in the study.

Chapter Summary

This basic qualitative research study was designed in three steps: document analysis, semi-structured interviews and comparison of the information gleaned from the two. Berg (2004) describes document analysis as an unobtrusive way to collect information. The documents used for document analysis in this study included job descriptions of department heads. Semi-structured interviews followed the job description document analysis (Merriam,

2009). Finally, the researcher completed a comparison of the information gleaned from each in order to review and compare the data collected (Merriam, 2009).

The population for the study was agricultural and extension education department heads from 1862 land-grant universities in “stand-alone” departments. A purposive sampling technique was utilized in this study (Berg, 2004). Only individuals in the “stand-alone” departments were considered to be part of the study, leading to a total of 18 possible department heads. 13 individuals were interviewed and included both male and female participants.

When beginning data collection, the researcher contacted the department heads and requested job descriptions for the initial document analysis. Job descriptions were coded JD with a corresponding number. Department heads were then contacted for semi-structured interviews and had the option of conducting the interviews via Skype, Google Hangouts or phone. Once a time and place were agreed upon, department heads were informed of their rights as participants prior to the interviews taking place (Merriam, 2009). Each interview was coded, recorded and transcribed. Codes for the interviews included DH (Department Head) and a corresponding number.

Data was analyzed using constant comparative method. First, researchers must conduct “a general review off all information” (Creswell, 1998, p. 140). Second, Creswell (1998) stated that researchers should reduce data and start to build codes/categories” (p. 140). Finally, Creswell (1998) said the final step in analysis is to compare and relate categories to develop logical frameworks. As part of the constant comparative method, content analysis

was completed. Content analysis has three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Creswell, 1998).

Because the researcher was a graduate student at North Carolina State University, she witnessed daily interaction between a department head and faculty members and students. The researcher's knowledge and experiences gained as a graduate student of the department influenced the reasoning and analysis of this study. Trustworthiness of this study was established using tenants of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS

This research began as a study of expectations versus reality regarding leadership effectiveness. The researcher was interested in discovering what department heads are expected to do, what it is they say they do, and how those align to make them effective leaders. After initial research, the researcher found that department heads do more than simply what is implied in their job descriptions. In order to truly understand what department heads do and how effective they are, a breakdown of their responsibilities and duties must be discussed as well as their influences. Therefore, the purpose of the research evolved to also identify factors that influence the effectiveness of department heads. The following report will discuss the findings of the study based on semi-structured interview answers and job description document analysis. Quotes and excerpts from each of the interviews will be used to further illustrate concepts. The findings of this study are arranged by research questions.

1. According to university expectations, what are the responsibilities of a department head in an AEE department?
2. According to department heads, what are the responsibilities of their position?
3. What roles do department heads take on?
4. What communication strategies are employed by department heads?
5. How do department heads interact with faculty members?
6. What external factors influence what roles and responsibilities department heads undertake?
7. What internal factors influence the roles and responsibilities of department heads?

8. How do department heads perceive effective leadership in their position?

Introduction to Department Heads

Who are AEE Department Heads from 1862 land-grant universities? Land grant universities with stand-alone AEE departments represent 32% of all 1862 land grant universities (United States Department of Agriculture, n.d.). In this study, both department heads (appointed by administrators) and department chairs (elected) were represented as well as both female and male department heads. Combined, the department heads interviewed have a total of 310 years of professional experience in Agricultural and/or Extension Education or an average of almost 24 years.

A department head in AEE oversees an average of 20 faculty, staff, and employees. Their departments include an average of 200 undergraduates and 37 master's/PhD students. Department heads from 1862 land grant universities with stand-alone AEE departments, came from a wide range of backgrounds. Some department heads were former high school agriculture teachers while others were involved in extension. Some were seasoned administrators while others considered this their first administrative position. All department heads interviewed had previous experience as faculty members. They were all tenured either at the associate or full level. Everyone participated in professional organizations. Department heads have a wide range of responsibilities, obligations and functions they must undertake in their role to be effective. In order to have a deeper understanding of what makes a department head effective, a look at what responsibilities they have was the starting point for this research. The first and second research questions discuss the responsibilities of

department heads; first from the expectations of the university (via job description information), then from the perceptions of the department heads (via interview information). Therefore, the first two sections are arranged in a similar fashion to allow for simple comparison. It is important to note that some sections may be smaller than others due to the amount of information that was available, but for comparison sake, the layout was kept the same.

Research Question One

According to university expectations, what are the responsibilities of a department head in an AEE department?

University expectations can be derived from job descriptions because they are the foundation upon which department heads accept their position. The expectations that the university sets dictate the responsibilities of a department head because the department head ultimately reports to the university. Responsibilities include tasks, duties and obligations of department heads on a day-to-day basis or throughout their time in the position. Specific responsibilities in this study included recruitment of student and faculty, evaluations of faculty and programs, budget management, strategic planning and goal setting for the department, and policy regulation.

Recruitment & Retention

Recruitment involved employing and retaining faculty and staff for the department. Five job descriptions required recruitment as a responsibility of the department head (JD3, 8,

9, 12, 14). Job Description 12 stated a department head should “facilitate recruitment, development, and retention of division faculty and staff.” Department heads hire/fire (JD8) as well as recommend “personnel for faculty and staff positions” (JD3).

The job of department head is also required to recruit students to the department. A department head leads “the development and implementation of academic programs that attract and retain students at both the baccalaureate and graduate levels” (JD9). Job Descriptions 12 and 14 both said that department heads “coordinate and participate in undergraduate and graduate student recruitment and retention activities in the division, the college and the university.”

While recruitment involves getting faculty, staff and students to the department, retention involves keeping them there. A major part of retention is completing evaluations, especially with faculty members, in order to make sure faculty goals are aligned with departmental goals and that they are meeting expectations.

Evaluations

Along with recruiting faculty, another responsibility an AEE department head has is conducting annual evaluations of the faculty. Four of the job descriptions required department heads to conduct evaluations (JD3, 5, 8, 15). “Performance evaluation” (JD3), “performance evaluations/reviews” (JD8), and “annual reviews of professional staff and support staff” (JD15) were all ways in which department heads were instructed to conduct evaluations.

In conjunction with faculty and staff evaluations, program evaluations were also part of some department heads' responsibilities (JD5, 8, 9, 14). The department head is responsible for "faculty and program evaluations" (JD5).

Fiscal Responsibility

A third major duty of department heads is fiscal responsibility such as budgets, program budgeting and being aware of funding opportunities. Many department heads have some type of responsibility that deals with financial management (JD3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14). Department heads have the "primary responsibility for budget development and sound fiscal management of funds apportioned to the department" (JD3). In order to be fiscally responsible for the department, department heads also must have a "knowledge of trends and funding opportunities in the discipline related to research and extension programs" (JD3). Job Description 10 said a department head should act as a "fiscal agent for the department's academic, research, and extension activities." In understanding funding opportunities, department heads should assist "faculty in securing external funds; [provide] fiscal management and [be] responsible for oversight and maintenance of the established financial and operational processing environment" (JD6). Another area of fiscal responsibility was programs. Job Description 14 stated a department head is required to "develop and administer budgets for the departmental programs." Another job description stated department heads need to "provide fiscal and operational oversight of all research and educational programs of the department" (JD9). Many of the fiscal responsibilities of the

department head were designed to reflect the strategic plan of the university based on university budgets and requirements.

Strategic Plan

Departments are guided by strategic plans and goals. These goals can be set by the university or the department. A few job descriptions actually mentioned departmental planning or goals (JD2, 3, 6, 10). It was said that a department head is “responsible for short term and long term program planning for the department. [They develop] strategic plans in concert with other college or division planning activities” (JD3). Department heads must also have “the capacity to articulate a vision for the department, and a strong commitment to diversity as well as the land-grant mission” (JD2). Another job description described the responsibility of the department head as one that is “responsible for representing the department in strategic processes as exemplified in the creation of the National Agricultural Education Research Agenda” (JD10).

Goal Setting

Goals were formed based on departmental objectives and future desires. The need for goals was expressed by two job descriptions to guide the department and the faculty (JD6, 12). Goals are also created with the input from faculty according to Job Description 6. Department heads (in association with faculty) establish “departmental direction, goals, programs and budget priorities” (JD6). In the same way, Job Description 12 stated

department heads must “work closely with faculty in establishing program priorities and plans.”

Meeting Attendance

Department heads are expected to attend a variety of meetings (JD 8, 12, 14, 15). The meetings range from departmental to university level to serving on external committees. Job Description 15 stated that department heads must serve on an assortment of committees and attend meetings that involve said committees. Likewise, Job Description 8 stated department heads participate “on department, college, and university committees and in professional organizations as appropriate.”

Balancing Act

Balancing responsibilities meant working on more than one duty at a time successfully on top of handling all of the requirements of the job. It was found that balancing responsibilities was not explicitly stated in most job descriptions. Job Description 6 did state the importance of department heads’ ability to “balance competing priorities.”

Policy Regulation & Paperwork

Policy regulation was another duty of department heads. Department heads must have “a good understanding of University and Division policy and [be] able to interpret and enforce policy with faculty and staff as needed” (JD3). These responsibilities mostly involved paperwork and regulation of departmental, division, or university/college policy.

Job Description 3 said a department head is “responsible for compliance with civil rights regulations in programs and employment... [and] for timely preparation and submission of required reports.”

Also mentioned in job descriptions, department heads “provide leadership for diversity in human resources and promote the Affirmative Action Plan” (JD7). Other policy-related responsibilities were discussed in Job Description 12 and 14 that tell us a department head needs to “promote compliance with federal and state regulations regarding hazardous wastes, safety, and other regulations.”

Part of the requirement to provide policy regulation was to provide the paperwork that went with it. Job Description 3 stated that department heads are “responsible for timely preparation and submission of required reports.”

Overall, the job descriptions showed that the position of department head encompasses a variety of responsibilities that need to be accomplished as part of the position.

Research Question Two:

According to department heads, what are the responsibilities of their position?

Department heads viewed responsibilities somewhat differently from what their job descriptions stated. Many of their responsibilities were the same such as recruitment and retention, evaluations, fiscal responsibility, strategic planning, goal setting and policy regulation; yet, the tasks of balancing priorities and meeting attendance were also discussed in detail. Department heads viewed their responsibilities in a much more detailed way than their job descriptions entailed.

Recruitment and Retention

My personal philosophy is that I can be most effective by, first of all, when I have the opportunity to hire people, hire the very best people I can, but also make sure I give people what they need to do their job and be successful and then get out of their way (DH14).

Recruitment and retention involved employing and keeping quality faculty, staff and students. Recruitment was viewed as important to a few of the department heads (DH10, 12, 14). Department Head 12 said that in his position, “You have to do recruitment.”

Students are one group of people that department heads focus recruitment tactics on. One department head stressed the importance of recruitment throughout the university and not just in their department. When discussing events as recruitment tools, Department Head 12 said:

we are trying to get other departments in the college to improve their recruitment because combined, we have about a potential 1,000 [UNIVERSITY] students on campus. So, we are working together to try and get the college and university to recognize those events as good recruitment events.

They also followed up the importance of recruitment by saying “we recruit students from [other states].”

Recruitment and retention of faculty and staff was also found to be important to creating a successful department (DH10, 12, 14). Recruiting diverse faculty, department heads are able to bring different ideas and abilities to their departments to make them successful. Department Head 10 explained that as a department head, they see “the potential in everybody [they] work with, whether it’s faculty, staff or students. [The department tries]

to get those people to the right places so that what they do can be enhanced.” Having diverse people in the department was also important to another department head:

When you start to get into the arena of ideas and you want what’s best for the organization, you have to recognize the fact that you get people from diverse as backgrounds as possible and they bring a different perspective completely and a different way of viewing things. At the end of the day, you have a much greater chance to get an idea to overcome whatever obstacle you are facing (DH14).

Department Head 6 said “We’ve [the department] got the diversity from people representing many, many states here...Culturally, we know we are diverse.” When working with diverse groups of people, it is important to make sure they are adapting and achieving in the department, which is why many departments take part in evaluations.

Evaluations

Performance reviews or evaluations are a time for department heads to sit down with faculty and discuss faculty goals, achievements, challenges, and growth. “I have the wonderful task of doing evaluations on about 30 faculty members,” said Department Head 3, “That’s something you can’t take lightly.” Annual faculty and staff performance evaluations were discussed by a majority of the department heads (DH3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16).

Evaluations take a large part of department heads time at the start of the calendar year.

Department Head 10 said “Much of what I do in the spring, counting the hours between January, February, and March, at least 50-60% of my time will be documenting what we do through annual performance reviews.” From another participant, “By far, the largest part of my job is working in personnel issues – conducting annual evaluations or managing the structure for all of the annual evaluations that occur for the [number of] people in the

department is a huge part of that” (DH14). Evaluations are usually done with only the department head and the faculty member being evaluated present as Department Head 12 said “we do annual evaluations every January, so I will sit down with the faculty members on a one-on-one evaluation basis.” Evaluations are also used after hiring faculty and staff, to help department heads “make decisions on tenure and promotion documents” (DH7) as well as budgets. Budgets then flow into a larger fiscal responsibility that department heads have.

Fiscal Responsibility

Department heads see their fiscal management responsibilities in practice different from the theory in their job descriptions. Fiscal management requires department heads to handle budgets as well as funding allocation for the department. And while budget sizes are different across the population, most department heads mentioned budget in their list of responsibilities (DH2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18). As a department head “of course managing budget and all that kinds of stuff falls under your jurisdiction” (DH18). Keeping a balanced budget takes time and practice. Department Head 8 said part of their job is “trying to figure out how you can balance a budget in a certain situation.” As a new administrator, there is a “learning curve” for department heads in order to understand “what one can do and one cannot do in terms of shuffling money here and there” (DH2).

“I get requests pretty regularly for spending money several times a day” said Department Head 14. Department heads handle budgeting allocation decisions in a few different ways. Some department heads make the decisions as an individual (DH7). Department Head 7 said they deal with “lots of budget stuff that the faculty never see.” Some

let others take care of their portion of the budget – “My associate heads all have appropriate sized budgets. They have complete budget authority to handle any decisions that are made there” (DH10). Others work with people to figure out the departmental budget – “I sit down with my administrative assistant and we have a financial tech in the college” (DH12).

Strategic Planning

Strategic planning provides direction for departments for a period of several years. More than half of the department heads have been developing a departmental strategic plan within the past year or are currently working on it (DH2, 3, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 18). Department Head 2 said their department “had the opportunity last spring to put together [their] strategic plan... [They] had a new dean coming in. He had set forth that expectation – ‘I want all the departments to take a look at the strategic plan’ and wanted [them] to start from scratch.” In order to set goals for the strategic plan, department heads ask, “What’s the most important thing we need to do, both short term and long term?” (DH12). In some cases, faculty members are also engaged in strategic planning (DH3, 7, 12, 18). Department Head 3 said, “I’ve tried to engage the whole faculty in a strategic planning process... I’m trying to convince them that strategic planning and taking control of their future is part of their job.”

The length of time covered in a strategic plan is usually between three and five years. Deciding what will be included in the strategic plan takes time. “It took about 18 months and we used an outside facilitator, [but] we were able to identify 17 goals that were critical to this department being relevant and sustainable for the next five years,” said Department Head 14. Other departments have fewer goals – “We develop 3-5 sometimes more strategic goals for

that next time frame, usually three years” (DH7). Department Head 5 talked about being “responsible to help direct the direction that the department’s going to go.” Other factors such as stakeholders’ desires factor into planning strategically for the department.

Department Head 12 said their department works “with all of the external stakeholder groups making sure we are meeting their needs.” The goals of a department are often set based on a strategic plan and what the department desires to achieve within a certain time frame.

Goal Setting

“I set goals for the department...I basically look at what I see as some of the issues going on in the department or opportunities maybe, maybe not so much issues” (DH16).

The goals that are decided for a department cover a wide range of areas. Department Head 18 said, “we have major goal areas around teaching, research, extension, and resources.” Many goals of departments fit into those areas as well. For example, Department Head 2 said, “I think we have an opportunity to take a bigger role in career and technical education teacher preparation.” Department Head 6 explained their goals fit into similar categories:

We’ve [the department] got three goals of the department, of course, communication, education, which is that in the center, and leadership, which we’ve added in recent days/months/years that we found was necessary to fully implement education through effective communication and that’s where we are all about leadership, leadership development.

Further, Department Head 6 described their faculty as a group that has a focused goal: “We also know we are focused on the same goal or purpose and that is high quality in teaching

and extension.” The goals described by Department Head 14 were “goals that had to do with really the major components of who [they] are as a department.”

All department heads have a goal of growing the department in regard to students, faculty and degree programs (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Department Head 6 hoped for “expansion of the faculty in two dimensions. One is the number of faculty and one is the quality of the faculty scholarship.” Department Head 5 stressed the importance of becoming more practical:

I see us also working toward being more practical. Giving students the opportunity for more hands on learning. Being able to gain those skills that they can then take and use when they get out (DH5).

When discussing the growth of their department, Department Head 18 said “people are continuing to work really hard. I think the reason we are growing is because we are doing work that’s valuable to the college. I think as we continue to do that, we will continue to grow as a unit.” One department head mentioned that one of their goals aligned with the university’s strategic plan: “I think our goal is to increase student numbers. That’s on the college’s strategic plan...So, I would hope in five years, we have a full group of faculty in the academic and [PROGRAM] side” (DH12). Another department head focused on degree expansion in their goals:

I see the department with a PhD program. That’s one of my short-term goals. I see the department with a second master’s degree that focuses solely on extension education. I see the department with a very strong leadership minor. And, I see a department with additional faculty (DH9).

Another major goal of department heads was having the department be viewed as an asset to the college/university and their home state (DH3, 5, 8, 12, 15, 18). In five years,

Department Head 3 “would like to see our programs having a higher impact in terms of student numbers, in terms of what it means to the people in [STATE].” Department Head 12 hopes that their department can be viewed as a resource to the college: “I’d like to be seen as a resource for the college related to teaching.” Another department head said “I see [the department] gaining a lot of respect within the college and with other departments” (DH8).

Another department head said:

I see us at the top of the mountain. I honestly truly believe that we will be positioned well within the college particularly at a time of uncertainty and we will be positioned well within the college and within the state in terms of teacher preparations, Ag literacy, and the skill sets that we bring to the table (DH2).

Some department heads would like to see their department becoming a high ranking department in the field of agricultural and extension education (DH2, 7, 10, 16). Department Head 10 said, “Not because we are shooting for it, but because of the things we are doing, we will be the #1 department in the country and the world.” Department Head 7 said something similar: “I’d like to see the department be one of the best in the nation, however that might be viewed.”

Other goals included looking to the future of the programs in the department (DH12) and increasing the collaboration with the university because “teaching and learning are going to become more and more important and more and more of a crux in higher education” (DH15).

Meeting Attendance

“My [family] always ask me how I get everything done because I always have so many meetings” (DH18).

Department heads attend numerous meetings. “Typically my day has a large amount of time for meetings,” said Department Head 6, “So, if I’m working 8-10 hours a day, maybe 40% of that is sitting on my butt in a meeting.” All of the department heads mentioned a meeting that they attend on a regular basis (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). One noted, “As department heads I’m sure everywhere, there’s a number of meetings you have to attend or be a part of” (DH5). Meetings stretched across the department and university: “I’d say probably 40% of my time is taken up in meetings of some kind, either meeting with individuals, meeting in committees – those would include at the department level, college level, and the university level” (DH14). The purpose of the meetings ranged from handling student issues (DH6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 18) to generating funding support (DH8, 18) to updating administrators with what is happening in the department (DH2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14). As part of that, department heads often meet with administrators beyond the department as part of their position in order to advocate for the department. Department Head 15 claimed, “Once every other week, I’m meeting with my [administrator] to communicate what we are doing for [them] and so [they know] how [they are] able to support us and able to make sure that [they are] sending us the resources and doing the things for us that [they need] to do administratively.”

It is important for a department head to attend meetings, said Department Head 2 because “as an administrator it’s important to be at those meetings... ‘the world is changed by those who show up.’” Depending on the type of meeting however, different types of people could be involved. Department Head 6 said:

I have meetings with people who are superior to me, meaning my dean, associate dean, director of my experiment station. And, I have meetings with those who are inferior to me, not in a bad sense, but people that work for me. That could be an assistant professor, an associate professor, a secretary or grad student.

Department Head 8 said they have meetings with “sponsors and donors trying to get money for things.” Another department head attends “team meetings with other department chairs, center directors” (DH7).

Balancing Act

Informally, my job is to help bring order to chaos. When you take [#] individuals and you overlay all of the responsibilities we have from academics to service, to dealing with the number of students we deal with, to the number of classes we teach, it can become very chaotic and complex. (DH14)

Part of what department heads do is balance their roles and responsibilities in order to create a successful department. They are required to complete more than one task at a time and it requires time and energy. A few department heads mentioned that their job is a “balancing act” of sorts in the skills they need and the duties they perform (DH3, 6, 7, 12, 14). Department Head 14 said:

It’s been said many times and I’ve heard it from both administration and others that being a department head is the most difficult administrative role in the university. Simply because you have faculty and staff on one side with all of their interests, their needs, their concerns, and on the other side you have upper administration who are making policies and procedures for getting things done and meeting university goals and things like that.

Another department head described the need to “juggle everything [to] make sure everything runs efficiently” (DH12) in the department. Department Head 7 said their job requires them to question what if “I give a little bit of change over here, how is that going to change what

happens over there so I try to spin all of these plates on bamboo poles like the Chinese acrobats you see at the circus?” Department Head 14 claims balance between leading and managing is a daily task: “One of the biggest journeys I’ve been on in this role as a department head is trying to balance the difference between leading and managing.” Similarly, Department Head 2 said, “It’s tough balancing between how much time and energy you devote to doing the little stuff and how much time that leaves to get the big stuff done.”

Policy Regulation & Paperwork

Department heads said other duties included policy regulation and paperwork (DH3, 6, 7, 12, 14). In order to make decisions in their department, Department Head 3 said “we have to be aware of policy issues and those policy issues are university policy and state policy.”

Various forms of paperwork are completed by department heads to follow policies or relating to other tasks within their responsibilities (DH3, 14, 16). “I spend probably 30 minutes of every day just signing approval forms to just make sure that the work of the units get done” (DH3). Department Head 14 said “Roughly 35% of my time would be involved in really the paperwork/procedures/signing documents/working with budget allocations/financial and personnel side of things.” Signing paperwork to “enable faculty members to do their jobs more efficiently and effectively” (DH3) is another responsibility of department heads.

Research Question Three:

What roles do department heads take on?

Nobody ever trained us [department heads] for this. We are not trained to be department heads (DH8).

Overall, it was found that department heads have a wide variety of duties that they feel responsible for. Department Head 7 shared they have a “wide range of responsibilities” when it comes to doing their job. As a department head, “you have to take responsibility for your job. You have to do a lot of planning. You have to do a lot of hard work getting everything ready” (DH12). By reviewing both job descriptions and interviews, the researcher found that department heads take on a variety of roles when fulfilling their duties. The roles include being an administrator, a resource allocator, an academic, an outreach coordinator, a collaborator, an advocate, a researcher, a leader, a manager, and decision maker.

The Role of Administrator

Department heads take on the role of an administrator when they deal with the day-to-day happenings within the department that are required to help the department be productive. Parts of this role included overview of basic activities of the department, resource allocation, and reporting to people throughout the university. Numerous department heads and job descriptions discussed administrative roles that department heads take on (JD5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16; DH 2, 3, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16).

In the role of administrators, department heads are to oversee daily activities of the department by “implementing the department’s vision and all aspects of administration”

(JD5). Job Description 8 said a department head is to “provide oversight of all departmental programs and activities in advising, extended education, research and scholarship, teaching distance courses and service.” Similarly, Job Description 12 said a department head is in charge of “developing, budgeting, and administering all teaching, research, and extension activities of the division.” Department Head 6 said their “philosophy of administration is to serve the faculty and students...by building a strong, positive relationship built on the principles of shared goals we [as a department] might have.” Department Head 14 described part of the role as dealing with “administrivia or the minutia of the day to day, the little fires that burn that are urgent, but may not be the most important things to get done.” Job Description 16 said department heads need to have “demonstrated leadership and administrative abilities, appreciation for the support of the diverse interests of the department, and a commitment to the land-grant philosophy.”

Responsibilities in the administrative role came not only from the department. Instead, they “work both ways,” (DH7). By working “both ways” department heads “work up to the senior administrative team and...work then across to [the] faculty” (DH7). Many department heads explained that their job was working with other people to accomplish a goal (DH3, 7, 12, 16). “I spend a lot of time working for everybody else,” said Department Head 3. Department heads were required to complete reports for people outside of the department as well. According to Department Head 10, “If you look at time on my tasks, 20-25% on any given day are dealing with systems activities, both special committees that report to the vice chancellor and things like [research].” Department Head 14 advised when in an

administrative role “you are taking on a mantle of responsibility to serve the people of the organization if the organization is to truly move forward.”

The Role of Resource Allocator

In order to administer a department, resource dispensation is another responsibility department heads assume. Resources were claimed by a majority of department heads as under their purview (JD6, 9, 12, 14; DH2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18). Resource allocation was expected by Job Description 6: “maintain effective custody over university resources.” Job Description 9 stated that department heads should work with faculty and administration to “develop the resources necessary for program delivery.”

Department Head 2 said, “The best description I can say about my role is being a broker of resources and a shepherd of those resources... [and]...making sure resources don’t go dry.” Additionally, “I spend most of my time directing resources – financial resources and personnel resources” claimed Department Head 3. Department Head 14 described his function as an administrator as one that aligned with what the university expected because “My responsibility indicates that I have responsibility for people and resources of this department” (DH14).

Department Head 16 said:

My role is to convince the dean that we [as a department] need more resources to...develop the scholarship we need, coming from faculty members and also allow us the curriculum, training and programs in 4-H that we need.

Department Head 18 said “I’m constantly searching for resources for the department.

Helping the faculty find resources to do their programs.” Another department head said in a

department head's position, "you've got to figure out what people can bring to the table, what they are passionate about and then give them the resources to continue to grow in that area and others" (DH10).

The Role of Academic

The academic role of a department head included any responsibilities that dealt with the academic side of the position. Duties such as teaching, advising, instructing, curriculum building, distance education and scholarly achievement were expected of many department heads (JD2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 16; DH 5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16).

Teaching classes either at the graduate or undergraduate level was required (JD2, 5, 8, 12; DH2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16). Job Description 2 said that a department head is "expected to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses." Job Description 5 said similar requirements stating, "some teaching within the department will be required." One job description instructed the department head to "teach graduate courses and participate in other classes as needed and appropriate [as well as] advise students in graduate and undergraduate programs" (JD8).

Although teaching classes is a requirement of many department heads in the academic role, the amount of time required in the classroom varied. One job description only required department heads to teach a minimum of one graduate course and one undergraduate course in an academic year (JD9). Job Description 9 also said that department heads need to be active contributors to the distance education and doctoral degree programs.

Half of the department heads said they teach at least one class (DH 5, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16). “I teach one class a year,” said Department Head 14, “just because I really miss the classroom.” On the other end of the spectrum, “I teach five classes a year” in addition to advising students and being a full time faculty member stated Department Head 15. Department Head 9’s schedule usually includes teaching “three to four classes in an academic year in addition to visiting student teachers in the spring.”

The official teaching appointment from the college varied among the department heads. One participant had a 100% teaching appointment – “Most of the faculty in this department have a 100% teaching appointment [including the Department Head]” (DH9). One position was a smaller portion of teaching responsibilities – “My position split is 40% teaching, 40% administration and 20% scholarly research” (DH12). There was yet another department head that does not teach due to administrative instructions – “The vice chancellor doesn’t want any of his department heads teaching” (DH10). Even though this department head does not teach, they still “makes sure all the courses are taught...the students are advised...[and] works with college administration to make sure the department is doing everything curricular wise” (DH10). University regulation was not the only reason found for some department heads to not teach in their position. Time was another factor according to Department Head 3: “Just since I became interim [position] of another unit, it’s been more and more difficult for me to engage in any research and I haven’t taught a class since I assumed that role. I’m 100% administration now.”

On-campus classes were not the only type of classes mentioned. A few department heads were encouraged to participate in distance education (JD2, 9, 12). Job Description 9

said department heads have a “demonstrated commitment to innovative distance education and instructional technology.” Conducting “off-campus instruction using appropriate delivery technology” (JD12) was also mentioned as an area in which department heads are involved. Department Head 7 stressed the importance of an online graduate program when explaining how the initiative was brought to the faculty’s attention, saying, “I really felt and I still believe that we must have an active, meaningful presence in distance education” (DH7).

In addition to teaching classes, advising students was another responsibility that emerged in this role. A few job descriptions said department heads are either required to advise students themselves or arrange advising appointments for faculty (JD5, 8, 12). Department heads “advise undergraduate and graduate students...direct theses and serve on graduate committees...[and] supervise student teachers and beginning teachers” (JD12). As a department head, “you have to do teaching [and] you have to do advising” (DH12). Department Head 5 said “getting graduate students to come in and then assisting them to help determine which direction they would like to take their research or creative components” was part of their job as department head.

Lastly, academic distinction was required for some of the department heads (JD2, 5, 6, 16). The term academic distinction encompasses all actions taken by the department head to further excellence in scholarship, teaching or other forms of academia. Department heads enhance academic distinction through a variety of ways including promoting excellence in programs (JD6) and demonstrating excellence in teaching (JD5). Overall, a “strong evidence of excellence in teaching and use of instructional technology, experience, and active participation in agriculture teacher education (JD2) is needed for department heads.

Department Head 2 said, “We didn’t select our jobs by accident. Right? The Ag teacher’s creed. I’m a teacher by choice, not by chance. We took the formal courses on how to become good teachers... We study the discipline of teaching. We are scholars of teaching.”

The Role of Outreach Coordinator

Not all department head roles are strictly in the department. The outreach role of department heads deals with reaching beyond the university. Extension, service, in-service training, and serving on external committees were included in this category. Half of the department heads’ job descriptions (JD2, 3, 5,8, 10, 12, 16) as well as all of the department heads (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18) said they conduct some type of outreach from their department. Job Description 12 described the outreach role as one that would “participate in the design and delivery of in-service activities [and] provide on-site programmatic and technical support to secondary schools and extension programs.”

Cooperative Extension fell into this category because of the interactions it creates with people outside of the department. Job Description 10 described one of the jobs of the department head as a supervisor for “the extension unit housed within the department... responsible for the training and accountability of the [UNIVERSITY] Extension Service faculty and staff throughout the state.” Support of extension staff was also described in Job Description 12: “provide on-site programmatic and technical support to secondary schools and extension programs.”

Twelve of the 13 department heads mentioned Extension in their interview (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18). Support of the 4-H program was also included in Extension.

Department heads actively support “student and outreach activities housed within the department, such as clubs and 4-H” (JD3). Department Head 7 confirmed support of extension by saying their department is “heavily engaged in [STATE] cooperative extension.” Department Head 8 hopes to continue the growth of working with extension because they “think extension offices are a good group to work with so I see us expanding opportunities with them.” “I love my job,” said Department Head 6, “It’s focused highly on what I believe in, which is changing society through agricultural education/extension education/non formal education.”

Serving on external committees was also required for some department heads (JD8, 12, 14, 15). External committees were committees outside of the department, still within the university as well as those not affiliated with the university. Department heads are expected to “serve on university, college, division and professional committees” (JD12). Job Description 15 requires its department head to be a representative to a professional executive committee outside of the department. Job Description 16 explained that department heads “will promote the department within the University, the state...and the nation, consistent with the department, school and university strategic plans.” Part of a department head’s role when attending different committee meetings is to “serve as department’s representative” (JD15) or “serve as the spokesperson for the department” (JD15). Department heads should be considered a “liaison for several state and national agencies” according to Job Description 10. It is important for department heads to “represent the department both internally and externally and try to present the department in the best way internally and externally in an honest way” according to Department Head 7.

The Role of Collaborator

Another role department heads play is that of collaborator. Collaborators are people who engage groups of people in working together. In this case, department heads act as collaborators when they challenge faculty to work together or for departmental faculty to work with others outside of the department.

Collaboration methods differed across requirements, but many universities encouraged some form of connection with other people within the university in order to promote achievement. Four of the job descriptions explicitly discussed collaboration (JD5, 8, 12, 14) as did all of the department heads (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). A department head is:

expected to exert foresight and effective leadership while fostering positive working relationships among faculty, staff, and students within and between academic and extension departments and our clientele (JD5).

Other job descriptions explained the need for the promotion of interdisciplinary collaboration between department faculty and other departments or colleges (JD5, 8, 12, 14). Department heads should participate “on department, college, and university committees and in professional organizations as appropriate to achieve departmental, college, university, and professional goals” (JD8). Likewise, department heads should also “foster interdisciplinary ties with appropriate departments and programs within the university” (JD12, 14).

Department Head 12 said “our [department’s] goal is to do more things collaboratively. To work together on projects” (DH12). Similarly, Department Head 18 said they are typically “looking for people to collaborate with and work with in our department.”

Other collaboration initiatives included a “formal mentoring system” (DH7), to create a collaborative department culture (DH15), and build “partners in the community” (DH18). Department Head 15 explained the importance of collaboration to their department by saying, “Sometimes, in higher education, we are knowledge hoarders. We hoard information. That’s exactly the opposite of what higher education should be. We should be sharing that information with everyone.” Department Head 18 expressed the need to daily seek collaboration by saying, “I think something I look for everyday [is] opportunities to collaborate with other people.” Grant work and research were also deemed important collaborative efforts according to Department Head 15:

One of the other things I do a lot is I do a lot of collaborative work on grants so that other faculty members across this college know who we are, know what we are doing, and know what [AEE] is and what we have to offer as a discipline.

The Role of Department Advocate

Advocating on behalf of the department is a role department heads take on when looking outside of the department for opportunities to collaborate or be utilized as a resource with an external group. Many department heads assume this role in their position (JD2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 12, 16; DH6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18).

Job Description 5 stated department heads must “serve as an advocate for the department.” Job Description 6 also claimed department heads must act as a “departmental advocate who collaborates and forms partnerships across disciplines.” Job Description 14 called the role a “liaison.” Department heads must “provide liaison between the administration and the faculty on recommendations/actions which are subject to approval at a

level beyond the university” (JD14). In order to be an advocate of the department, department heads must have the “ability to promote the department to the college, university, industry, granting agencies, government, and clientele” (JD2).

Advocating for the department meant promoting the strengths and benefits of the department among external groups. Department Head 6 explained their role as an advocate as follows:

I believe my role as department chair is to be promoting this department. It’s for people outside of this department to know that this department is valuable and viable to the college and university. So, I’m a bit of a [salesperson]. I’m into marketing the department.

Similarly, Department Head 15 described their role as one that promotes the department:

I spend a lot of time making sure I am communicating on behalf of our interest in [department] and putting us in the right kinds of positions where we can take advantage of opportunities and be able to make sure we are being resourced.

Department Head 12 called their role being a “champion for the faculty”:

I’m making sure the department is working with the college and we are fitting in and doing what we can do as a college...I feel like I should be a champion for the faculty. I’m making sure [faculty] are on the right track. And that I’m their advocate with the dean in the college.

Other department heads explained their role as meeting “with people to advocate for the department” (DH18) or “promoting faculty members to other departments...deans...and across the campus” (DH8).

The Role of Researcher

A majority of the department heads were expected to conduct and/or support some form of research (JD 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14; DH3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 18). Being a researcher

included creating publications, having recognition in research (JD6), assisting in faculty research (JD8, 9, 10), or simply “conducting research and other scholarly activities” (JD12).

Having “established scholarly credentials in agricultural teacher education” is important according to Job Description 2. Job Description 16 said a “strong and continuing commitment to scholarly achievement” is needed to be a department head.

One job description explained the duty of a department head in the research function as one that is to:

Plan and conduct research and other scholarly activities related to teaching and learning, which may result in discovery, integration and application of new knowledge and/or techniques. Disseminate research in appropriate venues. Obtain extramural funding support for research and scholarly activities (JD12).

Many department heads conduct research as part of their job (DH6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 18). The current topics of research that department heads conducted included “historical research” (DH12), “leadership and teaching methodologies and faculty development” (DH15), “research in extension, teaching and learning” (DH9) along with other “not just Ag Ed” (DH9) topics. Department Head 7 expressed the need for useful research:

We have lots of busy researchers in our discipline, but all that cumulative research, what difference is it making? I think we really need to focus on research that really makes a difference to someone in their work roles.

Although it is expected of many department heads, not all of them still do research.

Department Head 10 does not do research because their vice chancellor “does not want any of his department heads to be the direct contributor to research.” Department Heads 3 and 6 both said they no longer do research because of time: “Up until this year, I really maintained some commitment to my personal research program. Just since I became interim

[administrator] of another unit, it's been more and more difficult for me to engage in any research" (DH3).

Sometimes faculty were included in the discussion of research such as with Department Head 8, who is continually "trying to see if there's anything I can do to help them [faculty] in their research and scholarship" (DH8). Department Head 9 discussed working with faculty members for research – "We collaborate on manuscripts. We collaborate on research. It's not uncommon for us to publish something with five or six authors from the department" (DH9).

In order for department heads to facilitate research, some job descriptions required the search for grants or extramural funding (JD5, 6, 9, 12). Job Description 8 said department heads develop "programs and seek outside funding to support department activities." One way grant money was to be used in research was to help "faculty to advance the research and development of several social science-oriented areas" (JD10). Department Head 15 said they spend time writing grants, attending grant team meetings and research sessions: "I might have to write a grant or have this grant team meeting or that program team meeting or this research session [as part of my job]."

The Role of Leader

One role of the department head is obviously being a leader. Department heads are viewed as leaders in a variety of ways and have leadership responsibilities they must take on in their position. All department heads were required to perform some aspect of leadership in their job as department head (JD2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16). In order to be

considered an effective department head, they must provide “strong innovative leadership in an academic environment” (JD2). According to Job Description 5, leadership can be defined as someone with “team building skills, strong interpersonal and communication skills and administrative experience.”

The way in which department heads lead their department varied based on the person (DH2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Some described their leadership in relation to other people such as faculty and staff (DH2, 6, 7, 14, 15, 18). Department Head 6 said their philosophy on leadership is “really that servant level [leadership]...how can I serve this faculty to advance them as their leader?” Servant leadership was also discussed by Department Head 14:

It’s not about me. If I wanted to get awards and get recognized...I should have stayed a faculty member because there’s a lot of opportunities for that to happen...But, I look at my job now as to help faculty and staff be recognized for the outstanding work that they are doing and be able to serve them in that.

Being a good educator (DH6), an ethical leader (DH12), and modeling good leadership (DH12, 15, 18) were also ways that leadership was explained. One stated, “I try to be a...person who shares opinions and ideas. In fact, one of the keys to effective leadership, I mean you have to have good ideas to make change” (DH7). Department Head 12 said “I think leadership is important. I think being an ethical leader is important,” and continued “as a department head, if you show good quality leadership, if you are willing to work hard, if you are willing to talk to people, people know that and I think they respect that” (DH12).

Department Head 2 described their views on situational leadership:

I try to lead through a participatory mode primarily. Though, sometimes I do take on a laissez-faire approach on some things. On other things, I just have to act and take on

a more autocratic perspective. So, I recognize that different leadership styles are needed depending on the situation (DH2).

Department Head 6 was adamant that choice was key in effective leadership. The faculty have “gotten to know that my leadership style is that I’m not going to tell people what to do,” said Department Head 6, “I am going to give them enough information so that they can then see what the best choice is for them and me in our relationship and they will execute that choice.”

Many times, department heads were required to combine leadership with another role they were expected to perform. Statements such as a department head needs to “provide leadership and administrative support” (JD7), “provide academic and administrative leadership” (JD6), and “provide leadership to establish and promote excellence” (JD8) were all examples of how leadership was joined with another area of skill. Management and leadership were also required to be joined in order to guide the department and programs (JD2). Department Head 10 explained the requirement to “provide leadership and management for the operations of [the department].” In the case of the AEE Department Heads, leadership tended to be more people oriented while management tended to deal with objects or intangible materials.

The Role of Manager

The management role of department heads is different than the role of the leader based on the duties that fall under each category. Management duties covered a range of activities including basic management, fiscal management, time management, and personnel

management (JD2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 15, 16; DH5, 6, 7, 9, 10). Job Description 3 said “knowledge of and ability to apply principles of management” were important to a successful department head. Job Description 15 explained that department heads must “coordinate the overall management and operation of the Department in cooperation with the...administration.” Another job description stated “The Department Head has the responsibility and authority for all departmental programs and activities” (JD8).

Time management was one form of management that many department heads mentioned (DH2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12). “I’m very organized in terms of time management” said Department Head 10. When deciding what activities need to be completed in a day, Department Head 8 utilizes time management in order to prioritize:

For me, I’m not saying I’m great as a time manager or anything like that. But, sometimes for me, it might be a situation where I feel like someone came in and I feel like handling that challenge right now.

Management of the department was also considered when making decisions according to Department Head 9. They take into consideration their “role as department head and [their] daily management of the department” (DH9). Department Head 7 said, “A big part of [my job] is management as well. Managing budget, managing space, managing course offerings, managing GA assignments, I mean there is a lot of management.”

The Role of Decision Maker

Department heads make decisions on a daily basis that range from small details to large, departmental choices. All department heads have a type of decision making style

(DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18), and the process and way they communication their choices vary person to person.

Almost all department heads claimed to discuss many of their decisions with other people before making a decision (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, 18). Department Head 7 explained that they “try to be a shared decision maker.” Members of the faculty were one group that many department heads discussed. Department Head 12 said they “try to leave a lot of decision making up the faculty” especially when it comes to their classes. Other times, department heads utilized faculty as a sounding board for discussion and opinions. For example, Department Head 16 said, “I may actually bounce off, depending on the issue, off another faculty member that I could get some feedback from that could give me some insight [to my choices].” Another department head said it was important to communicate decisions to faculty members because, ultimately, the decisions will affect them as well:

Very seldom do you have the opportunity to create brand new programs or make life-changing kinds of decisions. When those happen, when you do get that opportunity, I view those as an opportunity and I try to include as many faculty members as possible or that they are relevant to the conversation. I try to get everyone on board with it because I don’t want to be the only one leading the charge on something if the rest of the group isn’t behind it (DH3).

Department Head 14 further expressed the need to include faculty members in the decision making process:

We make decisions as a ‘we’ first. What are we doing? Is it for the good of the program? We don’t make decisions as an individual or as an ‘I’ or ‘what’s good for me?’ It’s about what’s good for us [as a department].

Faculty members were not the only types of people that department heads communicated with about decision making choices. Department Head 6 noted the importance

of including people that would be involved in the outcome, including those outside of the department:

If the decision also involves funding from other agencies, like our experiment station or cooperative extension, I will send an email or make a phone call to those administrators to double check...some of those things with the boss.

Department Head 10 claimed to utilize outside sources as well especially “if it’s a major decision that affects the department...I will run my scenarios by [their associate heads].”

Another department head mentioned that after a decision is made, it’s important to discuss the decision: “After I make a decision, I try to get buy in from everybody. I know that not everybody is going to agree 100% of the time, but it’s a decision that gets made” (DH12).

Finally, when making decisions, Department Head 18 explained the importance of asking advice from others in order to make the best decision possible as a department head:

I really try to be inclusive and seek counsel. I try to get lots of input, especially on decisions that are going to have long term impact. Again, it’s our department. I am the department head, but that doesn’t mean I’m the ruler again. I’m trying to take us in a direction we all want to go and we all feel is the appropriate direction. I really try to be collaborative in decision makings and talk to people and get as much information as I can.

Many department heads discussed the importance of keeping the department in mind when making decisions (DH5, 10, 12, 14, 16). “Whenever I make a decision,” said

Department Head 5, “I want the final decision to be best for the students, the faculty, and the department.” Department Heads 10 and 6 both claimed that it ultimately comes down to “what’s best for the department” when making choices.

Research Question Four:

What communication strategies are employed by department heads?

Communication is essential to a department head's job. Strong communication skills are required of many department heads (JD3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 16; DH2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). A department head should have "ability in working and communicating effectively with faculty, staff and students" (JD9). Internal communication involves communication that takes place inside the department with faculty, staff and students. A department head must be clear and effective in communication to faculty and staff (JD9, 12). Department Head 10 said "Department heads need to be available when the faculty are ready to communicate or talk. And that availability can be a variety of ways, not just present. It could be through emails, cell phones, and those kinds of things."

A department head facilitates "effective communication within the department and beyond" (JD6). External communication happens outside of the department on a division, college, university or off-campus level. One job description said department heads should have the "ability to effectively communicate and work with diverse internal and external populations, including the public, other agencies, secondary and postsecondary teachers, advisory groups, professional peers and classified staff" (JD8). Department Head 12 also stated that department heads need to "try to have lines of communication open...within the department and externally with...advisory committee and stakeholder groups."

Types of Communication

The ways in which a department head communicates takes many forms. Communication “can be not only physical, but also by way of email. Occasionally telephone...occasionally text” (DH2). Email was the most talked about form of communication by almost all department heads (DH2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Department Head 3 said, “It’s incredible the amount of time we [department heads] spend responding to emails.” “25% of my day would be taken up with email/communication” said Department Head 14. Some department heads use email to answer questions or solve problems while others use it to communicate with faculty and staff (DH2, 7, 16). Department Head 7 said, “I’ve tried to send a bi-weekly email with updates. What I do now, at the faculty meetings is send out an agenda and then send out an email with the agenda note and its further information on each agenda item and then an update.” Department Head 14 described email as a “whipping post” because, “at the end of the day, I’m not going to be complimented by my superiors because I kept my inbox small” (DH14).

Another way department heads communicate is through the use of an administrative assistant. Administrative assistants are used for managing department heads’ calendars as well as keeping department heads organized. They also take on various duties to help the department head complete their tasks. For example, Job Description 15 stated that department heads “work with the administrative assistant on [the] department’s website.”

Many more department heads expressed the use of an administrative assistant or secretary in their role (DH2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16). Department Head 15 has an administrative assistant that “loves organizing travel.” Because of that, Department Head 15 can focus on

other duties rather than travel arrangements. Department Head 16 said, “I have an administrative assistant that keeps me structured.” Department Head 3 even lets one of their administrative assistants make decisions: “In one of my units, the administrative assistant feels a lot more comfortable making decisions and just telling me later.”

All of the department heads who mentioned having an administrative assistant spoke highly of the people in those positions. “I have an amazing assistant to the department head. She does a wonderful job of keeping my calendar and giving me my workloads for each day” (DH10). Department Head 2 said their administrative assistant is “a Godsend...because she takes care of a lot of things that I don’t have time to worry about.” Department heads that have an administrative assistant also use the assistant to communicate and organize meetings with faculty. The administrative assistant to Department Head 6 is in charge of the Head’s calendar and if faculty “have a major topic they want to discuss; they get it on the calendar.”

Conflict Resolution

Department heads communicate with faculty in order to deal with issues or concerns (DH3) as well as just to reach out and talk with them (DH9). Because department heads deal with people, they must be prepared to handle both the positives and negatives associated with that. Conflict resolution skills are necessary for department heads when the time arises to handle issues among faculty, staff and/or students. All of the department heads claimed to have some form of conflict resolution style, but not all have had to implement their skills (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18).

Various styles were discussed, even though no formal job description specifically discussed conflict resolution. According to one department head, the overall goal in conflict resolution was to problem solve and try to find a solution to create a win-win situation for those involved (DH15). It's important to "show strong leadership [by] getting people together, getting all the facts and information and making a decision, making a plan, communicating that with people and then having to live with the consequences" (DH12). The role a department head plays in managing conflict varies depending on the situation. One department head said they play a "questioning role" (DH3). Another one said they provide "a good listening ear" (DH18). Another department head claimed to act as a facilitator to resolution (DH2). In dealing with conflict, one department head said they recalled their use of conflict resolution in 4-H.

In dealing with conflict, it kind of goes back to when I was in 4-H and you get a mad mom call who's upset about something. You know, the agent did this or this happened, whatever. Well I would always talk to the agent and find out, ok, I got this call – what happened? And, I do the same thing here whenever it happens. I go up and visit with the faculty member and we take care of it right then (DH5).

All department heads viewed some part of good communication skills as vital to handling conflict in the department (DH 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Listening and discussion were two of the major areas of communication that were pointed out by the department heads. "I've also learned to understand that people like resolution in different ways" said Department Head 2. Listening meant hearing what the conflict was from the faculty members involved as well as understanding their issue with the situation. Department Head 8 described their conflict resolution style as a "case-by-case basis" because:

you have all types of personality styles, but I think the first thing is to give them the opportunity to talk it out. Whether that's to vent or if it's a true problem that needs to be dealt with, to give them a chance to talk and to be a good listener. I think that's key (DH8).

Discussion between the department head and the faculty members was important to solving conflicts in the department. It was found to be especially important to some department heads to have the information stated to them immediately instead of waiting. "When conflict comes up," said Department Head 6, "I want it clearly stated to me." Department Head 15 similarly said they don't avoid the conflict: "I don't ignore conflict. I feel like ignoring conflict, ignoring things, it doesn't solve the problem."

A few department heads mentioned that conflict rarely takes place in their department or is bad enough to bode lengthy discussion (DH2, 3, 15, 16). Department Head 15 said,

This is going to sound like I'm making this up, but we barely have conflict. Once in a while, there might be a disagreement where it might be "I don't agree with that, why do you think that?" And then we will just talk through it.

Similarly, Department Head 2 said, "Luckily, I haven't had too many conflicts that I've had to resolve or say some resolution for...I would rather be proactive and it not ever get to the point that it boils over."

Research Question Five:

How do department heads interact with faculty members?

It's not about advancing your own agenda. You are advancing your colleagues, your subordinates, your staff, your students, and the department. The last thing it should ever be about is you (DH2).

All department heads interact with faculty on a daily basis (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Faculty engagement focused specifically on the faculty members and helping create a strong department through continual improvement. A department head is to provide “for new faculty orientation, professional development, and management of the accountability system for the organization” (JD10).

Two department heads compared working with faculty as “herding cats” (DH2, 15). These two department heads explained the need for faculty to be focused and headed in one direction in order to develop and better the department. Department Head 2 said expressed the importance of department heads being clear when they work with faculty because in order to have a successful department, faculty must work together well:

Sometimes, it’s a bit like herding cats. Sometimes it’s like herding cattle. It depends on the issue. Obviously the herding cats is a little more difficult to do, but the cattle, if we get them on point with certain things, it’s smooth as ice and you’ve got no concerns. In other cases, it’s a little tough. So, one of the things I try to do in my role is to make sure I’m clear in my communications.

Likewise, Department Head 15 said sometimes faculty members can be similar to cats in their way of working together:

There’s a syndrome I like to call ‘herding cats.’ ...sometimes faculty members are that way. They are brilliant people with a lot to offer. Some of them are phenomenal teachers, but they are going in all kinds of different directions. Sometimes that really hurts what we [as a department] can do...that’s the problem with higher education – this lack of programmatic focus. We pretend to be a bunch of cats instead of going in a direction together.

The notion that faculty members can sometimes act as cats demands that the department head take charge and engage with faculty to promote a unified department. Faculty engagement as

discussed by department heads was mentioned in three forms: formal interactions, informal interactions, and faculty development (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18).

Formal Interactions

Formal interactions of department heads with faculty members included consistent meetings and other planned meeting events. More than half of the department heads take part in a monthly faculty meeting (DH2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16). These monthly meetings are for faculty to discuss upcoming events, curriculum, financial items and other departmental issues. Department Head 2 said their department has “systematic interactions, which are department meetings...at least once a month.” Both department heads and faculty prepare agenda items for the meetings. “I organize those meetings,” said Department Head 7, “[faculty] bring reports [and]...items...It’s a collective shared agenda.”

Some departments meet on a weekly or bi-weekly basis (DH8, 15, 18). “I meet with faculty each week” said Department Head 18. Department Head 8 was one that utilized bi-weekly meetings and said,

Probably because we are a fairly small department, we had weekly, now we have bi-weekly departmental meetings where we will get together, give them [faculty] a chance to list agenda items and I will put agenda items up and we will talk about those.

Department retreats once or twice a year were another formal meeting time discussed by department heads either in addition to their monthly meetings or as a separate interaction (DH7, 9, 15, 16). At retreats, faculty plan curriculum and discuss events and policies for the coming year. Department Head 9 said “Twice a year we have faculty retreats where we all

meet in one location for an entire day and address issues, work on program planning, new courses, etc.” “We have a semester one [meeting], at least once or twice a semester that’s an all-departmental meeting,” Department Head 16 explained, “that would be all faculty and staff, clerical invited as well.”

Department Head 16 said “we have a monthly faculty meeting. We [also] have a semester one, at least once or twice a semester that’s an all-departmental meeting.”

Department Head 6 utilized meeting outside of departmental meetings to arrange formal interactions:

For formal discussions, we [the department] have a conference room. If they [faculty] really want to have a head banging session of brainstorming, two or three of them will set a time to come in my office, sit around the ‘kitchen table’ and we will shut the door and will write some things and assign some people.

Department Head 15 stated that weekly formal interactions was important to them: “I touch base with them [faculty] at least once a week on a formal level...but then try to informally touch base every single day.”

Informal Interactions

While departmental meetings are a formal way for department heads to interact with faculty, social functions are an informal way for them to spend time with faculty. Social activities include parties, meals together, and conversations not related to work. Many department heads participate in some type of social function with their faculty members (DH3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15). Holiday parties tended to be one way for faculty and department heads to socially interact. “Usually we have an annual Christmas party, end of the year party,

beginning of the year party” (DH8). One department head conducted an “ugly sweater contest” (DH7) for the department close to the Christmas holiday. Social interactions are important to department heads and faculty in order to “build the community” (DH7) within the department.

Eating meals together was another form of social interaction between faculty members. “We [the department] will have times that we eat together, do cookouts and those kinds of things,” explained Department Head 5. Sometimes faculty and department heads go out to eat (DH3, 5) and other times food is brought into the department. Department Head 6 has “cooked twice. Cooked food at home and brought it in [for faculty].” Other casual social interactions include developing departmental camaraderie. “All of us [faculty] talk almost every day... We have fun, we laugh, we joke, we have personal jokes, we have little sayings [we share]” (DH15). Departments with smaller amounts of people allow for quick interactions if needed as with Department Head 8: “It’s very easy for us [faculty] to just walk in and have a conversation with a faculty member rather than having to go down the hall, see if their office is open or something like that.” Discussion of family and friends is important to help develop departmental connections:

I think it’s important for us [department heads] to always be in touch with the personal side and let them [faculty] know that we appreciate and care about them as individuals and their families...it develops a strong relationship between the faculty members and the department head and also helps to develop a sense of community within the department (DH8).

Another informal interaction with faculty members included having an “open door policy.” Open door policy is the idea that department heads keep their office doors open so that faculty, staff, or students may walk in any time to talk to them. Five department heads

expressed the importance of having an open door policy in their office (DH3, 6, 7, 9, 16).

Department Head 7 said, “I don’t shut my door. So, that means if anybody has an issue, and I’m in the office, I want them to come in.” Open door policies create a “very open and relaxed environment” (DH9) in the department.

Faculty Development

[As a department head] it’s no longer about me as a faculty member. It’s no longer about me in terms of progression. It’s no longer about me in terms of awards and recognition. It’s no longer in terms of putting feathers in my hat. It’s more about everyone around me...It’s my job now to make sure my faculty are successful (DH2).

All department heads conduct faculty development in some way (JD5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16; DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). The concept of faculty development includes helping prepare faculty to succeed, finding opportunities for them to be recognized, and taking time to build a strong departmental unit.

Job Description 16 stated that department heads must provide “professional development of faculty and staff.” Similarly, Job Description 6 stated an effective department head is one that “leads [the] department to increased effectiveness and greater recognition in teaching, research, outreach and service.” Another job description stated department heads must foster “an environment conducive to the intellectual growth of faculty and students” (JD7). Department heads should provide “major attention to professional development and evaluation” according to Job Description 12.

Department Head 6 said their “job is to serve the faculty.” Department heads “want to help those in our program be successful, be recognized, so my job again is to look for

opportunities to reward them [faculty], recognize them, [and] propel them” (DH2). By developing faculty, “people are motivated to come to work” (DH6).

Research Question Six:

What external factors influence what roles and responsibilities department heads undertake?

External factors of influence include people and items that are outside the department heads themselves. These factors can be from the department, college, university or outside sources. Three major areas of external influence included stakeholders/clientele, the departmental environment, and required attributes.

Stakeholders/Clientele

Stakeholders/clientele are groups of people that have invested in the department, are benefiteres of the department or are considered a major contributor to what the department does. Many job descriptions required department heads to work with stakeholder groups/clientele (JD3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14). Some groups were considered outside of the university such as alumni, agencies and professional groups. According to Job Description 12, it is important for department heads to maintain “effective relations and communication with stakeholders, industry groups, professional organizations, and the public.” A department head also “develops and maintains liaisons with alumni groups, advisory boards and stakeholder groups as appropriate” (JD3). They also “encourage linkages with external groups to strengthen ties with stakeholders, state, regional, national and international organizations, governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, alumni and the citizens of [the

state]” (JD14). Within the university, but external to the department, department heads report to deans, associate vice presidents (JD3), or associate deans (JD5).

Department heads viewed their connection with stakeholders/clientele to be important to their job and their departments. Department Head 6 said, “I think that what they [faculty] are looking at is they want to have positive relationships with their stakeholders/constituents, which includes not just their undergraduates and graduates.” Department heads listed a more detailed list than their job descriptions provided. People and organizations such as Farm Bureau (DH5, 9, 16), Ag in the Classroom (DH5, 8, 12), extension agents/4-H (DH7, 12, 16), FFA (DH8, 9, 12), and Ag teachers (DH2, 3, 7, 12, 15) were described as being stakeholders or clientele to department heads. Department Head 6 pointed out that Ag teachers are not the only external group that AEE department heads should be focused on, even if most department heads currently do so:

If you came to me and asked who are your stakeholders in agricultural and extension education? I would say, well it ain’t those Ag teachers and you would say, what? What kind of heretic are you? I’m not saying our constituents have changed. What I want to influence more than anything out there are the high school principals and high school counselors who are making important decisions about what courses to offer in the high school and for them to see the value of hands on learning in agriculture science education... We serve Ag teachers well in this state. But, the Ag teachers have not been influential in their school or communities and their programs are being chopped... I want to go to those decision makers, superintendents, principals, high school counselors... (DH6).

In considering stakeholder groups, department heads realize that “constituent groups evolve with [the] program and [the] program should evolve to meet the evolving needs in society” (DH3).

Inside the department or university, department heads are also influenced by people around them. Advisors, administrators, deans, supervisors, and advisory/leadership councils are examples of groups that department heads said they work with within the department or college (DH7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 18). Department Head 7 gave the example of a departmental advisory council”

We have a department advisory council that’s been in effect for about 12 years. That includes 16 external members and so, our faculty also participate in that and we use that council to not only share reports of what we are doing, but also invite feedback on ideas we are considering.

Department Head 16 referred to an external influencer as being their leadership team: I do have what I call a departmental leadership team. It’s really a brainstorming unit.”

Students also influence what a department head does (DH3, 8, 12, 15). Department Head 3 explained two levels of influence. The “first level would be students we have in our programs or students we will have in our program – future students. [The] second level would be the faculty and staff that we work with” (DH3). “Without students, we wouldn’t have a program, whether it’s the undergraduates, the graduates. Without students, higher education does not exist,” pointed out Department Head 15. “Students definitely influence my priorities. If a student comes in and I’ve got things going on, that priority is going to move to the bottom and I am going to work with that student” (DH8).

Departmental Environment

The environment of a department is both influenced by department heads and influences a department head. A department head’s environment represents the culture of a

department. The environment comprises how a department works together and what creates the unit as a whole. Space, people and community are all components of a departmental environment. Many department heads are required to build a department focused upon creating successful people (JD6, 7, 9, 12, 14). Job Descriptions 12 and 14 both said a department head needs to “maintain a productive environment for research, teaching, extension, public service and international programs and, within available time, participate in these activities,” thus demonstrating that a departmental environment both influences and is influenced by department heads.

According to department heads, a departmental environment is inclusive, focused on improvement and collaborative (DH3, 5, 14, 18). Department heads try to create environments that are “friends, family-type” (DH5), positive (DH7) and respectful (DH8). “The culture in our department is such that I would say it’s evolving” mentioned Department Head 2. Another department head said,

I try to instill a culture of continual improvement here within the department that says – ‘we might not have done that as well as we may have liked to’ or ‘there may have been some mistakes in the way we pulled that off, but tomorrow we are going to do that better’ or ‘we’ll learn from that and next time do this.’ We will learn from those mistakes (DH14).

According to Department Head 14 there are five important areas to a department:

1. Community – we want to create a community where people at all levels...are valued,
2. Being authentic – which means providing a trusting and open atmosphere that says ‘I’m not going to say one thing and mean another,’
3. Excellence – in that everything we do, we strive to do very well, not half-hearted,
4. Culture of service – I try strongly to model that,
5. Being globally minded – that really is as much about being international as it is valuing people regardless of where they are from and recognizing that there are different ways of looking at things (DH14).

Faculty also influence how an environment develops in a department. “You can’t have a culture if the faculty don’t own up to it. So, whatever the cultural norms are, the culture remains if there’s ownership to it,” stated Department Head 2. The faculty of a department “take ownership in what they are doing [and] have a really good working relationship” (DH9).

University/Professional Required Attributes

In order to achieve department head status, there are a few requirements that universities expected as well as some qualities that department heads themselves deemed important to the position. Almost all job descriptions required that a department head have a degree in the field of or a related field to Agricultural and Extension Education (JD2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16). Two job descriptions required previous experience as either an agriculture teacher, in an extension field or previous administrative experience (JD8, 12). Other intangible requirements included that Department Heads are required to have a “commitment to student learning and success” (JD8) as well as be “a proven leader with excellent decision-making, motivation, relationship building and oral and written communication skills” (JD9). There should also be “knowledge of the history, philosophy, objectives, and methods of land grant university mission work” (JD3).

Research Question Seven:

What internal factors influence the roles and responsibilities of department heads?

Department heads have the final say in their decisions and ultimately choose what course of action they take. The biggest areas of influence for a department head are those that have been internalized. Internal influences are the experiences, situations, and personal items that have created the persona of who Department Heads are and what they do. Internal factors cannot come from the university nor can they come from other people. The internal factors that are prevalent among many department heads are values, strengths, weaknesses, personality, beliefs, past experiences in context and the leadership library they have built up (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18).

Strengths

Strengths are positive characteristics or skills that department heads perceive themselves as having that influence why and how they do their jobs. Strengths of department heads varied among the population. All department heads had at least one strength that they found beneficial in their job as department head (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Many department heads saw their strength as having the ability to “see the big picture” (DH3, 5, 6, 8, 10) when completing their responsibilities: “I think the thinking big, seeing the big picture is important to the department to keep the department positioned in that organizational structure” (DH3). Department Head 6 said, “I can zoom up or zoom down as some people would talk in organizational leadership.”

Two department heads saw being analytical and logical as strengths (DH6, 16). “I think I am allowed to cut through a lot of the cloudiness of department administration by having an analytical view or expecting decisions to be based in data” said Department Head 6. Department Head 16 similarly said having an analytical side is a strength “because I do try to make conclusions based on facts and figures and not on rash decisions.”

Another two department heads believed having “emotional intelligence skills” (DH6, 9) as important. Emotional intelligence and its importance were explained by Department Head 9 as:

There are five components to emotional intelligence. Empathy is one of five. Another one that I am really passionate about is self-awareness...identifying who you are, how you react to different situations, etc. That’s also really important. Having a strong self-awareness and empathy... [Other components are] social skills, which are ... are important as a department head. The other one is self-regulation, which is really important. And then the fifth one is motivation.

Numerous department heads described being a good listener as a strength (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10). “I really listen to people” said Department Head 5. Department Head 2 said it is important to listen because “sometimes, people just need to be listened to. And that’s all they want – just to be listened to.” One department head mentioned what they “try to do every day, in any situation, is be a good listener, to let people know they have been heard” (DH9).

Two department heads expressed the notion that being a learner is important to the job of department head (DH2, 18). “I try to be a lifelong learner” said Department Head 18. One other department head said “I love what I do and I enjoy it and I’m willing to work hard at it” (DH7).

Other strengths included working “well with a lot of different people” (DH12) and being patient (DH2). Yet another department head compared their strength to being on a sports team. When playing basketball, Department Head 10 said, “I’ve been told ‘When you are on the court, everyone on your team becomes better.’ I find that a huge compliment. That’s what I end up doing as a department head.”

Weaknesses

The opposite of strengths are weaknesses. Weaknesses are personal characteristics that department heads see as a challenge to what they do. All department heads cope with weaknesses in their job that they must overcome to run the department (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Department Head 6 described weaknesses as “character assets... any of them in excess [they] become defects,” and followed with this example: “People say ‘Well, you are too analytical and you are not emotional enough. You seem detached.’ ... That’s because that character asset has become in excess and now it’s become a liability or a defect” (DH6).

Procrastination was a weakness to which a few department heads related (DH2, 6, 8). Department Head 2 said, “I can’t afford to procrastinate. That’s what gets me in that quadrant one” (alluding to Stephen Covey’s Time Management Quadrants). “Sometimes I procrastinate,” said Department Head 2, “How I wish I could fix that.” Department Head 6 explained their procrastination as purposeful procrastination: “I’ve got some procrastination to myself, but I also call that being reflective or contemplative.” Department Head 8 realized

the need to not procrastinate in their position as department head because it makes the job even harder:

The procrastination and the [not] delegating responsibility certainly make it [the position] more difficult. That's not setting a good example for faculty...I think it's important to teach them to delegate responsibility too.

Organization was another weakness with which some department heads grappled (DH2, 3, 15). Department Head 3 said, "I really wish I was more organized than I am." Department Head 15 wished to be more organized or "one of those people who was able to color code things." In order to make up for lack of organizational skills, Department Head 15 finds "people who I know can accomplish those kinds of things who can compensate."

Another weakness some department heads had was not being able to say no when asked to do things (DH8, 9, 12, 18). Department Head 12 said, "I cannot say no. I take on way too much. It's good to be needed and I want the department to be needed and I'd like people to look at us to be that problem solver, but because I can't say no, I get way too much work than I can handle." Over committing and delegation challenges also fell into this category (DH8, 18). Department Head 18 claimed to over-commit from time to time: "A friend sent me a quote the other day that said 'half of the problems in life come from saying yes too quickly and not saying no enough'" (DH18). "I'm not very good at delegating" said Department Head 8.

Personality

Many department heads claimed that personality influences what they do and the choices they make (DH2, 3, 8, 10, 14, 16). Personality guided the roles which department

heads portrayed – “I could see how if we had a different personality group [of faculty], my role would be a bit more autocratic. My role with this group is to be more of a facilitator” (DH3). One department head said “My personality is I don’t want to be surrounded by YES men and women and not people that think the same way” (DH10). According to Department Head 10,

if you are going to do something like Myers-Briggs, Strengths Quest, True Colors, any of those analysis, that you don’t just find out who you are. You find out how you can work with people that are different than you...All those kinds of experiences help put things into perspective when you are being asked to lead a department as diverse as our department here. We have very different operational styles, personalities.

Personality also influences how department heads handle situations. Department Head 14 claimed to be an introvert having a personality type “very prone to wanting to handle those things and solve those things and answer those emails or those pop-in problems that just show up that are not on anybody’s schedule. So, the challenge [becomes] to learn how to be more of a leader and less bogged down in the day-to-day managing.” Another department head said his personality style is based on True Colors and he is “green” (DH16). “I’m green. I’m not gold. I have almost no gold at all. If you saw my office you would understand that I’m not a really structured person. So, I have to have people around me that do [have organizational traits]” (DH16).

Beliefs

Beliefs are ideals that department heads uphold in their lives that contribute to what they do. Beliefs, in this case, are based on a religion, Higher Power, or morals. Four

department heads mentioned beliefs as an influencer in their lives (DH5, 6, 9, 14).

Department Head 14 made sure to mention

You should know that I am a Christian and I take very seriously what the Bible has to say. As a result of that, that is my worldview. I take very seriously what the words of Christ mean. Everything I do, everything I am, I have to look in the mirror and respect what's in the Bible and ask –am I living those out?

Department Head 6 said their beliefs were to be reflected in the way they served their faculty and students. “If you think about it like this... Christ got down on His knees and washed [the disciples'] feet. If you think about that in your philosophy from your Sunday School days, that's the type of department heads we need” (DH6). Department Head 5 joked “When I was in 4-H, one of my favorite sayings was, ‘I see the 4-H program leader as the opposite of being a preacher.’ A preacher's goal in life is to comfort the afflicted. I saw my goals as to afflict the comforted.”

When discussing priority setting, Department Head 9 mentioned “part of it goes back to my beliefs, to my accommodation in which I use every day to direct myself in life. It's really important to me to have a strong connection with my faculty, staff, students, and other colleagues here.” Beliefs when priority setting was also important to Department Head 14:

I [got married] for a reason and we had children intentionally for a reason. It was not so that I could widow my [spouse] and orphan my children on the altar of a career or of having a job. I say that in, I work very diligently to own my calendar, to be very intentional about what my day looks like so that I can have time in the evenings and weekends to be able to enjoy them and to be able to focus on the things that are truly important in life.

Values

Values are personal principles or standards of behavior that department heads deem important. They influence how a department heads think because they look for them not only in themselves but other people. Values such as being caring (DH2), honest/trustworthy (DH8, 9, 12), having integrity (DH7, 8, 9) and being loyal to the department (DH6) were some examples of what department heads valued. “Integrity is huge for me,” said Department Head 9, “very, very important.” Department Head 6 explained that they believe “commitment and loyalty to an organization” are important; “meaning, if [STATE] State University is paying you and you are working here, you are loyal.” Department Head 15 said they valued “openness, honesty, trust, collaboration, [and] programmatic thinking.”

Department Head 12 reported valued being firm, fair, and consistent:

The notion of being firm means that you are deeply rooted, well at least rooted enough that the wind’s not going to blow your decision...this idea of being fair is this whole notion of if I do one thing for somebody, I need to be fair and do it for everyone else because no one likes favorites...consistency is key. The day that you contradict something you said the day before, loses all trust (DH12).

Some values that department heads shared stemmed from past experiences.

Department Head 7 said their values stemmed from “growing up on a farm” while Department Head 18, said “practice drives [values] and then they drive practice.” Department Head 2 mentioned that their values came from teaching – “Students have a way of teaching you. That’s not to say I didn’t learn these particular [values] from a teacher educator, because I did, but students just reinforced it. Students have a way of training you and teaching you. As do faculty and staff.” Another department head said that by “being a teacher you are

always looking at and trying to instill values on your students. Instilling values in teaching leadership at the high school level...has really helped shape and form me” (DH8).

Past Experiences in Context

I think the experience I’ve had to draw upon now I think a lot of it is real world experience that I’ve gained, but I’d say that experience I’ve gained has been tempered by the education I’ve received (DH5).

Department heads are internally influenced based on experiences before they came into the position of department head. Experiences both in the field and in academia contribute to how a department head does the job (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Department Head 18 stated, “I wouldn’t be here without that academic experience, but I think academic experience really does fold into your life experience.”

Past experiences in the field included teaching high school or working in extension. Teaching high school later influences how department chairs operate because they “are managing an entire program such as students, facilities, budget, working with parents, things like that” (DH8). Being a high school teacher gives department heads context in order to better understand their students – “[teaching high school] provides some important context to ground you to what’s going on so you don’t forget the kinds of students you get into your university program and their kinds of goals and aspirations” (DH3). Teaching high school was also found to be important to Department Head 14:

Teaching high school in a comprehensive agricultural sciences program, essentially a teacher is a CEO of an enterprise in the sense that those are community-based programs. It’s much, much more than simply being a classroom teacher, it’s really in

charge of student activities, organized events, especially competition through FFA, travel opportunities and those things. But, as well as managing budgets and facilities.

Academic experiences such as being a student, being a faculty member or taking part in some other administrative role were also ways that past experiences influenced department heads (DH2, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15); “In terms of really truly preparing me for being an academic leader and understanding academics and understanding education and being able to help lead a higher education program; I would have to say that my academic career has been instrumental in that” (DH15). Department Head 9 said working at the university level has been beneficial as a department head because

I’ve had the chance to witness and be a part of different departments and identify what has worked well and what needs to be done in departments with tight budgets, small faculty numbers. Just a number of experiences faculty face. It’s very beneficial to get a perspective from different institutions.

Department Head 6 also said that past experiences helped them become the department head they are today:

I probably learned the most as I was an undergraduate at [STATE] State and then a student teacher, then an active ag teacher, then a [POSITION]. That was the solid foundation upon which I was able to build a career as a teacher educator.

Academic experiences also influenced Department Head 7 because “My academic faculty experiences have been more helpful than my high school teaching. There’s so much about the context of a university that if you are going to be a department chair, you have to understand that. You have to experience that as a faculty member. You have to know what a faculty member deals with” (DH7).

Department Head 10 said experience as a parent influences his role as department head;

Essentially, being a parent you have strategies to work with your children and young people. I'm not saying faculty are like that, but many of the positive reinforcement strategies you would use as a parent are definitely applicable in the classroom and in meetings and in working with faculty (DH10).

Leadership Library

I really got serious about becoming a student of leadership. Reading, thinking, reflecting, talking. When I go to conferences, I gravitate to the leadership topics as opposed to my own disciplinary base...I'm looking at my bookshelf and I currently have probably 70 leadership books over there (DH7).

Leadership books have been used by some department heads to help develop their leadership abilities. These books vary in context but are focused on making people better leaders. Many of the department heads in the population either own or have read a number of books on leadership (DH2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18). Stephen Covey's book *7 Habits of Highly Effective Leaders* was mentioned many times, specifically when relating to his time management model (DH2, 6, 10, 14, 18). Department Head 18 explained the "four quadrants of priorities" as:

things that are urgent and have to be done now, things that are urgent and could be done later, things that are not urgent that you're doing now, things that are not urgent and you can do later. I think most of us would like to say we focus on the things that are urgent and we'd like to get them done.

Department Head 2 stated that they tried to stay in quadrant two (things that are urgent and could be done later).

There are three books that Department Head 14 said influenced their leadership philosophy. They are "aside from the Bible, they are John Maxwell's *21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership*.... Stephen Covey's *7 Habits of Highly Effective People*...Jim Collins' *Good to Great*." (DH14). Kouzes and Posner's *Five Practices of Extraordinary Leadership* was a

book Department Head 7 read. “I’ve read lots of things and I really think, everything I’ve read, you can find in those five practices” (DH7). Other leadership books included William James’s *The Variety of Religious Experiences* (DH6), *A Sense of Urgency* by John Kotter (DH16) and Glasser’s *Choice Theory* (DH6). *Strengths Quest* and *Strength Finders* were other forms of leadership development that some department heads utilized (DH9, 10, 15).

Research Question Eight:

How do department heads perceive effective leadership in their position?

I guess one reason it might be an advantage for me to be department head is because of my perspective on the discipline and that is we are a single discipline with four dimensions. And those dimensions are very interdependent and so, it may sound pretty abstract, but I think that’s really significant. If you look around at a lot of other departments, they are segmented and they don’t embrace that one dimension philosophy (DH7).

Throughout the interviews for this study, various themes of effectiveness emerged, but the researcher deemed it important to understand how department heads viewed their effectiveness in the department. Discovering strengths and weaknesses of department heads was one part of understanding what makes up an effective department head. Three other parts were understanding the attributes department heads deemed necessary for the position, discovering how department heads viewed themselves in the position and what they thought future department heads should model.

Necessary Skills/Attributes

Department heads themselves have stressed the importance of various skills and abilities (DH2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18). The skills and abilities included both learned and innate skills. Department heads need to enjoy their job (DH9, 16); “If you don’t enjoy what you are doing, then you need to look at something different” (DH9). Further, it was encouraged that department heads must “be in a position to be able to reward behaviors that work” (DH10), and “be sensitive of others’ opinions and try to understand why they think the way they do” (DH9).

Perceptions of Self in Position

All department heads viewed themselves positively in their position (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18). Experience was a major factor of more than half of the department heads (DH5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16). Department Head 10 described their experience with the position as

To have someone like me in this position, you know when to act. Probably more importantly, you know when not to act. So, these scenarios that come to your table every single day, you know when to do due diligence and when to jump in. You know when to go full bore. You know when to draw the line in the sand with your deans. You know when to do those things, but you also know you can’t cry wolf too many times. You have to be able to balance those things that you need to address or even you to not address.

Another department head explained “I’ve got years of experiences, years of mistakes I bring to the job. Hey, I’ve made that mistake before; I hope to not make it again” (DH6).

Department Head 8 said experience is an advantage of a good department head because

“when I walk into a room of teachers, they know that I have been there. I have been in the trenches a long time and I understand them. I think that’s an important advantage.”

Other department heads said their backgrounds were helpful in their position.

Department Head 12 said their background and communication skills help because “coming from the faculty and still teaching, I think I have a strong enough leadership that I advocate for my faculty and my department. And when I go forward to the college level, and again, I communicate with my faculty all the time.” Department Head 16 viewed their diverse background as effective:

The thing that helped early on was that even though I was in the 4-H group, I had an undergraduate degree in Ag Ed, so I was familiar with that side. So, I think that helped early on to create some credibility and establish that, which I think is important.

Similarly, “My personal and professional life aligns very well with the core values of the department. I am committed to seeing this organization fulfill its potential” stated Department Head 14.

Opportune timing was viewed by a few department heads as why they have been successful in their position (DH3, 15, 18). Department Head 15 claimed “I think it is advantageous [to have me as a department head] because we have that foundation, now we can go to that next level and I think I’m able to fill that role in the thinking of how do we take this to the next level?” Additionally, “Well, I think I was hired at the right time to come into the department,” said Department Head 18, “We were at a place where we really needed to change our direction and I think my futuristic view was critical at that time, or someone with a futuristic view.”

A couple department heads recognized that other people were capable of doing the job of department head (DH3, 12). “I offer my resignation every year at my annual evaluation with my bosses. It’s not a threatening way, it’s just look, I enjoy doing this, but I realize there are other people that are going to do the job better than me” (DH3).

Advice for Future Department Heads

Department heads also offered advice for future people interested in the position (DH2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18).

Some department heads claimed that being a good listener is important to anyone in the department head position (DH3, 5, 6, 9). Department Head 6 said a new department head has to “get ready to listen more than [they] talk.” Other advice that involved listening included “to listen a lot,” (DH3), to “listen to the people around you” (DH5) and to “be great listeners...that really helps a lot” (DH18).

In becoming a department head, a shift of responsibilities and thinking happens. Two department heads mentioned the change that people should be prepared for in becoming a department head (DH9, 12). “It’s going to be a big change from being a faculty member,” said Department Head 12, “Because I worked with department heads, I thought I knew what a department head did. But, I probably didn’t know all of the day-to-day minutia they deal with.”

Another area of advice included working with people (DH3, 5, 8, 9, 18). Seeking advice was important to Department Head 18: “I would encourage people to be inclusive and seek advice.” Department Head 5 realized the importance of interacting with people in the

job and suggested “Get out amongst everyone. Get out amongst your clientele. Get out amongst the faculty, the students. Understand where they’re coming from. Talk to them. Create relationships with them and listen to what they have to say.” “If you are going to promote your department, you’ve got to get out and meet other department heads across the university and be involved as much as you can” (DH8).

Department Head 12 said

it really comes down to leadership and time management and communication. You’ve got to be a very strong, proactive leader. You have to be very, very good at time management to deal with all of the issues that get put on your desk. You need to have good communication with all of your stakeholders.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this qualitative study was to discover a holistic view of factors influencing the leadership effectiveness of 1862 land-grant universities' Agricultural and Extension Education department heads. The study explored the jobs of the department heads as well as their responsibilities and roles in order to establish an understanding of their leadership effectiveness. In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, eight research questions were created:

1. According to university expectations, what are the responsibilities of a department head in an AEE department?
2. According to department heads, what are the responsibilities of their position?
3. What roles do department heads take on?
4. What communication strategies are employed by department heads?
5. How do department heads interact with faculty members?
6. What external factors influence what roles and responsibilities department heads undertake?
7. What internal factors influence the roles and responsibilities of department heads?
8. How do department heads perceive effective leadership in their position?

Summary of Theoretical Framework

Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1981) Competing Values Framework (CVF) and Lipman-Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles were the theoretical

frameworks used to base this study. Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981) believed that many of the established leadership effectiveness theories would not work because they were paradoxical in the way they worked. Quinn and Rohrbaugh said there were three dimensions to a leader that should be considered in order to decide effectiveness: organizational focus (people vs. task), structure (flexibility vs. control), and closeness to desired organizational outcomes (means vs. ends). After comparing these three dimensions, four models of effective leaders emerged; Human Relations, Open System, Internal Process and Rational Goal.

The second piece of the theoretical frame was Lipman-Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles. Lipman-Blumen (1996) described achieving styles as "personal technologies for accomplishing our tasks or achieving our goals" (p. 24). Three behavioral sets make up the Connective Leadership Model with three achieving styles making up each of the sets: Direct (intrinsic, competitive, power), Relational (collaborative, contributory, vicarious), and Instrumental (entrusting, social, personal).

Summary of Review of Literature

Leadership has been studied in a variety of ways. It has been said that leadership is paradoxical in nature (Cameron & Quinn, 1988). Paradoxical leadership can also be found when dealing with behavioral complexity (Lawrence et al., 2009, Hooijberg & Quinn, 1992). This study used the definition of leadership based on Denison, Hooijberg, and Quinn (1995) as "the ability to perform the multiple roles and behaviors that circumscribe the requisite varied implied by and organizational or environmental context" (p. 526). Leadership in its many forms can be seen in managerial roles as well as in executive positions, including

higher education. An important element of leadership is effectiveness. In this study, leadership effectiveness is based on Denison, Hooijberg, and Quinn's (1995) definition: effective leaders are leaders that "have the cognitive and behavioral complexity to respond appropriately to a wide range of situations that may, in fact, require contrary or opposing behaviors" (p. 526).

Wangler (2009) studied managerial leadership by utilizing both the Competing Values Managerial Leadership instrument and the L-BL Individual Achieving Styles Inventory. The study revealed that "connective leadership, behavioral complexity and managerial effectiveness were correlated" (p. 98). Wangler concluded that different role sets are conducive of different achieving styles of leadership and managerial effectiveness.

Hart and Quinn (1993) attempted to create a model of executive leadership roles to discover business performance in comparison to leadership roles of top managers. Using the CVF as a theoretical base, the researchers established a four quadrant model reflective of roles and demands for management positions. The quadrants included to roles of motivator, vision setter, analyzer, and task master. Hart and Quinn found that leaders that showed a range of roles and skills and were behaviorally complex were the ones that were also considered effective. Their study supported the idea paradoxical leadership as well as the idea that context and situation are closely tied to effective leadership.

A study of managerial leadership at different levels was conducted by DiPadova and Faerman (1993) in order to understand the similarities and differences of roles at different levels of organizations for managers. By using the CVF, the researchers found numerous similarities and difference among all of the managers that participated in the study. It was

found that different roles and responsibilities fit into the four quadrants of the CVF and were utilized by managers during different points in their job.

Organizational management is not the only place where leadership effectiveness is important. Spendlove (2007) studied Pro-Vice-Chancellors in order to understand the competencies that are associated with the job and leadership effectiveness at the university level. In the study, the researcher found that leadership competencies such as credibility, experience, and people skills were needed to be considered an effective leader. Attributes such as openness, honesty and broad thinking were also found to be important as Pro-Vice-Chancellors.

Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) conducted research involving community college administrators and their leadership and roles. The study lead the researchers to report 11 different categories of leadership that administrators see themselves in at the community college level. These categories included positional, change agent, vision provider, leader and others. The researchers also found that different leadership positions relied on different leadership roles.

Wolverton, Ackerman, and Holt (2005) studied “what department chairs need to know to be effective leaders” (p. 228). Through their study, the researchers found three themes that department heads face during their job – budget issues, personnel management and balance of roles. Because of the roles and responsibilities take on, the researchers found that department chairs struggled to fully understand their role as a chair.

Another study conducted to understand the roles and responsibilities of department heads was conducted by Edwards (2006) at the community college level. The researcher’s

study used the Globalization theory, the Critical theory and the Role theory to understand how a department chair viewed his or her role within the college. Four findings emerged through the research which included:

- “1) The work of North Carolina community college chairs is influenced by global economic forces;
- 2) department chair power is limited by centralized decision processes in the college;
- 3) technology has changed how department chairs work in the classroom and in the office; and
- 4) technology-intensive departments receive proportionally more resources instructor-intensive departments” (p. 44).

The researcher also found that department chairs in the study used a variety of roles to complete their duties as a department chair.

Nellis and Harrington (n.d.) discussed the importance of creating relationships outside of the department when someone is in the role of department head. The researchers found four frames that department heads use to view their organization including structural, human resources, political and symbolic frames. A good leader, based on their research, was then one that leads through all four frames.

While studying department chairs in land grant universities, McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass (1975) found that department chairs have three major roles – academic, administrative and leadership. The researchers found that effectiveness of department chairs can be enhanced by giving them more autonomy and resources as well as utilizing administrative assistants.

Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey’s (2010) study explored the perceptions, conceptualizations and experiences of leadership development of department heads at land grant universities, specifically in colleges of agriculture. The data from the researcher found

that a majority of the department heads in the study had no formal leadership training; the department heads' background played a role in preparing them for their position of department head; and that leadership development of department heads took place in two kinds: national leadership programs and on-campus programs. Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey (2010) also found that department head leadership education came from different areas in their lives including observation of past people/experiences, utilizing leadership books and learning by doing.

Wilhite (1990) also studied department chairs and found department chairs had six areas of behavior that helped them manage and develop faculty including recruitment, communication, identification of goals, support, evaluation, and recognition.

Summary of Methodology

This basic qualitative research study was designed in three steps: document analysis, semi-structured interviews and comparison of the information gleaned from the two. Berg (2004) describes document analysis as an unobtrusive way to collect information. The documents used for document analysis in this study included job descriptions of department heads. Semi-structured interviews followed the job description document analysis (Merriam, 2009). Finally, the researcher completed a comparison of the information gleaned from each in order to review and compare the data collected.

The population for the study was agricultural and extension education department heads from 1862 land-grant universities in stand-alone departments. A purposive sampling technique was utilized in this study (Berg, 2004). Department heads were chosen based on

their department's standing among land-grant universities. The department was required to be a "stand-alone" department of Agricultural and Extension Education. Only individuals in the "stand-alone" departments were considered to be part of the study, leading to a total of 18 possible department heads. 13 individuals were interviewed and included both male and female participants. Years of experience in the department head position of those interviewed ranged from less than a year to more than 20 years.

When beginning data collection, the researcher contacted the department heads and requested job descriptions for the initial document analysis. Job descriptions were coded JD with a corresponding number. Department heads were then contacted for semi-structured interviews and had the option of conducting the interviews via Skype, Google Hangouts or phone. Once a time and place were agreed upon, department heads were informed of their rights as participants prior to the interviews taking place (Merriam, 2009). Each interview was coded, recorded and transcribed. Codes for the interviews included DH (Department Head) and a corresponding number.

Data was analyzed using constant comparative method. Corbin and Strauss (1990) reminded researchers that "analysis begins as soon as the first bit of data is collected" (p. 6). Creswell (1998) suggested three steps to the constant comparative method. First, researchers must conduct "a general review off all information" (p. 140). In this portion of the analyzing process, the researcher also unitized the data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Merriam, 2009). Second, Creswell (1998) stated that researchers should reduce data and start to build codes/categories" (p. 140). For this study, the researcher used colored pencils to track findings of both job descriptions and interview transcripts. Finally, Creswell said the final

step in analysis is to compare and relate categories to develop logical frameworks. As part of the constant comparative method, content analysis was completed. Content analysis has three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. More information on content analysis can be found in Appendix J.

Because the researcher was a graduate student at North Carolina State University, she witnessed daily interaction between a department head and faculty members and students. The researcher's knowledge and experiences gained as a graduate student of the department influenced the reasoning and analysis of this study.

Trustworthiness of this study was established using tenants of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. Credibility was established through the use of triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checking. The researcher used "thick description" (Creswell, 1998; Denzin, 1989; Erlandson et al., 1993) to establish transferability. Dependability was created through the use of a dependability audit trail and journaling. Finally, the researcher established confirmability through a confirmability audit trail.

Summary of Key Findings and Conclusions for each Research Question

Due to the nature of this study, key findings are presented with the conclusions and implications for each research question.

Research Question One:

According to university expectations, what are the responsibilities of a department head in an AEE department?

This question focused on understanding department head responsibilities from a university perspective using the job descriptions provided by each institution. Eight major areas of responsibilities emerged as expectations of department heads from the university level: Recruitment & retention, evaluations, fiscal responsibility, strategic planning, goal setting, meeting attendance, balancing act and policy regulation & paperwork.

Recruitment involved employing and retaining faculty and staff to the department. As well as enrolling students to the department. Evaluation was a responsibility that required department heads to review faculty and program performance of the department. Fiscal responsibility included actions such as creating budgets and handling funds. Strategic planning and goals were described as creating future plans for the department. Meeting attendance describe the various meetings that department heads attend. By completing a balancing act, department heads were encouraged to equal out what they do on a daily basis while meeting the needs of the department. Finally, policy regulation involved paperwork and enforcing departmental, division or university/college policies.

It was found that department heads take part in the strategic planning and goal setting process. By doing so, it can be concluded that department heads influence the future of the department by taking part in strategic planning and goal setting. Likewise, Gmelch and Miskin (1993) claimed that “effective chairs influence the future of the department” (p. 9). Thus, it is implied that effective department heads are ones that take part in goal setting that

assists in establishing direction to departments. While department heads work to influence the future of the department through goal setting and strategic planning, it is implied that the university expects the goals set by the department head to be positive and focused on improvement of the department.

Department heads are expected to complete a variety of administrative tasks such as budgeting, handling paperwork and attending meetings. This finding is congruent with Edwards (2006) who stated department heads spend at least a portion of their day completing “administrivia” (p. 78) responsibilities. It can be concluded that department heads have tasks that are constantly going on, which are expected to keep the department running successfully. By having a wide range of tasks that the universities expect department heads to complete, there is also an implication that department heads must have the abilities, competence and necessary qualities to complete the tasks.

Based on the findings of this research question, it can also be concluded that job descriptions act as a roadmap for department head responsibilities. The explanations of expectations set forth by universities are simplistic and basic with most responsibilities being described in a sentence or two.

Research Question Two:

According to department heads, what are the responsibilities of their position?

Research Question Two focused on discovering the responsibilities of department heads based on what these individuals say they do. Eight major areas of responsibilities emerged during this portion of the study. These responsibilities included recruitment and

retention, evaluations, fiscal responsibility, strategic planning, goal setting, meeting attendance, balancing act, and policy regulation.

Edwards (2006) found department heads spend a major portion of their day dealing with “administrivia” or the daily details that are needed to run a department including meetings, paperwork and other minutia. This study supported Edwards’s (2006) findings. However, this study differed from Edwards when more responsibilities were established by department heads in this study.

This study also produced findings similar to that of Wolverton et al. (2005) by proving that department heads believe there are major areas of responsibilities that they face. Wolverton et al. (2005) study found budget issues, personnel management, and balance of roles to be the major areas of responsibilities department heads face. While the findings of this study found other areas of responsibility, budget, personnel and balance were three similar areas.

Both Wolverton et al. (2005) and the findings of this study suggested the need for department heads to balance their actions and responsibilities. Hart and Quinn (1993) also support the idea of balance by claiming leaders need to be able to balance competing demands. It can be concluded that an effective department head is one that has a grip on what needs to be done and can balance responsibilities accordingly and this group of department chairs demonstrated they recognized that balance. A strong balance of work load can be between two things or among many depending on what the department head is faced with at the time. By having the ability to balance the roles and responsibilities that department heads

assume, the department heads will be able to more effectively manage their time and improve their department's efficiency.

Wilhite (1990) found evaluations of faculty members to be used to give department heads a chance to provide feedback as well as help faculty members develop. This study supported the finding of Wilhite by discovering one way department heads utilize evaluations is for development and feedback. However, it was also found that evaluations were utilized to make hiring decisions as well as decisions on promotion and tenure. It can be concluded that although department heads utilize evaluations for a variety of ways, it is for the betterment of the faculty and the department.

Findings from this study were also found to be similar to DiPadova and Faerman (1993) who found that "managers at all levels sought to develop meaningful goals in order to give direction to their employees" (p. 149-150). Department heads were found to set goals for the department based on the needs and desires of the department as well as to guide faculty to succeed. These findings were similar to those mentioned in research question one due to the similar nature of the responsibilities. It can be concluded that goals were created in the best interest of the department. With that in mind, it is also implied that department heads want the department to succeed and one way of achieving that is to have attainable and desirable goals since the goals of the department direct what is done in the department.

It was also found that some of the responsibilities of department chairs extend beyond just the department either physically or through communication in order to achieve the desired progress. Department heads many times were outside the department promoting the department and its goals. Because a department head has responsibilities internally and

externally, it can be concluded that the people they interact with are different as well. Thus implying that department heads are able to utilize the connections they create beyond the department to accomplish goals of the department as well as promote faculty involvement in external settings.

After studying the findings of this study, the researcher concluded that department heads have more to their responsibilities than what was explained in their job descriptions. Department heads were very descriptive when expressing their responsibilities in their position. It's implied that department heads discussed responsibilities that were relevant at the time of the interview.

After understanding responsibilities based on expectations of the universities as well as descriptions from the department heads, it was found that there are similarities in responsibilities, but differences in depth of description. Job descriptions of the department heads were found to be basic and simply described. When department heads discussed responsibilities, more detail was given and responsibilities were explained with a deeper understanding. It can be concluded that job descriptions are used as a starting point for department heads, but once in the position, responsibilities deepen and become more detailed. While job descriptions explain the basics of the position, it is implied that they do not explain the "extra work" that goes into accomplishing the responsibilities. An example would be evaluations. Evaluations were stated in some job descriptions as being a required responsibility. However, the job descriptions did not mention the time needed for department heads to prepare for evaluations. Many of the department heads, when discussing evaluations, explained the time and effort that went into evaluations. Instead of simply

describing the processes as “completing faculty evaluations” as a job description would, department heads gave more details and vivid explanations.

Research Question Three:

What roles do department heads take on?

In order to understand what makes a department head effective, the researcher studied the roles of department heads. This study resulted in the emergence of seven roles for department heads. The roles included being an administrator, a resource allocator, an academic, an outreach coordinator, a collaborator, an advocate, a researcher, a leader, a manager, and decision maker.

The roles department heads take on are influenced by the responsibilities they complete. The findings of this study also parallel some of the findings of Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) including categories such as decision making, leader, advocating for others, modeling, collaboration and expertise. Not all of the categories discovered by Eddy and VanDerLinden were like the roles found in this study. Eddy and VanDerLinden found a category where community college administrators identified themselves as “me-centered, I am successful, I have the ability to make things happen” (p. 13). Instead, the findings of this study found department heads in AEE departments to be very faculty and department oriented. It can be concluded in this situation that no matter the roles assumed by department heads, the department heads focus on what is best for the department.

McLaughlin et al.’s (1975) study reported that department heads in the academic role had responsibilities such as “teaching, advising, conducting and encouraging research,

development of curriculum, faculty development, and related activities” (p. 246). This study supported a majority of the responsibilities involved in the academic role based on McLaughlin et al., but also differed in the area of inclusion of research and faculty development. McLaughlin et al. continued to explain that leadership was another role department heads undertook and is separated into two sections: faculty development and program development. However, in the case of this study, faculty development was considered an interaction with faculty and program development fell under the responsibility of strategic planning.

Previous researchers such as Berdrow (2010), McLaughlin et al. (1975), Gmelch and Miskin (1993), and Edwards (2006) found the roles of department heads to include: gatekeeper, academic, faculty developer, administrator or manager/supervisor, troubleshooter, leader, scheduler, informed disseminator, evaluator, resource allocator, liaison, teacher, recruiter, advisor and advocate. This study supported a majority of the roles established in these prior research studies. The roles of gatekeeper, faculty developer, troubleshooter, evaluator, and recruiter were not found to be roles in this study. But, the concepts of the roles were found in other areas such as responsibilities, communication or faculty interaction.

Gardner (1987) found that “effective leaders deal not only with the explicit decision of the day...but also with the partly conscious, partly buried world of needs and hopes, ideals and symbols. They serve as models; they symbolize the group’s unity and identity” (p. 544). Similarly, this study found while department heads face many responsibilities in their roles, some roles are intangible and are utilized as a way to promote the department to external avenues.

The role of a department head serving as an advocate for the department was also found in Wescott's (2000) and Wolverton et al.'s (2005) studies. The researcher concluded that in this study, department heads serve as an advocate for their department to external groups in order to advance the department. It is implied then, that a department head also acts as an advocate for external sources to faculty, serving as a "middle man" for both sides of the organization.

At times, one role a department head has may overlap with another role based on what they are doing and who they are interacting with. Just as with Hart and Quinn's (1993) study, this study found effective leaders to need a balance of paradoxical roles and capabilities. By taking on more than one role, department heads can do more and accomplish more. It also implies that serving in multiple roles will help department heads in their interactions with people. Since not all people they interact with are the same, department heads can thus be prepared to change or modify roles they assume based on the person and the person's needs.

It can also be concluded that the depth of the roles vary not only from person to person, but situation to situation. For example, not all department heads have the same teaching appointments; therefore, their roles as an academic will vary. A department head who still teaches numerous classes is going to have a significantly different role as an academic compared to someone who does not teach classes at all.

Research Question Four:

In what way is communication utilized by department heads?

Research Question Four was created in order to understand how department heads use communication in their positions. Communication is essential to a department head's job. Two major areas of communication developed throughout the research: types of communication utilized and conflict resolution. Department heads utilized various types of communication including email and face-to-face. Conflict resolution was a way in which department heads used communication skills to resolve issues that would arise within the department.

It was found that communication was important to department heads for a variety of reasons. Spendlove (2007) found that communication skills were important for department heads. The results of this study agreed. Wolverton et al. (2005) also identified the importance of communication based on their findings as well. For this study, it can be concluded that department heads are well-versed in communication skills and methods.

Not only must department heads have communication skills, but they must utilize those skills in a variety of ways. Email was by far the most discussed method of communication for department heads. Edwards (2006) found that "technology has changed how department chairs work in the classroom and in the office" (p. 44). It can be implied then, that technology such as email, has influenced the way department heads communicate. Another implication that follows from the research is that new technology in the future will mean new ways for department heads to communicate, both internally and externally.

As in McLaughlin, et al.'s (1975) study, this study found the use of administrative assistance to be useful in the department head position. An administrative assistant should be used "in order to relieve [department heads] of some of the reported onerous administrative detail" (McLaughlin, et al., 1975, p. 258). In this study, many department heads utilized administrative assistants for organization and accountability of their roles and responsibilities. It can be concluded that without administrative assistants, department heads would be less organized and would have to take on more responsibilities. Thus implying that department heads would also assume more roles and need a stronger sense of balance in order to remain effective.

Conflict resolution was another form of communication department heads utilized. Wolverton et al. (2005) discussed the importance of communication, especially when dealing with conflict: "chairs must listen, adapt, and be flexible, but they must also be able to deal with issues, not ignore them or deal with everything" (p. 230). This study resulted in similar findings. Department heads face conflict from time to time in their departments so they must be able to communicate and resolve the conflicts in order to move forward. Therefore, it can be concluded that an effective department head is one that can utilize communication skills when dealing with conflict in the department. Because not all conflicts are the same, department heads must be prepared to listen, understand, and help with a variety of issues. The communication techniques utilized by department heads will change based on the conflict and the people involved.

Research Question Five:

How do department heads interact with faculty members?

This research question focused on the professional relationship department heads have with faculty members. Since all department heads interact with faculty on a daily basis, it was important to understand the types of interactions as well as the purpose of those interactions. It was found that there are three main types of interactions department heads have with their faculty members: formal, informal and developmental.

Many department heads conducted some type of formal meeting as well as social interactions with their faculty. Social interactions allow for faculty members to connect on a personal level and develop a sense of who are the people with whom they work. Wilhite (1990) found “while formal communication methods such as faculty meetings, newsletters, memos, and retreats are useful ways to regularly communicate with faculty, an open door policy which permits informal, but frequent interactions is also very helpful” (p. 18). The findings in this study support Wilhite’s findings. Formal meetings were conducted by almost all department heads in some form and many department heads also maintained an open door policy. It can be concluded that an effective department head is one who uses both formal and informal faculty interactions. An implication then is that those department heads who utilize both methodologies will then have a deeper connection with their faculty members by understanding who they are at a formal level as well as in a social setting.

Faculty development was also found to be important when interacting with faculty members of a department. Nellis and Harrington (n.d.) found that as a department head, “You’ll spend most of your time working directly with your faculty colleagues and

administrative staff...your communication and presence is important in their understanding of events and trends in the department, discipline, and college or university” (p. 1). Wilhite (1990) also believed faculty development was important and stated that it should be tailored to meet the needs and goals of the faculty in the department. The findings of this study concur with both Wilhite (1990) and Nellis and Harrington (n.d.). Because it was found that faculty development was important interactions, it can be concluded that department heads influence how faculty are developed. Department heads oversee faculty development, thus control what opportunities are disseminated or promoted to faculty. An implication of this finding is that department heads are able to either develop or hinder faculty growth based on what they utilize to develop faculty.

Research Question Six:

What external factors influence what roles and responsibilities department heads undertake?

There were two major areas of influence that externally influenced a department head’s roles and responsibilities: stakeholder/clientele groups and the departmental environment. Stakeholder groups included groups both outside of the department as well as outside of the university. The departmental environment included the culture of a department that was comprised of how a department works together and what creates the unit as a whole.

The results of this research question lead the researcher to conclude that stakeholders heavily impact both the roles and responsibilities of department heads. The way that department heads interact with external stakeholder/clientele groups reflects back on the department. This notion of reflection is similar to Wangler’s (2009) study that found the

needs of the constituents of an organization are reflected back to the organization and influence responsibilities of managers. The researcher concluded that the connection between stakeholders and department heads is circular: stakeholders influence the department head, the department head influences the department, the department influences society, society then influences stakeholders. The idea of a circular connection is important for department heads to understand because it implies the actions of the department heads affect more than just the department and its stakeholders.

Nellis and Harrington (n.d.) discussed the importance of having a strong relationship with entities outside of a department. They also claimed, however, that stakeholder groups could also be within the university such as deans and provosts. The findings of this research agreed. Department heads serve a variety of clientele both within the university and outside the university that influence what they do. It can be concluded that department heads are continually communicating and interacting with their stakeholder groups in order to better the department and meet the demands of external clientele. Due to demands of changing organizations, the people the department heads work with outside the department will also be changing. Implications include department heads must be able to reach new people as well as support those groups that are already involved with the department. By reaching new groups or organizations of people, the department broadens its stakeholders and opens itself up to more opportunities.

Research Question Seven:

What internal factors influence the roles and responsibilities of department heads?

Internal factors of influence came from the department heads themselves. This research question found strengths, weaknesses, personality, beliefs, values, past experiences, and leadership books to all influence a department head.

As with Gudge, Bono, Ililes, and Gerhardt (2002), this study found that personality influenced leadership effectiveness, in this case with department heads. Other influencers that were found were similar to that of Hart and Quinn (1993): hard work, lengthy experience... and knowledge. This study also found values of department heads that were comparable to those of Spendlove (2007): honesty, openness, broad thinking, and engaging with people. These values as well as the others that were found in this study can be used to form a deeper understanding of department heads from an internal influencer perspective.

The findings of this research question were consistent with the findings of Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey (2010) that found past experiences of department heads, as well as the use of leadership books in understanding leadership, were influencers of department chairs. Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey found that some department heads “believed that being a faculty member was their leadership preparation before becoming department head” (p. 84). Both this study and Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey also found observation of other department heads and leadership books were methods of preparation for department heads. This study differed from that of Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey when it came to leadership training programs. Williams, Blackwell, and Bailey found leadership training occurred in two

forms – national programs and on campus trainings – unlike this study, which found neither national programs nor on campus trainings were described as leadership influencers.

It can be concluded that some of the internal influencers were learned (such as beliefs) while others were less controlled (past experiences). It is implied that influencers that were less controlled helped shape some of the influencers that were learned. For example, a department head may have experienced a dishonest child while teaching in high school. Because of that experience, they now value honesty.

The researcher concludes that internal factors influence department heads the most. Because the department heads are influenced by internal sources, they influence their department and the people in it, in different ways. The way they influence would change depending on the nature of their own influencers. DiPadova and Faerman (1993) agreed that experience of a leader was key to effectiveness. Managers in DiPadova and Faerman's study were able to learn from each other as well as their past experiences to improve their job effectiveness. It can thus be concluded that the way a department head reacts to a situation is based on their own experiences and history. It is implied that not only do internal influencers influence what a department head does or how they act, but it also influences their effectiveness as a leader.

Research Question Eight:

How do department heads perceive effective leadership in their position?

While previous themes emerged throughout research, the researcher found it necessary to understand the department heads' perceptions on leadership effectiveness. The

department heads discussed leadership effectiveness in three ways: necessary skills/attributes for the position, with self perceptions, and through advice they would give future department heads.

Because all department heads were not the same, nor did they come from the exact same background, their views on effective leadership varied. Many department heads believed experience was important in being an effective leader. Others claimed it was the situation. Others even discussed skills needed to be effective leaders. The important lesson is that department heads understand their views on effective leadership and do things that reflect those beliefs. Department heads should be effective leaders, in order to do so, they must understand what an effective leader means, does, and is. It can be concluded that the advice the department heads would give future applicants of the position is based on what the department heads have experienced in the position already. It implies that department heads have experienced situations that they have learned from, thusly prompting the advice to new department heads in order to save the new department head the hassle or pain of having to learn from the same mistake.

Recommendations

This study provided a way to gain an understanding of leadership effectiveness of AEE department heads. Based on the findings, the researcher has suggestions for both further research and future practice for department heads.

Further Research Suggestions

1. Since a variety of factors, including internal and external factors, influence department heads, it is suggested to interview department heads over a period of time to establish if there is consistency in their leadership effectiveness.
2. Interviewing department heads at land-grant universities that do not have “stand-alone” departments of Agricultural and Extension Education. A comparison could then be conducted to find similarities and differences in leadership, roles, and responsibilities of the department heads in AEE as a whole.
3. Similarly, department heads at private universities could be studied and compared to land-grant university department heads, both in AEE and non-AEE departments.
4. Department heads in land-grant universities can also be compared to department heads at other public universities to create a picture of public institution leadership.
5. An overall comparison of leadership effectiveness of department heads in land-grant, public, and private schools is also suggested. This includes AEE departments as well as other departments.
6. Conducting a 360-degree study in these “stand-alone” departments could establish a deeper understanding of leadership effectiveness from various points of view.
7. Future research should utilize both theoretical frameworks of this study – Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1981) Competing Values Framework (CVF) and Lipman-

Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles – to assess department head leadership effectiveness, their roles, and their responsibilities.

8. It is suggested that future research include a comparison of job descriptions from land-grant universities, public universities and private institutions in order to retrieve a deeper understanding of expectations and responsibilities of department heads.

Suggestions for Practice

1. By using the theoretical frameworks of this study – Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1981) Competing Values Framework (CVF) and Lipman-Blumen's (1996) Connective Leadership and Achieving Styles – universities need to create more thorough job descriptions of department heads, specifically in AEE departments.
2. Potential department heads need to undergo some form of training before assuming the role of department head. This study as well as Edwards (2006) and Wolverton et al. (2005) found that department heads have numerous responsibilities. Many of the responsibilities are briefly described in job descriptions, but not all details are described to department heads until they are in the position. A detailed list of responsibilities as documented by this research is helpful for preparing someone to assume the department head responsibility. Preparing department heads ahead of time will allow for smoother transitions as well as a more efficient start to the position. The training would involve a more

in-depth view of what will actually be required of the department head so they can plan and prepare for their new position.

3. Similarly, department heads should take part in some type of leadership development. Examples of this could be attending leadership seminars, taking personality tests, and becoming an active leadership book reader. Not only should the department heads do it, but they should encourage faculty to do so as well. This needs to be done so that people in the department can understand how to effectively work together and communicate, including with the department head.
4. Since the actual responsibilities of the department head position are greater than expected, department heads should be assigned an administrative assistant to help him/her manage responsibilities efficiently. An administrative assistant can be used to help the department head stay organized as well as attend to certain daily duties (paperwork, filing, appointments, etc.).
5. Communication skills and methods of use should continually be developed. Department heads must have a broad understanding of communication skills and are encouraged to participate in activities to increase those skills.
6. Faculty development is important (Wilhite, 1990; Nellis and Harrington, n.d.), thus department heads should continually look for ways to engage faculty and create a positive environment. Formal interactions such as monthly departmental meetings are needed, but social events must also be planned. It is suggested that department heads plan at least one social event a month in order to balance out the time spent in formal settings. Examples of social functions would be going to

lunch as a department, having a contest within the department (door decorating, wildest hat, etc.), or partaking in a community service project together (Christmas Angel tree, canned food drive, etc.).

7. Department heads should have systematic interactions with their external stakeholders. Creating time to meet with stakeholder/clientele groups will allow department heads to not only better understand the needs of those groups, but create a positive image for the department. One example of how to do this would be an end or beginning of the year banquet. The banquet would be hosted by the department and invitations would be extended to all stakeholder groups of the department. This would also allow departmental faculty to meet and get to know the stakeholders.
8. Department heads should continually be doing research for ways to improve their leadership in the department. Reading leadership books and observing other leaders are two ways that department heads can improve their effectiveness as a leader. Another way that department heads could improve their leadership is through working with other department heads. By working with peers, department heads will be able to attain new ideas and an understanding of what works well and what doesn't work well in a department.
9. In order for department heads to have an understanding of their background and prepare themselves for future situations, a self evaluation is suggested for AEE department heads. The self evaluation would have department heads reflect on past events/situations they have experienced and provide information that could

be helpful if the situation arose in the future. By completing a self evaluation, department heads not only learn from their experiences, but develop as a leader.

10. In preparing for the job of department head, it is suggested that department heads have an advisory committee. The committee will guide and help the department head along the way. It will include various people within the department as well as external members from the community.

REFERENCES

- Amagoh, F. (2009). Leadership development and leadership effectiveness. *Management Decision*, 47(6), 989-999.
- Ballenger, N., & Kouadio, D. (1995). The National Research Council study of the colleges of agriculture at land grant universities: Status and thought for agricultural economists. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 77(5), 13-29-1336.
- Bartram, D. (2005). The great eight competencies: A criterion-centric approach to validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1185-1203.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications* (4th Ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bennett, J.B. (1982, May-June). *Inside a department chairperson*. AGB Reports, pp. 5253.
- Bennett, J.B., & Figuli, D.J. (1993). *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.
- Berdrow, I. (2010). King among kings: Understanding the role and responsibilities of the department chair in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(4), 499-514.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Birchfield, R. (2012). Paradoxical leaders. *New Zealand Management*, 59(3). Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.prox.lib.ncsu.edu/ehost/detail?sid=3d414914-d4d6-4604-aab7ba6e1a12590f%40sessionmgr112&vid=3&hid=124&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=bth&AN=74454330>.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Birkenholz, R.J., & Simonsen, J.C. (2011). Characteristics of distinguished programs of agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 52(3), 16-26. doi: 10.5032/jae.2011.03016.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Boote, D.N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-15.
- Bruno, L.F., & Lay E.G. (2008). Personal values and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 61, 678-683.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Cacioppe, R. (1998). An integrated model and approach for the design of effective leadership development programs. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 19(1), 44-53.
- Cameron, K.S., & Quinn, R.E. (1988). *Organizational paradox and transformation*. In R.E. Quinn & K.S. Cameron (Eds.), *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management*: 12-18. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Campbell, J.P. (1977). *On the nature of organizational effectiveness*. In P.S. Goodman and J.M Pennings (eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carroll, J.B. (1991, Dec.). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 32(6), 669-688.
- Carroll, D., & Chang, J.J. (1970). Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via an N-Way generalization of Eckert Young decomposition. *Psychometrika*, 35, 283-319.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon-Elsevier Science.
- Clont, J.G. (1992). *The concept of reliability as it pertains to data from qualitative studies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the South West Educational Research Association. Houston, TX.
- Collinson, D., & Collinson, M. (2009). 'Blended leadership': Employee perspectives on effective leadership in the UK further education sector. *Leadership*, 5(3), 365-380.
- Corbin, J., and Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria, *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3-21.
- Conger, J. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's

- perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 145-170.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denison, D.R., Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R.E. (1995). Paradox and performance: Toward a theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership. *Organization Science*, 6(5), 524-540.
- Development Dimensions International. (2012). *Lessons for leaders from the people who matter: How employees around the world view their leaders*. World Headquarters, Pittsburgh: Weaver, P. & Mitchell, S.
- DiPadova, L.N., & Faerman, S.R. (1993). Using the competing values framework to facilitate managerial understanding across level of organizational hierarchy. *Human Resource Management*, 32(1), 143-174.
- Dooley, K.E. (2007). Viewing agricultural education research through a qualitative lens. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 48(4), 32-42.
- Dressel, P.L. (1981). *Administrative leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dressel, P., Johnson, F.C., & Marcus, P.M. (1970). *The confidence crisis: An analysis of university departments*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Eddy, P.L., & VanDerLinden, K.E. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education: New visions of leadership or same old “hero” leader? *Community College Review*, 34, 5-26.
- Edwards, J.W. (2006). *Department chair roles in the community college*. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from <http://catalog.lib.ncsu.edu/record/NCSU1907197>. (viii, 165 p.: ill.).
- Erlandson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.A., & Allen, S.D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fast Track to College Act of 2013, H.R.551, 113th Cong. (2013). Retrieved from <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/thomas>.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1981). Leadership effectiveness. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 24, 619-632. doi: 10.1177/000276428102400503.

- Fritz, S., & Brown, F.W. (1998). Leadership education courses and programs in departments of agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 39(3), 57-62.
- Gardner, J.W. (1987). Leaders and followers. *Liberal Education*, 73(2), 4-6.
- Georgopoulos, B.S., & Tannenbaum, A.S. (1957). A study of organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 22(5), 534-540.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gibson, C.B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 209-226.
- Gillespie, K.H. (1998). Internal chairperson development programs. *The Department Chair*, 9(1), 35.
- Gillett-Karam, R., Cameron, D., Messina, R., Mittelstet, A.E., Mulder, A.B.S., & Thornton, J.S. (1999). College presidents examine midlevel management in the community college. In R. Gillett-Karam (Ed.), *Preparing Department Chairs for their Leadership Roles*. (p. 37-46). *New Directions for Community Colleges*, No. 105. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.
- Gmelch, W.H., & Miskin, V.D. (1993). *Leadership skills for department chairs*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-607.
- Gordon, A., & Yukl, G. (2004). The future of leadership research: challenges and opportunities. *Zeitschrift fur Personalforschung*, 18(3), 359-365.
- Gries, G.A. (1968, March). The departmental administrator – The man in the middle. *North American Colleges & Teachers of Agriculture*. Retrieved from http://www.nactateachers.org/attachments/article/1778/Gries_NACTA_Journal_March_1968-2.pdf.
- Gumport, P.J. & Snyderman, S.K. (2002). The formal organization of knowledge: An analysis of academic structure. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(3), 375-408.
- Hart, S.L., & Quinn, R.E. (1993). Roles executives play: CEOs, behavioral complexity, and

- firm performance. *Human Relations*, 46(5), 543-574.
- Hecht, I.W.D., Higgerson, M.L., Gmelch, W.H., and Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leaders*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education Oryx Press.
- Heller, D. E. (2009). The context of higher education reform in the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21(2), p. 1- 18.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1969). Management of organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 12(4), 526.
- Hevesi, G. (1996). *Checklist for leaders*. Portland, OR: Productivity Press.
- Hickman, G.R. (1998). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R.E. (1992). *Behavioral complexity and the development of effective managers*. R.L. Phillips, J.G. Hunt (Eds.), *Strategic management: A multiorganizational-level perspective*. Quorum, NY.
- Huberman, A.M., & Miles, M.B. (1994). *Data management and analysis methods*. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (p. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hughes, R. (2009). Time for leadership development interventions in the public health nutrition workforce. *Public Health Nutrition*, 12, 1029.
doi:10.1019/S1368980009990395.
- Jenkins, R. (2013). What makes a good leader? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/onhiring/what-makes-a-good-leader/36725>.
- Jones, D., & Rudd, R. (2008). Transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership: An assessment of college of agriculture academic program leaders' (deans) leadership styles. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 49(2), 88-97.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780.
- Kaiser, R.B., Overfield, D.V., & Kaplan, R.E. (2010). *Facilitator's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Kaplan DeVries Inc.

- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kim, S. (2007). Learning goal orientation, formal mentoring, and leadership competence in HRD. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(3), 181-194.
- Knight, W.H., & Holen, M.C. (1985). Leadership and the perceived effectiveness of department chairs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(6), 677-690.
- Knippenberg, D.V. (2011). Embodying who we are: Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1078-1091.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2001). *The leadership practices inventory (LPI)*. Facilitator's Guide, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(3), 214-222.
- Lawrence, K.A., Lenk, P. & Quinn, R.E. (2009). Behavioral complexity in leadership: The psychometric properties of a new instrument to measure behavioral repertoire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 87-102.
- Leaming, D.R. (2007). *Academic leadership: A practical guide to chairing the department*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Levin, J.S. (2001). The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the twentieth century. *Community College Review*, 28(2), 1-25.
- Lewis, M.W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 760-776.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lucas, A. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Majeski, S. (2004). Surviving administrative mandates (from a department chair's

- perspective). In S. Pharr (chair), 2004 Conference for chairs symposium – Strategizing in an era of resource constraints. Symposium conducted at the meeting of Conference for Political Department Chairs, Chicago, IL.
- Manz, C., & Sims, H. Jr. (2001). *Super leadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17, 13.
- McCauley, C., & Douglas, C. (2004). *Developmental relationships*. In C.McCauley and E. Velsor (Eds.), *The center for creative leadership handbook leadership development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCorkle, C.O., & Archibald, S.O. (1982). *Management and leadership in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McGregor, D. (1989). The human side of enterprise. In H. Leavitt, L. Pondy, and D. Boje. (Eds.) *Readings in Managerial Psychology* (314-324). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 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*, 2, 243-259.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mitroff, I. (1983). Archetypal social systems analysis: On the deeper structure of human systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 387-397.
- National Research Council Report. (1997). Colleges of agriculture at the land grant universities: Public service and public policy. *The Academy*, 94, 1610-1611.
- Nellis, M.D., & Harrington, J.W. (n.d.). Beyond the department: Building effective

- relationships with deans, provosts, and presidents. *Association of American Geographers*. Retrieved from <http://www.aag.org/galleries/education-files/HDNellisHarringtonFinal.pdf>.
- Olson, G. (2008, September 17). What deans expect of department heads. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com.proxy.lib.ncsu.edu/article/What-Deans-Expect-of/45916/>.
- Osborne, E.W. (Ed.). (n.d.). *National research agenda: Agricultural education and communication, 2007-2010*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Department of Agricultural Education and Communication.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (p. 169-186). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ponterotto, J.G. (2006). Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative research concept "thick description". *The Qualitative Report*, 11(3), 538-549.
- Quinn, R.E. (1988). *Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Quinn, R.E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1981). A competing values approach to organizational effectiveness. *Public Productivity Review*, 5(2), 122-140.
- Quinn, R.E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29(3), 363-377.
- Rosser, V.J., Johnsrud, L.K., & Heck, R.H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(1), 1-25.
- Satish, U. (1997). Behavioral complexity: A review. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(23), 2047-2067.
- Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(4), 465-478.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. Los Angeles, CA: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

- Sink, J.D. (1983). Strategies for administrative improvement of academic departments. *Agricultural Administration*, 16, 17-30.
- Slaughter, S., Kittay, J., & Duguid, P. (2001). Technology, markets, and the new political economy of higher education. *Liberal Education*, 87(2), 6-18.
- Smith, B. (2005). Why a chair or head? *All Things Academic*, 6(1).
- Smith, W.K., & Tushman, M.L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organizational Science*, 16(5), 522-536.
- Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *Journal of Educational Management*, 21(5), 407-417.
- Stanley, C.A., & Algert, N.E. (2007). An exploratory study of the conflict management styles of department heads in a research university setting. *Innovative Higher Education*, 32, 49-65. doi: 10.1007/s10755-007-9035
- Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: Survey of literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Torbert, W. (1987). *Managing the corporate dream*. Homewood: Irwin.
- Transforming Education through Technology Act, H.R.521, 113th Cong. (2013). Retrieved from <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/thomas>.
- United States Department of Agriculture. (n.d.). 1862 land-grant institutions. Retrieved from http://www.csrees.usda.gov/qlinks/partners/1862_land.pdf.
- Vardiman, P., Houghston, J., and Jinkerson, D. (2006). Environmental leadership development – Toward a contextual model of leader selection and effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(2), 93-105.
- Volk, C.S., Slaughter, S. & Thomas, S.L. (2001). Models of institutional resource allocation: Mission, market, and gender. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(4), 378-405.
- Wangler, V.E. (2009). *Connective leadership, behavioral complexity, and managerial effectiveness* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3361824).
- Weber, M. (Ed.). (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.

- Weerts, D.J., & Ronca, J.M. (2006). Examining differences in state support for higher education: A comparative study of state appropriations for research I universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 935-967.
- Weinberger, L.A. (2009). Emotional Intelligence, leadership style, and perceived leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 11(6), 747-772.
- Wescott, J.W. (2000). Perspectives from a new department chair. *The Journal of Technology Studies*, 26(2). Retrieved from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JOTS/Summer-Fall-2000/wescott.html>.
- Wilhite, M.S. (1990). Practices used by effective department chairs to enhance growth and development of faculty. *NACTA Journal*, June, 17-20.
- Williams, J., Blackwell, C. & Bailey, L. (2010). The conceptualization and investment of leadership development by department heads in colleges of agriculture at land grant universities. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 51(2), 81-89.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2), 315-328.
- Yamasaki, E. (1999). Understanding managerial leadership as more than an oxymoron. *New Directions for community Colleges*, 105, 67-73.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction:

Thank you, [name] for taking the time to talk with me today. I really appreciate it.

How is your week going?

Keeping busy?

In interviewing you, I would like to learn about your experiences as a department head.

I have planned this interview to take about an hour, and I look forward to what you have to say!

Okay. Well, I have a number of questions that I will ask your experiences or job and would like you to describe each as best you can. I want to emphasize that I'm interested in learning about your experiences and there are no right or wrong answers. Please, do not mention others using their full, identifiable name during our discussions.

I sent you a consent form outlining your rights as an interviewee for our interview today. Just to clarify [go over consent form]. Is there anything else I clarify for you?

During the interview, I will be writing notes. These notes will be used as a way to remember points that I can follow up with you about later in the interview, so I apologize for any delay. I will also ask questions to guide our discussion, but I am very interested in what you have to say. Do you have any questions?

Let's begin recording!

1. Tell me about your department
 - a. Who works there? How many faculty/staff/students?
 - b. How many degree programs?
 - c. In what college is it?
2. Describe your journey as department head?
 - a. How did you get here?
 - b. Where did you come from?
 - c. What were your experiences?
 - d. What do you think is more helpful to you now, your "real life experiences" or your academic experiences?
3. Tell me about your job as department head.

- a. What do you do in a normal day/week
 - 4. Describe how you interact with faculty.
 - a. What are the main reasons for your interactions?
 - b. What is the amount of time you believe you should spend with your faculty?
 - i. As individuals?
 - ii. As a group?
 - 5. Tell me about your conflict resolution styles.
 - a. How do you think your faculty reacts to your style of conflict resolution?
 - 6. Tell me about your decision making process.
 - a. At work and/or at home
 - i. What do you take into consideration when deciding something?
 - ii. Who do you talk with about it?
 - iii. What is your end goal?
 - 7. Describe how you set priorities
 - a. What differentiates the priorities on the top of your list to those at the bottom?
 - b. What or who do you believe influences those priorities?
 - c. What do you do inside the department that reflects those priorities?
 - d. What are you doing outside of the department that reflects those priorities?
 - 8. What are your values?
 - a. Where do they stem from?
- (Now I want to talk about strengths and weaknesses)
- 9. What do you consider your greatest strengths?
 - a. How do they contribute to your responsibility as department head?
 - 10. What do you consider your greatest challenges?
 - a. How do they contribute to your responsibility as department head?
 - 11. Where do you see your department in five years?
 - a. What changes should occur?
 - b. What people will you work with?
 - 12. Explain why it is advantageous for your department to have you as a department head.
 - a. What would you say to a new department head as advice?

Transition to demographics – any questions/comments so far?

Age

How do you identify yourself (race/ethnicity)

Tenure in department

Tenure in profession

What organizations are you a part of?

Additional questions?

As we talked earlier, I will have this interview transcribed and email it to you for review. All identifying information will be removed from transcripts prior to emailing them to a single private email address for member checking purposes. Send an email back to me letting me know if any corrections were made and if you accept the transcript as a fair representation of our discussion today.

Thank you so much for your time and input. By participating, you will help to determine factors that influence department heads' leadership effectiveness. I will be in contact with you soon.

Thank you.

APPENDIX B: EMAIL TO PROSPECTIVE INTERVIEWEES

Dear Potential Research Participant,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences working on a research project. As part of this project I am looking to gain an understanding of influencers on leadership effectiveness of agricultural and extension education department chairs. To do this I am asking you to participate in an interview regarding your experiences as a department chair.

If you choose to participate in the study, a one-on-one phone interview will be performed. A time and date will be agreed upon prior to the interview. Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary and will only take about an hour. Your input could provide insight into how your leadership position can lead to a holistic view of department chair leadership. All responses to this interview will remain confidential. Please find an attached consent form and read over it. We will review it when we meet just in the event that you have any questions or concerns. Once all questions have been answered I will ask that you sign it.

Again, I encourage you to take part in this research study, but participation is strictly voluntary. All responses will be kept confidential by the use of a code number or pseudonym to replace your name on all study materials. Please let me know if you are willing to be interviewed.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Katharyn A. Ingerson
Principal Investigator
NCSU AEE Graduate Student
Kainger2@ncsu.edu
765-585-2497

APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

North Carolina State University INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH

Leadership Effectiveness of Agricultural and Extension Education Department Chairs

Katharyn A. Ingerson
Principal Investigator

Dr. Jackie Bruce
Faculty Sponsor

What are some general things you should know about research studies?

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to be a part of this study, to choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty. The purpose of research studies is to gain a better understanding of a certain topic or issue. You are not guaranteed any personal benefits from being in a study. Research studies also may pose risks to those that participate. In this consent form you will find specific details about the research in which you are being asked to participate. If you do not understand something in this form it is your right to ask the researcher for clarification or more information. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you. If at any time you have questions about your participation, do not hesitate to contact the researcher named above.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to discover a holistic view of factors influencing the leadership effectiveness of Agricultural and Extension Education department chairs from 1862 land-grant universities.

What will happen if you take part in the study?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to sign this consent form, conduct a phone interview with the researcher, and take part in an audio taped interview. Please look for email after the interview to review transcribed data, and approve/disapprove transcription.

All identifying information will be removed from transcripts prior to emailing them to a single private email address for member checking purposes. This interview will only take about an hour of your time, and the member check (review of interview transcript) will only take about thirty minutes. Participation is not required for graduation or course requirements.

Risks

The risks associated with participating in this study are minimal.

Benefits

No promise or guarantee of benefits has been made to encourage you to participate. The data collected from you during this study will be used to determine the overall factors that

influence leadership effectiveness of department chairs in the agricultural and extension education academic realm.

Confidentiality

The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent allowed by law. Data will be stored securely in locked desk drawer located in an office with a locked door and on a password protected computer. The audio recording device from the interview will be kept locked in a desk drawer and the transcription kept on the locked computer. When the audio recording is transcribed, numbers will be used for your name. Participants will also be asked not to mention other people's names using identifiable names. The written research report will also use those numbers for participants instead of actual names. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study. Upon completion of the study, the recordings will be destroyed immediately after transcription and all other data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet, in a locked office on a password protected computer for 3 years, and then destroyed per professional guidelines.

Compensation

For participating in this study you will not receive anything for participating.

What if you are a NCSU student?-

NCSU students will not be used during this study.

What if you are a NCSU employee?-

Participation in this study is not a requirement of your employment at NCSU, and your participation or lack thereof, will not affect your job.

What if you have questions about this study?

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Katharyn A. Ingerson, at kainger2@ncsu.edu or 765-585-2497.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919-515-4514).

Consent To Participate

"I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that I may choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled."

Subject's signature _____ Date _____

Printed name _____

Investigator's signature _____ Date _____

Printed name _____

Should I have any questions about this study or its conduct, or participants' rights, I may contact:

Katharyn A. Ingerson, Principal Investigator
765-585-2497
kainger2@ncsu.edu

APPENDIX D: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #1

To: Peer Debrief Team
From: Katharyn A. Ingerson
Subject: Thesis Research – Document Analysis Thus Far
Date: 11/6/12

Research Update

To this point, three job descriptions out of the eight received have been analyzed. From the analysis, a few categories are starting to form. These categories are as follows:

- Groups of people
 - This includes when the document says the department chair should work with a specific type of group
 - It also includes groups of people that the department chair would interact with for different reasons
 - Examples include “alumni,” “faculty,” “graduate students,” and “undergraduate students”
- Education/Scholarship
 - The job descriptions mention the words “education,” “scholarship,” and “teaching” quite a bit
 - This theme seems to pop up when mentioning classroom work, student education and promoting the department
- Budget/Money Handling
 - Terms in this category include “fiscal,” “budget,” “financial,” and “funding”.
 - This can mean both internally and externally
- Programs
 - The department chairs, so far, have to either participate in or coordinate numerous amounts of programs.
 - These programs include “educational programming,” “extension programming,” and “group programs”.
- Research
 - All three job descriptions require some form of research – “extension research” “research programs” - to be completed by the department chair.
- Extension
 - This includes involvement in Extension programs
 - It also includes working with Extension personnel
 - Examples of this include “extension programs,” “areas of extension,” and “research in extension”.
- Leadership
 - All three job descriptions discuss leadership at some point. For example, “proving leadership,” “strong, innovative leadership,” and “leadership abilities”.

- This could be in the educational setting or professional setting.
- Diversity
 - Acceptance and promoting of diversity
 - “Commitment to diversity,” “work with diverse...populations,” and “fosters diversity” are all examples found throughout the descriptions.
- Technology
 - A basic understanding of technology is needed for the three descriptions so far
 - This also including promoting technological growth in the department and classroom as well as participating in and encouraging technological growth
- Action Verbs
 - “Provide”
 - “Serve”
 - “Maintain”
 - “Promote”
 - Verbs that command action
- Management
 - Management of staff, programs, and just managerial abilities
 - Examples include “fiscal management” and “leadership management”.
- Degree Requirements
 - So far, the minimum requirement for department chairs is a PhD.
 - Usually in Agricultural Education or a similar field

APPENDIX E: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #2

To: Peer Debrief Committee

Subject: Thesis Research – Document Analysis Update and Initial Interview Analysis

Date: 12/23/12

Document Analysis Update

The previous categories have been combined and altered to form different categories. Below are the new categories with examples and explanation of what it includes.

Academic

Includes:

Scholar/scholarly, Advisory board, Curriculum, Degree, Education, Graduate, Student, Teaching, Undergrad, Campus

Examples:

“Teach undergraduate and graduate courses in AEE”

“Develop and strengthen curriculum and instruction”

“Conduct off-campus instruction...”

“Excellence in teaching”

“Culture of academic distinction

Administration

Includes:

Management, Budget, Department, Employment, Evaluation, Fiscal, Fund(ing), Personnel, Policy, Recruitment, Responsibility, Retention, Strategic, Supervise, Develop, Discipline, Report, Approval, Positive

Examples:

“Major decisions relating to departmental budget items”

“personnel management functions”

“oversight and maintenance of the established financial and operational processing environment”

“Budget development”

“Responsible for compliance with civil rights regulations in programs and employment”

“Experience in recruiting”

“Identify and acquire funding”

Leadership

Includes:

Multi-disciplinary, Land grant, Activities, Development, Mission, Vision, Excellence, Experience, Diversity, Effective, Enhance, Technology, Success(ful), Faculty/staff

Examples:

- “Provide leadership for the development...of programs”
- “Foster interdisciplinary ties with appropriate departments”
- “Leading the department in a manner consistent with the governance document”
- “Maintain faculty, student, and staff morale at a high level”
- “Provide leadership for promoting teamwork and collaboration across AEE”

Research

Includes:

Grant, Professional, Society/Association, Publications

Examples:

- “Pursuing internal and external grant support”
- “Participate in the programs of professional societies and associations”
- “Facilitate and improve student and faculty research and scholarly activity”
- “Broad appreciation and understanding of research in the department”

Service

Includes:

Commitment, Community, Team, Committee, Extension, Programs, Planning, Outreach, Environment, National

Examples:

- “Participates on department, college, and university committees”
- “Outreach and service”
- “Develops and maintains knowledge of the extension program planning process”

Clientele

Includes:

Relationship, Alumni, College/university, External, Internal, Stakeholder, International, Groups of people (teachers, educators, etc.), Title

Examples:

- “Encourage linkages with external groups to strengthen ties with stakeholders, state, regional, national and international organizations...”
- “Develop and maintain international networks”
- “Office of the Dean”
- “strong alliances with external constituencies”

Skill

Includes:

Communication, Written Skills, Speaking Skills, Organization

Examples:

- “Team building skills”
- “Ability to speak and write clearly and communicate ideas effectively”
- “facilities effective communication within the department”

Requirements:

Includes:

Agriculture, Degree required, Minimum year experience, Accomplishments
Examples:
“Earned PhD in Agricultural Leadership, Education, and/or Communication or related field”
“Accomplishments in teaching, extension, and/or research”
“Five years or more of successful agricultural...teaching experience”

Action Verbs

Examples:
“Provides”
“Conducts”
“Facilitate”
“Coordinate”
“Encourage”
“Maintain”

APPENDIX F: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #3

To: Peer Debrief Committee
Subject: Thesis Research – Updated Interview Analysis
Date: 1/18/13

Dear Peer Debrief Committee,

Below are the updated categories that I have found emerging during my analysis of the interview transcriptions. Following the category updates are interviews with Department Heads 6, 12, 14, and 16. Please note that Department Heads 5 and 7 were the two transcriptions in the last memorandum that was sent. Their information has also been included in this as well for comparison. Thank you. I look forward to your feedback.

Preliminary Interview Analysis Categories - Updated:

Past Experiences

- High School Ag teacher
- 4-H Extension Agent
- Faculty positions
- State FFA officer
- Family Experiences
- “My professional experience started as a high school agricultural science teacher” (DH14)
- “I was a state high school teacher for three years” (DH6)

Leadership

- “I’m a firm believer in you have to lead by example” (DH5)
- “They [the faculty] are looking at a different leadership style” (DH6)
- “Good leaders are good communicators” (DH6)
- “In fact, one of the keys to effective leadership, I mean you have to have good ideas to make change.” (DH7)
- “I gravitate to the leadership topics” (DH7)
- “They [the faculty] look to me for leadership” (DH12)
- “I think leadership is important. I think being an ethical leader is important” (DH12)
- “I am a student of leadership.” (DH14)

Faculty Development

- “I do make sure I go around and tell people good morning and things like that.” (DH5)
- “I should be spending at least 50% of my time with faculty” (DH6)
- “Faculty members do have designated roles” (DH7)

“I’m really engaged with faculty and staff“ (DH7)
“We try to get together every month” (DH12)
“I try to leave a lot of decision making up the faculty if it’s about their courses, when they are offered...try to delegate as much as I can to them” (DH12)
“You have faculty on one side with all of their interests, their needs, and their concerns” (DH14)
“The largest part of my job is working in personnel issues” (DH14)
“It’s guiding the department to say how do we make a stronger team and how do we work better together?” (DH16)
“We have our departmental retreat in the middle of December because...we have a lot of people at state fair so we can’t [do it before school starts], so we end up doing it during finals week” (DH16)
“At least once or twice a semester that’s an all-departmental meeting” (DH16)
“This faculty member and new person work as a team” (DH16)
“As we work to develop this team effort and those things, anything I can do as a department head that can provide faculty and staff with the resources, that may be time, it may not just be dollars, some type of resource that makes them feel like they can get involved with something and that they have the time or resources to do that” (DH16)
Social functions

Conflict Resolution

“If there’s an issue with a faculty member, I bring that to that faculty member’s attention at that time. I don’t wait around” (DH5)
“When conflict comes up, I want it clearly stated to me” (DH6)
“The conflict resolution style is to defuse and engage in an honest conversation about differences and try to help” (DH7)
“I’m dealing with that conflict of resolution by having open lines of communication...nothing is a surprise” (DH12)
“In confronting it and being up front, I hope to be able to deal with it and then put it behind us and move on” (DH14)
“I will approach you assuming the best” (DH14)
“I meet with each individual to get their side of the story, get their concerns or issues, and then...will call the two individuals in together and we will chat and see if we can meet some mean ground” (DH16)

Research

“What research can we do from this department that’s going to be a benefit to the people we serve here in the state?” (DH5)
“10 years ago we had hardly any research assignments” (DH7)
“I really love historical research” (DH12)

“We have been very successful in having those students get research studies accepted and presented at regional meetings, national meetings, and in the journal of Ag Ed” (DH12)

“Encourage the faculty members to do research” (DH12)

“We have goals to increase the number of publications and presentation, that as a department we put out” (DH14)

“We define scholarship in two areas” (DH16)

“My research in the past, I don’t do it much anymore, as been involved with electronic based learning” (DH16)

Extension

“They [the faculty] work closely with the extension side of the university” (DH12)

“Extension is the third part of that [interaction]” (DH14)

Service

“How can I serve this faculty to advance them as their leader?” (DH6)

“I realize that I have a position here to serve, not to be served” (DH14)

“Our mission is really based on servicing our clientele and being innovative” (DH16)

Teaching

“I still do a lot of teaching. My position is 40% teaching” (DH12)

“Making sure my classes are all ready and all set. Trying to grade papers” (DH12)

“You have to do teaching” (DH12)

“The faculty really own the curriculum and I believe that strongly” (DH14)

“I teach one class a year” (DH14)

“For the faculty meetings, the main focus of that obviously is our curriculum area” (DH16)

Responsibilities

“I’m responsible to help direct the direction that the department’s trying to go” (DH5)

“I’m promoting what is the role of our department” (DH6)

“Help them make connections to potential opportunities” (DH7)

“My chief responsibility is obviously the department” (DH12)

“My responsibility indicates that I have responsibility for people and resources of this department and to ensure that the programs administered through this department are as effective, well planned, and efficient as possible.” (DH14).

“One of the biggest journey’s I’ve been on in this role as a department head is trying to balance the difference between leading and managing” (DH14)

“My responsibility is to ensure that whatever faculty needs are related to teaching, research, and extension, I’m doing everything I can to help provide that for them” (DH14)

“If you really summed up my job, it would be to be a change agent” (DH16)

Teach courses
Attend meetings

Management

“Managing budget”
“Managing space”
“Problem solving”
“I’m careful about managing my time” (DH6)
“We don’t just manage by emergency. We manage purposefully” (DH6)
“I approve all travel. I approve purchases” (DH12)
“Managing workload and responsibilities and ensuring that I make the wisest uses of the financial resource we have as a department” (DH14)
“35% of my time would be involved in really the paperwork/procedures/signing documents/finance and personnel side of things” (DH14)

Administration

“There were administrative responsibilities that had to get done, but no one in our group held an administrative appointment” (DH7)
“I administer the department. I make sure all the courses are taught...the students are advised...work with the college administration” (DH12)
“It’s really easy...to get bogged down with what I call ‘administrivia’ or the minutia of the day to day, little fires that bur that are urgent” (DH14)

Evaluations

“This semester I’m looking forward to the structured time that allows me to do the performance review” (DH6)
“We do annual evaluations every January so I will sit down with the faculty members on a one-on-one evaluation basis” (DH12)
“Conducting annual evaluations” (DH14)

Budget

Once I look over all the funding areas, the budgets, then I can have an intelligent conversation with you” (DH6)
“Make sure everything is paid for from the correct budget” (DH12)
“Managing budgets and facilities” (DH14)
“I have a budget of about \$4 million that I’m responsible for” (DH14)
“Our money should be spent on where our priorities are” (DH14)

Meetings

“I do have a lot of meetings where I am doing a lot of planning” (DH6)
“I have meetings with people who are superior to me...and inferior to me” (DH6)
“I meet with undergraduate and graduate students because that’s why I’m here”
(DH6)

- “Leadership meetings with the college at least once a month” (DH12)
- “Meeting with potential students, potential grad students” (DH12)
- “40% of my time is taken up in meetings of some kind” (DH14)
- “It could be meeting with some of the individuals, some of the faculty” (DH16)

Recruitment

- “We are trying to work together with the college to look at those events as recruitment events” (DH12)
- “You have to do recruitment” (DH12)
- “We have to have good recruitment and retention rates of our students” (DH12)

Strategic planning

- “Over the past 15-16 years, we’ve had 8 or 9 strategic planning sessions with the department.” (DH5)
- “We’ve written a nice strategic plan” (DH6)
- “In our strategic plan, there is a very small mention of globalization and international education” (DH6)
- “I’m a firm believer in strategic planning” (DH7)
- “Last year we successfully went through a strategic planning process as a department” (DH14)
- “I can do nothing that’s more important for the department right now than making sure I’m leading this strategic plan operational process” (DH14)
- “We have a five year strategic plan” (DH16)

Departmental goals

- Growth
- High ranking departments
- “Increase the number of people we work with” (DH5)
- “My end goal is consensus, not compromise” (DH6)
- “My priority is advancing the department within the college” (DH6)
- “We have goals that have come out of our strategic planning activities and we pursue those using three-year chunks” (DH7)
- “Be seen as a resource to even put on workshops and look at teaching methods in courses throughout the college, in advising, in helping the college by being seen as that resource. Also, having the staff be seen as a resource for large grants that the college obtains” (DH12)
- “Our goal is to increase student numbers” (DH12)
- “We were able to identify 17 goals that were critical to this department being relevant and sustainable for the next five years.” (DH14)
- “I want to instill a culture of continual improvement” (DH14)
- “Our Ag Ed undergraduate program enrollment needs to go up” (DH16)

Communication

“I really listen to people” (DH5)
“I have pretty much an open door policy” (DH6)
“I’m constantly connecting those silos, or merging those silos into good educator and good communicators” (DH6)
“Communication is a challenge” (DH7)
“I try to have lines of communication open” (DH12)
“I have an open door policy so people can just walk in whenever they [people] want to” (DH16)

Use of email

“I do emails in between” (DH6)
“Usually email takes up quite a lot of the day” (DH7)
“Rule #1 – you never send an email that’s filled with emotion” (DH7)
“A normal day is arriving here at the office at 8 a.m. checking emails, maybe returning phone calls” (DH12)
“25% of my day would be taken up with email/communication” (DH14) “Fair amount of email. Way too much email. Although a lot of my email is done in the evenings, a fair amount throughout the day” (DH16)

Values

“Integrity”
“Openness”
“Honesty”
“Respect”
“Hard work”
“Vision and determination”
“Change”
“Collegiality”
“Fun”
“I value commitment and loyalty to an organization” (DH6)

Skills/Traits

“My role is to be open minded and optimistic” (DH6)
“I’m fairly analytical and logical” (DH6)
“Emotional intelligence skills” (DH6)
“My persistence” (DH7)
“I’m a detailed person” (DH14)
Ability to see big picture

Strengths

“I listen to people” (DH5)
“I can zoom up and see a bigger picture or zoom down and see what the impediment or bottleneck might be” (DH6)

“I work well with a lot of different people” (DH12)
“The true strength of this department is not me...it’s the people that were hired.”
(DH14).

Challenges

“It’s a challenge to find time to read” (DH7)
“I cannot say no.” (DH12)
“A department head is the most difficult administrative role in the university” (DH14)
“The challenge for me has been...to learn how to be more of a leader and less bogged down in the day to day managing” (DH14)
“It’s still a challenge, it’s almost a divide between some staff” (DH16)
“I don’t think I’m very innovative” (DH16)

Clientele/Stakeholders

“Ag in the Classroom”
“Agriscience teachers”
“PR Specialists”
“Extension Specialists”
“*Efinity* groups”
“Cattle growers”
“Farm Bureau”
“FFA”
“FFA Alumni”
“Friends of 4-H”
“Advisory council”
“Parents”
“Deans”
“Associate deans”
“Experiment station director”
“Dean’s Council”
“Youth”
Students
“[STATE] Team Ag Ed” (DH12) “What I want to influence more than anything out there, are the high school principals and high school counselors who are making important decisions about what courses to offer in the high school and for them to see the value of hands on learning in agriculture science education” (DH6)

Personality

“I don’t like people that put personalities before principles” (DH6)
“That’s really the value of faculty spending time together...they develop a relationship and understanding of those personalities and appreciation that everyone’s just a little bit different” (DH7)

“My personality type is that I’m very prone to wanting to handle ...those pop-in problems that just show up and are not on anybody’s schedule” (DH14)

“My personality profile is that I tend to be an introvert” (DH14)

Religion

“My Catholic term is to be contrite or sorrowful or sorry for” (DH6)

“Christ got down on His knees and washed their feet. If you think about that in your philosophy, from your Sunday School days, that’s the type of department heads we need” (DH6)

“My personal mission is to know God and to make Him known” (DH14)

“As soon as I tell you I’m a Christian...I better act like one or you are going to look for inconsistencies” (DH14)

APPENDIX G: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #4

To: Peer Debrief Committee
Subject: Thesis Research – Updated Interview Analysis
Date: 1/25/13

Dear Peer Debrief Committee,

Below you will find a few things. First, you will find updated emergent themes from my interviews. Following the categories, you will find possible suggestions of category combinations. Please weigh in with your opinion. After that you will find an updated protocol since some questions have changed/moved throughout the interviews. Finally, you will see three more transcriptions from interviews I have done. Since I have a few interviews left, category examples will start to shrink and combine in order to prepare for insertion into my actual thesis.

As always, please let me know your thoughts and I look forward to hearing back from you. Thank you for your support in reviewing these documents and keeping me on track. I really appreciate it.

Preliminary Interview Analysis Categories - Updated:

Past Experiences

After meeting with my committee, it has been decided that information such as this will be presented in a general sense and not a specific list. Other data such as years in profession and tenure in the department will be displayed as a range.

Leadership

- “I do think it’s incumbent upon people in this position to provide some kind of creative visionary leadership and I’m trying to do that” (DH3)
- “I’m a firm believer in you have to lead by example” (DH5)
- “They [the faculty] are looking at a different leadership style” (DH6)
- “Good leaders are good communicators” (DH6)
- “In fact, one of the keys to effective leadership, I mean you have to have good ideas to make change.” (DH7)
- “I gravitate to the leadership topics” (DH7)
- “I enjoy learning and reading a lot on leadership and operations and trying to improve” (DH10)
- “They [the faculty] look to me for leadership” (DH12)
- “I think leadership is important. I think being an ethical leader is important” (DH12)
- “I am a student of leadership.” (DH14)

“[Lead by example] If I want a trusting environment, I have to be trustworthy and I have to trust the people. If I want an authentic environment, I have to be authentic as well. If I want an open environment I have to be open and true” (DH15)

Faculty Development

“I spend a portion of my time processing through paperwork to enable faculty members to do their jobs more efficiently and effectively” (DH3)

“I do make sure I go around and tell people good morning and things like that.” (DH5)

“I should be spending at least 50% of my time with faculty” (DH6)

“Faculty members do have designated roles” (DH7)

“I’m really engaged with faculty and staff” (DH7)

“We try to get together every month” (DH12)

“I try to leave a lot of decision making up to the faculty if it’s about their courses, when they are offered...try to delegate as much as I can to them” (DH12)

“You have faculty on one side with all of their interests, their needs, and their concerns” (DH14)

“The largest part of my job is working in personnel issues” (DH14)

“To make this work and to do the kind of things we are doing – teach the number of classes we are teaching, have the number of PhDs that we have all that kind of thing - we have to really be collaborative” (DH15)

“It’s guiding the department to say how do we make a stronger team and how do we work better together?” (DH16)

“We have our departmental retreat in the middle of December because...we have a lot of people at state fair so we can’t [do it before school starts], so we end up doing it during finals week” (DH16)

“At least once or twice a semester that’s an all-departmental meeting” (DH16)

“This faculty member and new person work as a team” (DH16)

“As we work to develop this team effort and those things, anything I can do as a department head that can provide faculty and staff with the resources, that may be time, it may not just be dollars, some type of resource that makes them feel like they can get involved with something and that they have the time or resources to do that” (DH16)

Social functions

Formal meetings (all – mostly monthly meetings)

Faculty retreats

Conflict Resolution

“I spend a portion of my time interacting with faculty dealing with issues and concerns” (DH3)

“My role [in conflict resolution] is generally one of a questioning role” (DH3)

“If there’s an issue with a faculty member, I bring that to that faculty member’s attention at that time. I don’t wait around” (DH5)

“When conflict comes up, I want it clearly stated to me” (DH6)
“The conflict resolution style is to defuse and engage in an honest conversation about differences and try to help” (DH7)
“Deal with [issues] in private” (DH10)
“Make sure I have all of the information” (DH10)
“I’m dealing with that conflict of resolution by having open lines of communication...nothing is a surprise” (DH12)
“In confronting it and being up front, I hope to be able to deal with it and then put it behind us and move on” (DH14)
“I will approach you assuming the best” (DH14)
“Never avoid something because that’s not a good tactic” (DH15)
“I meet with each individual to get their side of the story, get their concerns or issues, and then...will call the two individuals in together and we will chat and see if we can meet some mean ground” (DH16)

Research

“I think collaborative work groups is a main theme of southern ag ed conference this year and I’m sure it will play a role in the national ag ed research meetings” (DH3)
“What research can we do from this department that’s going to be a benefit to the people we serve here in the state?” (DH5)
“10 years ago we had hardly any research assignments” (DH7)
“I have three graduate students conducting research in food safety” (DH10)
“I really love historical research” (DH12)
“We have been very successful in having those students get research studies accepted and presented at regional meetings, national meetings, and in the journal of Ag Ed” (DH12)
“Encourage the faculty members to do research” (DH12)
“We have goals to increase the number of publications and presentation, that as a department we put out” (DH14)
“We define scholarship in two areas” (DH16)
“My research in the past, I don’t do it much anymore, as been involved with electronic based learning” (DH16)

Extension

“They [the faculty] work closely with the extension side of the university” (DH12)
“Extension is the third part of that [interaction]” (DH14)

Note: I’m finding that not many department heads are actually discussing the extension side of things during the interviews besides when they mention that it is part of the department.

Service

“How can I serve this faculty to advance them as their leader?” (DH6)

“Everything I have seen in my career has told me that we need to do a better job of incorporating the effects within teaching and research and service of the human and behavioral sciences” (DH10)

“I realize that I have a position here to serve, not to be served” (DH14)

“Our mission is really based on servicing our clientele and being innovative” (DH16)

“I spend a lot of time making sure I am communicating on behalf of our interests in Ag educational leadership and putting us in the right kinds of positions where we can take advantage of opportunities and be able to make sure we are being resourced” (DH15)

Teaching

“The vice chancellor doesn’t want any of his department heads teaching” (DH10)

“I still do a lot of teaching. My position is 40% teaching” (DH12)

“Making sure my classes are all ready and all set. Trying to grade papers” (DH12)

“You have to do teaching” (DH12)

“I’m a full time faculty member. So, I teach five classes a year. I advise 25 undergraduate students, 5 masters students, and 3 PhD students” (DH15)

“The faculty really own the curriculum and I believe that strongly” (DH14)

“I teach one class a year” (DH14)

“For the faculty meetings, the main focus of that obviously is our curriculum area” (DH16)

Responsibilities

“It’s my job to support [decisions the department makes] to the university administration” (DH3)

“I’m responsible to help direct the direction that the department’s trying to go” (DH5)

“I’m promoting what is the role of our department” (DH6)

“Help them make connections to potential opportunities” (DH7)

“My chief responsibility is obviously the department” (DH12)

“My responsibility indicates that I have responsibility for people and resources of this department and to ensure that the programs administered through this department are as effective, well planned, and efficient as possible.” (DH14).

“One of the biggest journey’s I’ve been on in this role as a department head is trying to balance the difference between leading and managing” (DH14)

“My responsibility is to ensure that whatever faculty needs are related to teaching, research, and extension, I’m doing everything I can to help provide that for them” (DH14)

“If you really summed up my job, it would be to be a change agent” (DH16)

Teach courses

Attend meetings

Management

“Managing budget”

“Managing space”

“Problem solving”

“Managing by walking around” (DH3 + others)

“I spend probably 30 minutes of every day just signing approval forms to just make sure that the work of the units get done” (DH3)

“I’m careful about managing my time” (DH6)

“We don’t just manage by emergency. We manage purposefully” (DH6)

“[The Vice Chancellor] wants his department heads to provide leadership and management for the operations of their respective departments” (DH10)

“I approve all travel. I approve purchases” (DH12)

“Managing workload and responsibilities and ensuring that I make the wisest uses of the financial resource we have as a department” (DH14)

“35% of my time would be involved in really the paperwork/procedures/signing documents/finance and personnel side of things” (DH14)

“You have these unexpected fires that will pop up and you’ve got to deal with and take care of in the moment” (DH15)

Administration

“It’s tough balancing between how much time and energy you devote to doing the little stuff and how much time that leaves to get the big stuff done” (DH3)

“I have several critical things that I have to get done that are always there, but then I also have this day-to-day minutia that has to be done or else they become big issues” (DH3)

“There were administrative responsibilities that had to get done, but no one in our group held an administrative appointment” (DH7)

“I administer the department. I make sure all the courses are taught...the students are advised...work with the college administration” (DH12)

“It’s really easy...to get bogged down with what I call ‘administrivia’ or the minutia of the day to day, little fires that bur that are urgent” (DH14)

“We have to be aware of policy issues and those policy issues are university policy and state policy” (DH3)

“Our administrative roles are actually overload. We don’t get full time to do that” (DH15)

Evaluations

“This semester I’m looking forward to the structured time that allows me to do the performance review” (DH6)

“Much of what I do in the spring, counting the hours between January, February, and then March, at least 50-60% of my time will be documenting what we do through annual performance reviews” (DH10)

“We do annual evaluations every January so I will sit down with the faculty members on a one-on-one evaluation basis” (DH12)

“Conducting annual evaluations” (DH14)

Budget

“They are decisions of, do you fund this set of resources for this or do you funnel them over there?” (DH3)

Once I look over all the funding areas, the budgets, then I can have an intelligent conversation with you” (DH6)

“My associate heads all have appropriate sized budgets. They have complete budget authority to handle any decisions that are made there” (DH10)

“Make sure everything is paid for from the correct budget” (DH12)

“Managing budgets and facilities” (DH14)

“I have a budget of about \$4 million that I’m responsible for” (DH14)

“Our money should be spent on where our priorities are” (DH14)

Meetings

“I do have a lot of meetings where I am doing a lot of planning” (DH6)

“I have meetings with people who are superior to me... and inferior to me” (DH6)

“I meet with undergraduate and graduate students because that’s why I’m here”

(DH6)

“When I’m on campus, I attend a lot of meetings representing the department”

(DH10)

“Leadership meetings with the college at least once a month” (DH12)

“Meeting with potential students, potential grad students” (DH12)

“40% of my time is taken up in meetings of some kind” (DH14)

“I meet with my graduate students about different projects” (DH15)

“It could be meeting with some of the individuals, some of the faculty” (DH16)

Recruitment

“The vice chancellor expects all department heads to be spending a minimum of two days a month, that’s 10% of your time, minimally, doing development activities, out recruiting, finding people who will fund projects and efforts in our department” (DH10)

“We are trying to work together with the college to look at those events as recruitment events” (DH12)

“You have to do recruitment” (DH12)

“We have to have good recruitment and retention rates of our students” (DH12)

Strategic planning

“I’ve tried to engage the whole faculty in a strategic planning process and frankly, a lot of the faculty members just want to do their job and don’t want to do any strategic planning” (DH3)

“I’m trying to convince them that strategic planning and taking control of their future is part of their job, but they see their job as teaching their classes and working with students and managing whatever research programs they have going” (DH3)

“Over the past 15-16 years, we’ve had 8 or 9 strategic planning sessions with the department.” (DH5)

“We’ve written a nice strategic plan” (DH6)

“In our strategic plan, there is a very small mention of globalization and international education” (DH6)

“I’m a firm believer in strategic planning” (DH7)

“Last year we successfully went through a strategic planning process as a department” (DH14)

“I can do nothing that’s more important for the department right now than making sure I’m leading this strategic plan operational process” (DH14)

“We have a five year strategic plan” (DH16)

Departmental goals

Growth

High ranking departments

“Higher impact in terms of student numbers, in terms of what it means to the people in [STATE]” (DH3)

“Increase the number of people we work with” (DH5)

“My end goal is consensus, not compromise” (DH6)

“My priority is advancing the department within the college” (DH6)

“We have goals that have come out of our strategic planning activities and we pursue those using three-year chunks” (DH7)

“Be seen as a resource to even put on workshops and look at teaching methods in courses throughout the college, in advising, in helping the college by being seen as that resource. Also, having the staff be seen as a resource for large grants that the college obtains” (DH12)

“Our goal is to increase student numbers” (DH12)

“We were able to identify 17 goals that were critical to this department being relevant and sustainable for the next five years.” (DH14)

“I would love for us to expand and for us to be bigger” (DH15)

“I want to instill a culture of continual improvement” (DH14)

“Our Ag Ed undergraduate program enrollment needs to go up” (DH16)

Communication

“I really listen to people” (DH5)

“I have pretty much an open door policy” (DH6)

“I’m constantly connecting those silos, or merging those silos into good educator and good communicators” (DH6)

“Communication is a challenge” (DH7)

“Even though we might have similar goals, we have different strategies in trying to achieve those goals” (DH10)

“I try to have lines of communication open” (DH12)

“Try to be very collaborative, very communicative, share information and make sure all of the information is out there and make decisions together” (DH15)

“I have an open door policy so people can just walk in whenever they [people] want to” (DH16)

Open door policy

Use of email

“It’s incredible the amount of time we [department heads] spend responding to emails. Usually it’s emails from other administrators” (DH3)

“I do emails in between” (DH6)

“Usually email takes up quite a lot of the day” (DH7)

“Rule #1 – you never send an email that’s filled with emotion” (DH7)

“Almost everything of my 100+ maybe more than that emails a day, those get either filed or most of them move to somebody else to take care of” (DH10)

“A normal day is arriving here at the office at 8 a.m. checking emails, maybe returning phone calls” (DH12)

“25% of my day would be taken up with email/communication” (DH14) “Fair amount of email. Way too much email. Although a lot of my email is done in the evenings, a fair amount throughout the day” (DH16)

Values

“Integrity”

“Openness”

“Honesty”

“Respect”

“Hard work”

“Vision and determination”

“Change”

“Collegiality”

“Fun”

“I value commitment and loyalty to an organization” (DH6)

“I think we have to set our own agenda instead of having someone else set our agenda for us” (DH3)

“rising to the occasion”

“Being a professional and under that title, demonstrating senior leadership” (DH10)

Skills/Traits

“My role is to be open minded and optimistic” (DH6)

“I’m fairly analytical and logical” (DH6)

“Emotional intelligence skills” (DH6)

“My persistence” (DH7)

“I’m a detailed person” (DH14)

Ability to see big picture
“Futuristic thinking” (DH15)

Strengths

“I want to keep pushing myself to think big enough” (DH3)
“I listen to people” (DH5)
“I can zoom up and see a bigger picture or zoom down and see what the impediment or bottleneck might be” (DH6)
“We try to get those people to the right places so that what they do can be enhanced” (DH10)
“I work well with a lot of different people” (DH12)
“The true strength of this department is not me...it’s the people that were hired.” (DH14).
“I am a collaborative person” (DH15)

Weaknesses

“I really wish I was more organized” (DH3)
“It’s a challenge to find time to read” (DH7)
“Making decisions too quickly” (DH10)
“I cannot say no.” (DH12)
“A department head is the most difficult administrative role in the university” (DH14)
“The challenge for me has been...to learn how to be more of a leader and less bogged down in the day to day managing” (DH14)
“Not keeping track as much of those minute, day-to-day, managerial, color coding, list type details” (DH15)
“It’s still a challenge, it’s almost a divide between some staff” (DH16)
“I don’t think I’m very innovative” (DH16)

Clientele/Stakeholders

“Ag in the Classroom”
“Agriscience teachers”
“PR Specialists”
“Extension Specialists”
“*Efinity* groups”
“Cattle growers”
“Farm Bureau”
“FFA”
“FFA Alumni”
“Friends of 4-H”
“Advisory council”
“Parents”
“Deans”
“Associate deans”

“Experiment station director”

“Dean’s Council”

“Youth”

“State supervisors”

Students

“I spend time interacting with other administrators across campus, particularly the dean’s office in the college” (DH3)

“[In making decisions, the department can’t do something that] would upset a major constituent group or...they will stop supporting us because they think it’s bad” (DH3)

“I spend a lot of time working for everybody else” (DH3)

“It’s a balancing act with your constituent groups” (DH3)

“[STATE] Team Ag Ed” (DH12)

“What I want to influence more than anything out there, are the high school principals and high school counselors who are making important decisions about what courses to offer in the high school and for them to see the value of hands on learning in agriculture science education” (DH6)

Personality

“I could see where if we had a different personality group, my role would be a bit more autocratic” (DH3)

“I don’t like people that put personalities before principles” (DH6)

“That’s really the value of faculty spending time together...they develop a relationship and understanding of those personalities and appreciation that everyone’s just a little bit different” (DH7)

“Much like Myers-Briggs and Strengths, what they say about me is a person like me, once they make a decision, then I feel very comfortable with the decision and we move forward” (DH10)

“My personality type is that I’m very prone to wanting to handle ...those pop-in problems that just show up and are not on anybody’s schedule” (DH14)

“My personality profile is that I tend to be an introvert” (DH14)

Religion

“My Catholic term is to be contrite or sorrowful or sorry for” (DH6)

“Christ got down on His knees and washed their feet. If you think about that in your philosophy, from your Sunday School days, that’s the type of department heads we need” (DH6)

“My personal mission is to know God and to make Him known” (DH14)

“As soon as I tell you I’m a Christian...I better act like one or you are going to look for inconsistencies” (DH14)

Administrative Assistants

“I have two really great administrative assistant who understand the problem and really help me wade through what needs to be done and when” (DH3)

“There’s a lot of detail that could be handled with a good administrative assistant” (DH3)

“They note it on the calendar and I have a very good administrative assistant. They will go to her and say I need to talk to [NAME] about changing my research appointment, can you find 30 minutes in the next five days that I can talk with him, and she does it and puts it on there” (DH6)

“I have an amazing assistant to the department head. She does a wonderful job of keeping my calendar and giving me my work loads for each day” (DH10)

“There are certain things I can delegate to our administrative assistant. She loves organizing travel” (DH15)

“I have my administrative assistant that keeps me structured” (DH16)

Possible Combination of Categories

Thanks to some great feedback and guidance, the following categories have been considered for combination:

Past Experiences in context – not necessarily just experiences, but experiences that helped the Department Heads become who they are today. (i.e. “because I was a faculty member at [STATE] University I was able to....etc.)

Personal Characteristics

- Leadership Styles
- Values/Personality
- Skills/Traits
- Strengths/Weaknesses
- Religion

Role within the University Mission

- Administration
 - Management
 - Recruitment
 - Evaluations
 - Budgets
 - Strategic Planning
 - Research
 - Teaching
 - Outreach (service, extension, etc.)
 - Goals
- Communication
 - Types of communication (email, in person, use of administrative assistant etc.)
 - Faculty engagement (conferences, workshops, development, etc.)
 - Conflict Resolution
- Work Environment

Below is also an updated protocol. Some protocol questions have been removed due to participants struggling to understand the questions. Others have been rearranged in order to allow for flow and transition.

Introduction:

Thank you, [name] for taking the time to talk with me today. I really appreciate it.

How is your week going?

Keeping busy?

In interviewing you, I would like to learn about your experiences as a department head.

I have planned this interview to take about an hour, and I look forward to what you have to say!

Okay. Well, I have a number of questions that I will ask your experiences or job and would like you to describe each as best you can. I want to emphasize that I'm interested in learning about your experiences and there are no right or wrong answers. Please, do not mention others using their full, identifiable name during our discussions.

I sent you a consent form outlining your rights as an interviewee for our interview today. Just to clarify [go over consent form]. Is there anything else I clarify for you?

During the interview, I will be writing notes. These notes will be used as a way to remember points that I can follow up with you about later in the interview, so I apologize for any delay. I will also ask questions to guide our discussion, but I am very interested in what you have to say. Do you have any questions?

Let's begin recording!

1. Tell me about your department
 - a. Who works there? How many faculty/staff/students?
 - b. How many degree programs?
 - c. In what college is it?
2. Describe your journey as department head?
 - a. How did you get here?
 - b. Where did you come from?
 - c. What were your experiences?

- d. What do you think is more helpful to you now, your “real life experiences” or your academic experiences?
 3. Tell me about your job as department head.
 - a. What do you do in a normal day/week
 4. Describe how you interact with faculty.
 - a. What are the main reasons for your interactions?
 - b. What is the amount of time you believe you should spend with your faculty?
 - i. As individuals?
 - ii. As a group?
 5. Describe the work environment (culture) of your department?
 - a. Describe how the faculty works together
 - i. What’s the dynamic like?
 - b. What is your role in creating/maintaining that environment?
 - c. What is your faculty’s role in creating/maintaining that environment?
 6. Tell me about your conflict resolution styles.
 - a. How do you think your faculty reacts to your style of conflict resolution?
 7. Tell me about your decision making process.
 - a. At work and/or at home
 - i. What do you take into consideration when deciding something?
 - ii. Who do you talk with about it?
 - iii. What is your end goal?
 8. Describe how you set priorities
 - a. What differentiates the priorities on the top of your list to those at the bottom?
 - b. What or who do you believe influences those priorities?
 - c. What do you do inside the department that reflects those priorities?
 - d. What are you doing outside of the department that reflects those priorities?
 9. What are your values?
 - a. Where do they stem from?
- (Now I want to talk about strengths and weaknesses)
10. What do you consider your greatest strengths?
 - a. How do they contribute to your responsibility as department head?
 11. What do you consider your greatest weaknesses?
 - a. How do they contribute to your responsibility as department head?
 12. Where do you see your department in five years?
 - a. What changes should occur?
 - b. What people will you work with?
 13. Explain why it is advantageous for your department to have you as a department head.

a. What would you say to a new department head as advice?

Transition to demographics – any questions/comments so far?

Age

How do you identify yourself (race/ethnicity)

Tenure in department

Tenure in profession

What organizations are you a part of?

Additional questions?

As we talked earlier, I will have this interview transcribed and email it to you for review. All identifying information will be removed from transcripts prior to emailing them to a single private email address for member checking purposes. Send an email back to me letting me know if any corrections were made and if you accept the transcript as a fair representation of our discussion today.

Thank you so much for your time and input. By participating, you will help to determine factors that influence department heads' leadership effectiveness. I will be in contact with you soon.

Thank you.

APPENDIX H: PEER DEBRIEF MEMORANDUM #5

To: Peer Debrief Committee
Subject: Thesis Research – Updated Interview Analysis
Date: 2/1/13

Dear Peer Debrief Committee,

This memo looks different than the last few I have sent. It has come time to start preparing my presentations of findings. One way my committee and I discussed doing it is by research questions. In order to get feedback, I have presented them as such below. Each research question is followed by the information I believe should be included in the findings. This also includes combined categories/themes from the previous memo. I look forward to the feedback.

Thank you!

Identify the reoccurring themes that emerge from external department chair expectations
Overarching themes that were discovered include:

- Administrative
 - Academic
 - Scholarly, advising, curriculum, education, students, teaching, campus activities, classes,
 - Outreach
 - Extension, commitment, community, team, committee, programs, planning, outreach, environment, inservice, clientele
 - Research
 - Grants, professional, society/association, publications
 - Leadership
 - Development, mission, vision, diversity, effective, technology, success, faculty staff, lead, guide
 - Management
- Responsibilities
 - Recruitment
 - Evaluations
 - Budget
 - Strategic Plan/Goals
 - Meeting Attendance
 - Other Responsibilities
- Communication
 - Types of communication
 - Email, interactions, use of administrative assistant

- Faculty Engagement
- Conflict Resolution
- Work Environment
- Required Attributes
 - Degree required, experience, accomplishments, traits, skills required

Understand the personal and external expectations of AEE department chairs

Possible Alternative Question/Alternative way to format

- *Understand university expectations of AEE department chairs.*
- *Understand personal expectations of AEE department chairs.*

Administrative

Academic:

University Expectations:

- “Teach undergraduate and graduate courses in AEE” (JD)
- “Develop and strengthen curriculum and instruction” (JD)
- “Conduct off-campus instruction...” (JD)
- “Excellence in teaching” (JD)
- “Culture of academic distinction” (JD)
- “I still do a lot of teaching. My position is 40% teaching” (DH12)
- “I’m a full time faculty member. So, I teach five classes a year. I advise 25 undergraduate students, 5 masters students, and 3 PhD students” (DH15)
- “The faculty really own the curriculum and I believe that strongly” (DH14)

Personal Expectations:

- “Making sure my classes are all ready and all set. Trying to grade papers” (DH12)

Outreach:

University Expectations:

- “Participates on department, college, and university committees” (JD)
- “Outreach and service” (JD)
- “Develops and maintains knowledge of the extension program planning process” (JD)
- “I spend a lot of time making sure I am communicating on behalf of our interests in Ag educational leadership and putting us in the right kinds of positions where we can take advantage of opportunities and be able to make sure we are being resourced” (DH15)
- “Extension is the third part of that [interaction]” (DH14)
- “Our mission is really based on servicing our clientele and being innovative” (DH16)

Personal Expectations:

- “I realize that I have a position here to serve, not to be served” (DH14)

“Everything I have seen in my career has told me that we need to do a better job of incorporating the effects within teaching and research and service of the human and behavioral sciences” (DH10)

“They [the faculty] work closely with the extension side of the university” (DH12)

Research:

University Expectations:

“Pursuing internal and external grant support” (JD)

“Participate in the programs of professional societies and associations” (JD)

“Facilitate and improve student and faculty research and scholarly activity” (JD)

“Broad appreciation and understanding of research in the department” (JD)

“Encourage the faculty members to do research” (DH12)

“We have goals to increase the number of publications and presentation, that as a department we put out” (DH14)

Personal Expectations:

“What research can we do from this department that’s going to be a benefit to the people we serve here in the state?” (DH5)

“I really love historical research” (DH12)

“[My interaction with faculty includes] talking about research. Trying to see if there’s anything I can do to help them in their research and scholarship” (DH8)

Leadership:

University Expectations:

“Provide leadership for the development...of programs” (JD)

“Foster interdisciplinary ties with appropriate departments” (JD)

“Leading the department in a manner consistent with the governance document” (JD)

“They [the faculty] look to me for leadership” (DH12)

“[The Vice Chancellor] wants his department heads to provide leadership and management for the operations of their respective departments” (DH10)

Personal Expectations:

“I do think it’s incumbent upon people in this position to provide some kind of creative visionary leadership and I’m trying to do that” (DH3)

“I’m a firm believer in you have to lead by example” (DH5)

“Good leaders are good communicators” (DH6)

“In fact, one of the keys to effective leadership, I mean you have to have good ideas to make change.” (DH7)

“I think leadership is important. I think being an ethical leader is important” (DH12)

“I am a student of leadership.” (DH14)

“[Lead by example] If I want a trusting environment, I have to be trustworthy and I have to trust the people. If I want an authentic environment, I have to be authentic as well. If I want an open environment I have to be open and true” (DH15)

“I subscribe to relationship-oriented leadership” (DH2)

Management:

University Expectations:

“Coordinate the overall management and operation of the Department” (JD15)

“35% of my time would be involved in really the paperwork/procedures/signing documents/finance and personnel side of things” (DH14)

Personal Expectations:

(DH6) “We don’t just manage by emergency. We manage purposefully”

“Managing workload and responsibilities and ensuring that I make the wisest uses of the financial resource we have as a department” (DH14)

Responsibilities

Recruitment:

University Expectations:

“Experience in recruiting” (JD)

“Recruits and recommends for employment personnel for faculty and staff positions within the department (JD3)

“Diversity efforts of the department to recruit and retain outstanding faculty, staff and students” (JD17)

“The vice chancellor expects all department heads to be spending a minimum of two days a month, that’s 10% of your time, minimally, doing development activities, out recruiting, finding people who will fund projects and efforts in our department” (DH10)

Personal Expectations:

“We are trying to work together with the college to look at those events as recruitment events” (DH12)

“We have to have good recruitment and retention rates of our students” (DH12)

Evaluations:

University Expectations:

“Personnel management functions” (JD)

“Conductions an annual performance evaluation of directly supervised faculty and staff” (JD)

“Faculty and program evaluations” (JD5)

“Evaluation of division graduate and undergraduate teaching, research and extension programs in accordance with the University and [COLLEGE] strategic plans” (JD12)

“We do annual evaluations every January so I will sit down with the faculty members on a one-on-one evaluation basis” (DH12)

“Conducting annual evaluations” (DH14)

Personal Expectations:

“This semester I’m looking forward to the structured time that allows me to do the performance review” (DH6)

“Much of what I do in the spring, counting the hours between January, February, and then March, at least 50-60% of my time will be documenting what we do through annual performance reviews” (DH10)

Budgets:

University Expectations:

“Major decisions relating to departmental budget items” (JD)

“oversight and maintenance of the established financial and operational processing environment” (JD)

“Budget development” (JD)

“Identify and acquire funding” (JD)

“I have a budget of about \$4 million that I’m responsible for” (DH14)

Personal Expectations:

“They are decisions of, do you fund this set of resources for this or do you funnel them over there?” (DH3)

“My associate heads all have appropriate sized budgets. They have complete budget authority to handle any decisions that are made there” (DH10)

“Our money should be spent on where our priorities are” (DH14)

Strategic Plan/Goals:

University Expectations:

“Develops strategic plans in concert with other college or Division planning activities” (JD3)

“Advance the departmental, college, and university strategic plan” (JD8)

“Develop...the Division’s strategic plans including development of departmental goals in an equitable and professional manner (JD17)

“In our strategic plan, there is a very small mention of globalization and international education” (DH6)

“Last year we successfully went through a strategic planning process as a department” (DH14)

“We have goals that have come out of our strategic planning activities and we pursue those using three-year chunks” (DH7)

Personal Expectations:

“I’ve tried to engage the whole faculty in a strategic planning process and frankly, a lot of the faculty members just want to do their job and don’t want to do any strategic planning” (DH3)

“I’m trying to convince them that strategic planning and taking control of their future is part of their job, but they see their job as teaching their classes and working with students and managing whatever research programs they have going” (DH3)

“I’m a firm believer in strategic planning” (DH7)

“I would love for us to expand and for us to be bigger” (DH15)

“Our goal is to increase student numbers” (DH12)

“Higher impact in terms of student numbers, in terms of what it means to the people in [STATE]” (DH3)

“Increase the number of people we work with” (DH5)

“My end goal is consensus, not compromise” (DH6)

Meetings

University Expectations:

“Serve as Department’s representative to [COMMITTEE]” (JD15)

“Serve on university, college, division and professional committees” (JD12)

“Representing the Department at the cabinet meetings of the college” (JD11)

Personal Expectations:

“I do have a lot of meetings where I am doing a lot of planning” (DH6)

“Meeting with sponsors and donors trying to get money for things and you are doing that constantly” (DH8)

“When I’m on campus, I attend a lot of meetings representing the department” (DH10)

“Leadership meetings with the college at least once a month” (DH12)

“40% of my time is taken up in meetings of some kind” (DH14)

“I meet with my graduate students about different projects” (DH15)

Other Responsibilities:

University Expectations:

“Responsible for compliance with civil rights regulations in programs and employment” (JD)

“I’m responsible to help direct the direction that the department’s trying to go” (DH5)

“My chief responsibility is obviously the department” (DH12)

“My responsibility indicates that I have responsibility for people and resources of this department and to ensure that the programs administered through this department are as effective, well planned, and efficient as possible.” (DH14).

“My responsibility is to ensure that whatever faculty needs are related to teaching, research, and extension, I’m doing everything I can to help provide that for them” (DH14)

“I administer the department. I make sure all the courses are taught...the students are advised...work with the college administration” (DH12)

“We have to be aware of policy issues and those policy issues are university policy and state policy” (DH3)

Personal Expectations:

“My role is being a broker of resources” (DH2)

“It’s tough balancing between how much time and energy you devote to doing the little stuff and how much time that leaves to get the big stuff done” (DH3)

“It’s really easy...to get bogged down with what I call ‘administrivia’ or the minutia of the day to day, little fires that bur that are urgent” (DH14)

“One of the biggest journey’s I’ve been on in this role as a department head is trying to balance the difference between leading and managing” (DH14)

“If you really summed up my job, it would be to be a change agent” (DH16)

Communication

Communication:

University Expectations:

“Facilitate effective communication within the department and beyond” (JD6)

Personal Expectations:

“One of the things I try to do in my role is make sure I’m clear in my communications” (DH2)

“I really listen to people” (DH5)

“I have pretty much an open door policy” (DH6)

“Communication is a challenge” (DH7)

“It’s incredible the amount of time we [department heads] spend responding to emails. Usually it’s emails from other administrators” (DH3)

“Usually email takes up quite a lot of the day” (DH7)

“Rule #1 – you never send an email that’s filled with emotion” (DH7)

“Almost everything of my 100+ maybe more than that emails a day, those get either filed or most of them move to somebody else to take care of” (DH10)

“A normal day is arriving here at the office at 8 a.m. checking emails, maybe returning phone calls” (DH12)

“25% of my day would be taken up with email/communication” (DH14)

“Fair amount of email. Way too much email. Although a lot of my email is done in the evenings, a fair amount throughout the day” (DH16)

“They note it on the calendar and I have a very good administrative assistant. They will go to her and say I need to talk to [NAME] about changing my research appointment, can you find 30 minutes in the next five days that I can talk with him, and she does it and puts it on there” (DH6)

“I have an amazing assistant to the department head. She does a wonderful job of keeping my calendar and giving me my work loads for each day” (DH10)

“I ask myself, how did they do it before email?” (DH2)

Faculty Engagement

University Expectations:

“Development of faculty, staff and students” (JD17)

“I spend a portion of my time processing through paperwork to enable faculty members to do their jobs more efficiently and effectively” (DH3)

Personal Expectations:

“It’s no longer about me...It’s now my job to make sure my faculty are successful” (DH2)

“I do make sure I go around and tell people good morning and things like that.” (DH5)

“I should be spending at least 50% of my time with faculty” (DH6)

“We try to get together every month” (DH12)

“To make this work and to do the kind of things we are doing – teach the number of classes we are teaching, have the number of PhDs that we have all that kind of thing - we have to really be collaborative” (DH15)

“We have our departmental retreat in the middle of December because...we have a lot of people at state fair so we can’t [do it before school starts], so we end up doing it during finals week” (DH16)
“As we work to develop this team effort and those things, anything I can do as a department head that can provide faculty and staff with the resources, that may be time, it may not just be dollars, some type of resource that makes them feel like they can get involved with something and that they have the time or resources to do that” (DH16)
“Usually have an annual Christmas party, end of the year part, beginning of the year part” (DH8)
Social Functions

Conflict Resolution:

University Expectations:

Personal Expectations:

“I spend a portion of my time interacting with faculty dealing with issues and concerns” (DH3)
“If there’s an issue with a faculty member, I bring that to that faculty member’s attention at that time. I don’t wait around” (DH5)
“I’m dealing with that conflict of resolution by having open lines of communication...nothing is a surprise” (DH12)
“In confronting it and being up front, I hope to be able to deal with it and then put it behind us and move on” (DH14)
“Never avoid something because that’s not a good tactic” (DH15)
“I meet with each individual to get their side of the story, get their concerns or issues, and then...will call the two individuals in together and we will chat and see if we can meet some mean ground” (DH16)

Required Attributes

University Expectations:

“Team building skills” (JD)
“Ability to speak and write clearly and communicate ideas effectively” (JD)
“facilities effective communication within the department” (JD)
“Earned PhD in Agricultural Leadership, Education, and/or Communication or related field” (JD)
“Accomplishments in teaching, extension, and/or research” (JD)
“Five years or more of successful agricultural...teaching experience” (JD)

Personal Expectations:

“My role is to be open minded and optimistic” (DH6)
“I’m fairly analytical and logical” (DH6)
“Emotional intelligence skills” (DH6)

“My persistence” (DH7)
“I’m a detailed person” (DH14)
Ability to see big picture
“Futuristic thinking” (DH15)

Work Environment

University Expectations:

“Create an environment that fosters diversity, collegiality and work in a multicultural setting” (JD4)
“Maintain an inclusive climate in the unit” (JD12)
“Maintain faculty, student, and staff morale at a high level” (JD)

Personal Expectations:

“You can’t have a [work] culture if the faculty don’t own up to it” (DH2)
“I’m constantly connecting those silos, or merging those silos into good educator and good communicators” (DH6)
“In my opinion, a the work environment is a lot of respect” (DH8)
“Try to be very collaborative, very communicative, share information and make sure all of the information is out there and make decisions together” (DH15)
“I want to instill a culture of continual improvement” (DH14)
Fun environment

Identify the internal and external influences of effectiveness for department chairs

External Influencers:

Stakeholders/Clientele

“Encourage linkages with external groups to strengthen ties with stakeholders, state, regional, national and international organizations...”
“Develop and maintain international networks”
“Office of the Dean”
“Strong alliances with external constituencies”
“Ag in the Classroom”
“Agriscience teachers”
“PR Specialists”
“Extension Specialists”
“Cattle growers”
“Farm Bureau”
“FFA”
“Friends of 4-H”
“Advisory council”
“Parents”
“Deans”

“Associate deans”
“Experiment station director”
“I spend a lot of time working for everybody else” (DH3)
“It’s a balancing act with your constituent groups” (DH3)
“What I want to influence more than anything out there, are the high school principals and high school counselors who are making important decisions about what courses to offer in the high school and for them to see the value of hands on learning in agriculture science education” (DH6)
“Students definitely influence my priorities” (DH8)

Internal Influencers:

Values:

“Integrity”
“Openness”
“Honesty”
“Respect”
“Hard work”
“Vision and determination”
“Change”
“Collegiality”
“Fun”
“Work ethic is an important value to me” (DH8)
“I value commitment and loyalty to an organization” (DH6)
“I think we have to set our own agenda instead of having someone else set our agenda for us” (DH3)
“rising to the occasion”
“Emotional intelligence” (DH9)
“Being a professional and under that title, demonstrating senior leadership” (DH10)

Strengths:

“I want to keep pushing myself to think big enough” (DH3)
“I listen to people” (DH5)
“I can zoom up and see a bigger picture or zoom down and see what the impediment or bottleneck might be” (DH6)
“We try to get those people to the right places so that what they do can be enhanced” (DH10)
“I work well with a lot of different people” (DH12)
“The true strength of this department is not me...it’s the people that were hired.” (DH14).
“I am a collaborative person” (DH15)

Weaknesses:

- “I really wish I was more organized” (DH3)
- “It’s a challenge to find time to read” (DH7)
- “I’m not very good at delegating. Sometimes I procrastinate” (DH8)
- “Making decisions too quickly” (DH10)
- “I cannot say no.” (DH12)
- “A department head is the most difficult administrative role in the university” (DH14)
- “The challenge for me has been...to learn how to be more of a leader and less bogged down in the day to day managing” (DH14)
- “Not keeping track as much of those minute, day-to-day, managerial, color coding, list type details” (DH15)
- “It’s still a challenge, it’s almost a divide between some staff” (DH16)
- “I don’t think I’m very innovative” (DH16)

Personality:

- “I could see where if we had a different personality group, my role would be a bit more autocratic” (DH3)
- “I don’t like people that put personalities before principles” (DH6)
- “That’s really the value of faculty spending time together...they develop a relationship and understanding of those personalities and appreciation that everyone’s just a little bit different” (DH7)
- “Much like Myers-Briggs and Strengths, what they say about me is a person like me, once they make a decision, then I feel very comfortable with the decision and we move forward” (DH10)
- “My personality type is that I’m very prone to wanting to handle ...those pop-in problems that just show up and are not on anybody’s schedule” (DH14)
- “My personality profile is that I tend to be an introvert” (DH14)

Belief:

- “My Catholic term is to be contrite or sorrowful or sorry for” (DH6)
- “Christ got down on His knees and washed their feet. If you think about that in your philosophy, from your Sunday School days, that’s the type of department heads we need” (DH6)
- “My personal mission is to know God and to make Him known” (DH14)
- “As soon as I tell you I’m a Christian...I better act like one or you are going to look for inconsistencies” (DH14)
- “Part of it goes back to my beliefs, to my accommodation in which I use everyday to direct myself in life” (DH9) [when discussing priority setting influencers]

Past Experiences in Context

“The thing I find most beneficial [to help me in my job] has been the different perspectives that I’ve had in working in different states, with different people, in different programs” (DH2)

“I think having taught high school for five years provides some important context to ground you to what’s going on so you don’t forget the kinds of students you get into your university programs and their kinds of goals and aspirations” (DH3)

“I’d say that the experience that I’ve gained has been tempered by the education I’ve received” (DH5)

“I think the [teaching high school] definitely has a lot to do with it because you are managing an entire program such as students, facilities, budget, working with parents, things like that” (DH8)

“I’ve had a chance to witness and be a part of different departments and identify what has worked well and what needs to be done in departments with tight budgets, small faculty numbers” (DH9)

“You have to have that high school experience to work for high school Ag teachers to prepare high school Ag teachers, to teach the teacher Ed courses, the method courses, so that’s invaluable. But, then working at the university is a different system and you really need that experience to move up the administration” (DH12)

APPENDIX I: AUDIT TRAIL

In order to keep anonymity, the department chairs were coded based on when job descriptions were received. Job descriptions were coded to go along with the department chair code.

DH 2 – Received JD2 on October 18, 2012
DH3 – Received JD3 on October 19, 2012
DH5 – Received JD5 on October 22, 2012
DH6 – Received JD6 on October 23, 2012
DH7 – Received JD7 on October 24, 2012
DH8 – Received JD8 on October 30, 2012
DH9 – Received JD9 on November 5, 2012
DH10 – Received JD10 on November 12, 2012
DH12 – Received JD12 on November 28, 2012
DH14 – Received JD13 on November 28, 2012
DH15 – Received JD14 on December 4, 2012
DH16 – Received JD16 on January 9, 2013
DH18 – JD18 Not Available

APPENDIX J: ADDITIONAL CODING INFORMATION

According to Creswell (1998), there are three parts to the content analysis process: open coding, axial coding and selective coding. Open coding is when the researcher sorts the data into different categories (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Corbin and Strauss (1990) tell us that concepts that relate to the same phenomenon may be grouped together in a category. However, not all concepts will become categories. Open coding took place in this study for both documents and transcriptions. After the researcher received three job descriptions, open coding took place. After another three job descriptions, open coding took place again. Different colors were used to represent the different emergent concepts. The process continued until all documents were analyzed and initial categories emerged. Interview transcriptions were analyzed in the same manner. After three interviews, the researcher used crayons to depict various evolving categories. The process continued until all transcriptions were analyzed.

Axial coding is when “the investigator assembles the data in new ways after open coding” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). Job description categories were the first to be combined and coded since they were collected first. After reviewing all of the codes, the researcher combined categories to form new ones that better reflected broader themes. Interview transcription categories were also merged and rearranged in order to form new, broader categories.

Selective coding is the last step and happens when “the researcher identifies a ‘story line’ and writes a story that integrates the categories in the axial coding model” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). In order to tell the story of this study, the researcher examined both the

categories that emerged from the documents as well as the transcriptions. By viewing them together, the researcher was able to combine and create categories that gave a deeper understanding to department heads and their leadership effectiveness influencers.