IN SEARCH OF THE "DIFFERENT VOICE" IN THE ORGANIZATION: MEN'S AND WOMEN'S CONSTRUCTION OF THEIR WORK-ROLES

by

Shamima Ahmed

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Public Administration/Public Affairs

APPROVED:

James F. Wolf
Chair

Cynthia McSwain

Jane A. Asche

Gary L. Wamsley

Orion F. White Jr.

August, 1991

Blacksburg, Virginia

IN SEARCH OF THE "DIFFERENT VOICE" IN THE ORGANIZATIONS: MEN'S and WOMEN'S CONSTRUCTION OF THEIR WORK-ROLES

By
Shamima Ahmed

Dr. James F. Wolf, Chairperson
Center for Public Adminstration and Policy

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of women's "different voice" on their organizational behaviors. The phrase "different voice" is used here to indicate that women perceive realities and think about them in a manner distinct from men. The study examines this issue by focusing on how men and women, working in similar positions within similar organizations, construct their work-roles.

The specific research questions that this study pursues are the following:

1. Does the "different voice" find its expression in women's construction of their work-roles? and

2. If so, in what ways?
The study uses the ethnomethodological perspective on understanding roles.

For the purpose of data collection, the study uses several methods. Among them, the indepth interview is the major one. Indepth interviews are conducted with twelve informants, six men and six women, who are working as heads of various academic departments in a university. All the

interviews were tape-recorded and later transcribed.

Results show that the "different voice" does find its expression in women's construction of their work-roles, in the following ways:

1. Women chairs, in their role definition and in their role performance, expressed their "concern for people" more than men. Men chairs, in contrast, showed their "concern for the program or department."

2. All the women chairs, except one, mention students in addition to the dean and faculty as important "others" whose expectations regarding their (the informants') roles are important for the informants to consider. In contrast to this, all the men chairs mention the president/vice and president in addition to the dean and faculty as important "others."

3. All the women chairs emphasize the "covert" nature of others' expectations. Men chairs, on the other hand, point to the relatively "overt" nature of these expectations.

4. Regarding negotiation of their work-roles, it is found that though women are self-creating their roles more compared than men, they are also dissatisfied, for several reasons. Men are found to be more likely to follow the institutional requirements of their role. They are more satisfied with their jobs. It is argued that women make more compromises in their construction of their work-roles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

his mother.

I dedicate this work to my parents, whose love and concerns for me gave me the mental strength to move along. Even though we are far apart, I can feel how much they have been sharing this whole process in their mind.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

viii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the major developments in work-organizations over the last two decades has been an increased presence of women at all levels of the organization. According to 1980 census data, the percentage of women in executive, administrative, and managerial occupations increased from 18.5 percent in 1970 to 30.5 % a decade later, and by 1985 the percentage of women was nearly 36% (Blum et al., 1988, p. 528). During the 1990's this figure has continue to increase [as expected]. Naisbitt and Aburdene report that "women hold 39.3% of the 14.2 million executive, administrative, and management jobs, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly double the 1972 figure" (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990, p.224).

Studies on organizational cultures (especially cross-cultural ones) have created awareness of the influence of personal beliefs, values, and experiences on the organizational behaviors of individual members. Given the fact that women are moving into the work-force in increasing numbers, one may ask how women's personal experiences and world views influence their organizational behaviors.

The issue of the influence of women's world view on their organizational behavior is a crucial one because women are working in organizations that usually have male-dominated environments. The organizational world reflects a male-

1

dominated environment because most of these organizations are created by men and are dominated by men in terms of their sheer majority numbers, thereby reflecting men's perspective toward life and work. As Harrigan (1977) and Hennig and Jardim (1977) argue, in organizations that have largely been created by men, the rules of conduct are based on experiences acquired through male socialization. Similar concerns are raised by Peters and Waterman (1982) when they criticize traditional management practices for reflecting extreme masculine behavior, in being overly rational, instrumental, and therefore rigidly bureaucratic.

At present, though increasing numbers of women are entering organizations, most of the upper positions of those organizations are still being occupied by men (Kanter, 1977; Grant, 1988). The consequence has been no basic change in the way that organizations are formed, structured, or run. In short, organizations, in general, still reflect men's ideas, ideologies, values, interests, and world-view.

In contrast to men's view of life and work, however, as several writers have pointed out, women have a different vision of life and, what some refer to as a "different voice." Some prominent writers who hold this position are Carol Rivers (1983), Betty Friedan (1981), Kathy Ferguson (1984), Carol Gilligan (1982), Sandra Harding (1981), Anne Wilson Schaef (1981), and Sara Ruddick (1977). Although none of these

writers has given any general definition of this "different voice," each has focused on various issues to illustrate that women perceive the world differently than men. Thus, **the phrase "different voice" means women's voice; "voice" here includes perceptions, thoughts, and attitudes regarding different realities and issues. The phrase also indicates that women's voice differs from men's.**

At this point, a few examples will suffice to highlight the nature of this "different voice." Rivers (Flick, 1983) argues that women have a different way of looking at life, a way in which caring is vital. Harding (1981) discusses the male belief that the world is essentially made up of "physically and socially disembodied things," governed by ultimately predictable laws that can be rationally perceived and controlled by human beings. The contrasting belief systems of the female world are more compatible with an identity of relatedness and an ethic of care. Gilligan (1982) points out that women's conceptions of moral problems are concerned with the inclusion of diverse needs rather than with the balancing of opposing claims. Edwin Ardener in 1973 developed the muted group theory based on his assertion that women perceived the world differently than men as a result of men and women's different experiences rooted in the division of labor.

In brief, this literature suggests that in their basic

values and interests; their mode of thought; their view of life; their construction of knowledge; their sense of morality; and in their life experiences women bring a "different voice" to the construction of social reality.

Given that organizations have male-dominant environments and that women have a "different voice," two interrelated questions arise regarding their organizational behaviors, viz. (1) whether the "different voice" finds its expression in women's organizational behaviors, and (2) if so, in what ways. Different organizational behaviors of men and women can be studied to examine these questions. A comparative study of men and women is needed to find out whether women have a "different voice" regarding organizational realities or issues than men.

Summary of the topic

This study will address these questions by exploring how men and women, working in similar positions within similar organizations, construct their work-roles. Work-role is usually defined as a set of expectations about behaviors, attitudes, and values associated with a specified position (Schlenker and Gutek, 1987). It is not synonymous to a job, which is usually taken to mean a set of tasks expected of occupants of a specified position.

In contrast to the structuralists' position of viewing the individual as a passive role occupant, this study upholds

4

the position that the individual interacts with the role expectations, and may adopt, modify, or reject the pre-established role. In addition, it also assumes that the "meaning" of a role is necessarily mediated by an interpretive process. All these imply that the individual (i.e., the role-occupant) constructs his/her work-role. This position closely resembles the ethnomethodological position on role.

The specific research questions that this study will pursue are the following:

1. Does the "different voice" finds its expression in women's construction of their work-roles in the organization?

2. If so, in what ways?

Methodology & Framework of the Study:

Several studies have been undertaken to examine whether women in organizations behave differently than men. Some common areas of investigation are communication, leadership, management, conflict management, and decision-making. By being mainly functional and descriptive, studies of these sorts fail to explain whether women's behaviors as found in the organizational setting (e.g., decision-making style) are a result of their "different voice" or a result of their adjusting to a male-dominated organizational environment. In other words, this kind of methodology is inadequate and limited for inquiries into the interaction of the personal (in this case, women's "different voice") and organizational

5

factors and the emergent/processual nature of behaviors.

The methodology for such an inquiry, therefore, needs to be grounded on the following assumptions:

1. Social reality in organizations consists of ongoing, dialectical tensions between individuals and organizations, in which each element retains a portion of its identity.

2. In order to understand behavior, it is important to unfold and study the processes which lead to such behavior.

3. Any scientific understanding of human action, at whatever level of ordering or generality, must begin with and be built upon an understanding of the everyday life of members performing those actions.

Consistent with these requirements, this study takes an ethnomethodological approach toward understanding individuals' work-role construction. In very simple language ethnomethodology is "the empirical investigation- (-ology) of the methods (method) people (ethno-) use to make sense of and at the same time accomplish communication, decision-making, reasonableness and actions in everyday life" (Rogers, 1983, p.84). The ethnomethodologist is not concerned with providing causal explanations of observably regular, patterned, repetitive actions by some kind of analysis of the actor's point of view. Rather he is concerned about how members of society go about the task of "seeing, describing, and explaining order in the world in which they live" (Zimmerman

6

& Weider, 1970, p.289). Where others might see "things," "givens" or "facts of life," the ethnomethodologist sees (or attempts to see) process: the process through which the perceivedly stable features of socially organized environment are continually created and sustained. Cicourel and Garfinkel are the two major contributors of the development of ethnomethodology.

On the basis of such a methodological perspective, this study describes the construction of work-roles, on the part of the role-occupants, as a process that incorporates the following elements:

1. Role-occupant's expectations from his/her role.

2. Role-occupant's making sense of organizational expectations regarding his/her role.

3. Role-occupant's construction of his/her negotiated role.

These elements form the framework for studying informants' work-role construction.

Objectives and Goals

The study compares how men and women, working in similar positions within similar kind of organizations, construct their work-roles. Comparison has been made according to the previously mentioned framework. Thus, comparison has been made on these elements:

1. Role-occupant's expectations from his/her role (e.g., whether men and women have different role expectations for

themselves from the same position that they occupy).

2. Role-occupant's making sense of organizational expectations regarding his/her role (e.g., whether men and women read different signs/clues to understand organizational expectations).

3. Role-occupant's constructing his/her negotiated work-role. This dimension focuses on the differences between men and women in regard to the nature and degree of compromise between one's expectations and organizational expectations as involved in arriving at one's negotiated role.

The ultimate goals of this study are to find out whether the "different voice" affects women's organizational behaviors (in this case in their construction of their work-role) and if so, in what ways.

Summary of the Literature Gap Being Filled

Three streams of literature are pertinent to this study. These are:

1. The literature on the "different voice."

2. Comparative studies of men and women working in organizations.

3. Studies on role theory and organizational role-theory.

A review of these literatures shows the following:

1. <u>The literature on the "different voice"</u>.

This area has been explored by several writers, mostly women and feminists. Betty Friedan (1981) explores the two

8

modes of thoughts - 'Alpha' (the masculine thought) and 'Beta' (the feminine thought). Carol Gilligan (1982) explores the different moral domains of men and women. Anne Wilson Schaef (1981) discusses men's and women's different focus of life. Various writers have focused on a variety of issues to explore the "different voice" that women have. However, these studies have not been extended to show the influence of this "different voice" on the work-place. This study attempts to bridge this gap in the literature.

2.   <u>Comparative studies of men and women working in organizations</u>.

Comparative studies have been undertaken to examine whether women behave differently than men within the organization. With regard to communication, some studies (Baird, Jr. & Bradley, 1979; Jourard, 1958) found women to communicate more openly than men. In leadership, mixed results were found. Some studies (Borgotta & Stimson, 1963; Baird & Bradley, 1979) provide some support to the view that female leaders are more consideration-oriented and male leaders more task-oriented. Other studies (e.g., Kanter, 1979), however, provide mixed support.

Such conflicting results are found in decision-making, power styles, motivation, work-values, and other areas too.

These studies are limited in the following ways:
(i) They do not explain whether women's behaviors, as found

in the organization, reflect their natural behaviors as emanating from their "different voice" or their adjusted behaviors as emanating from their efforts to adjust to a male-dominated organizational setting.

(ii) They do not focus on the processes that give rise to such behavior.

This study fills these gaps in the literature by incorporating a methodology that helps to focus on the interaction of the personal and organizational factors and the resultant, emergent behavior.

3. <u>The literature on role theory and organizational role-theory.</u>

Biddle (1986) classifies the literature on role theory into five major groups: functional, cognitive, structural, symbolic interactionist, and organizational.

Organizational role-theory is said to begun with the seminal books of Gross, <u>et al.</u> (1958) and Kahn, <u>et al.</u> (1964). Recent works mostly focus on role ambiguity, role conflict and conflict resolution, and role transition. Such studies preclude the study of roles that evolve or the process of how the negotiated role is constructed. Very few studies have been undertaken that compare men's and women's perceptions of their work-roles. However, the researcher of this study has not come across any comparative study that focuses on how men and women are constructing their work-roles.

10

This dissertation, with its focus on the process of role-construction and its comparative analysis, makes a rich contribution to the organizational role theory literature.

Significance of the Study

In addition to fulfilling the literature gaps, as discussed earlier, the significance of this study lies in the fact that it moves beyond the gender-blind approaches of organizational analysis. This study is based on the position that since reality is subjective, an exploration into men and women's perception is vital in understanding the total range of human problems, experiences, possibilities, and knowledge-building.

The widespread neglect of gender issues within organizational analysis has been reviewed by Hearn and Parkin (1983). Functionalist treatment of gender, they argue, has provided mainstream organizational theory with a set of background assumptions about men and women in which gender divisions are accepted as given, or as fundamentally necessary. Within the interpretivists' school, men's, rather than women's, account of organizational reality has been the dominant mode of analysis. Moreover, as they point out, within the radical structuralists, class divisions are seen as having far greater significance than sexual divisions. According to Hearn and Parkin, virtually all the radical

humanist thinkers quoted by Burrel and Morgan are writing implicitly about men.

Most theorists and researchers, thus, seem to be guided by the unexamined premise that women are like men while working in organizations. Studies which are considered as classics bear testimony to this gender-blind analysis of organization. The well-known Hawthorne Studies are a case in point. The key areas of research in the Hawthorne Studies involved the study of a group of females ("test room") and a group of males ("bank-wiring room") and, despite the fact that output was increased by the women and restricted by the men, the overall findings were presented as an explanation of the behavior of employees per se.

Books on organizations also demonstrate this gender neglect. If one searches the major books on organization, one finds very few references to sex or gender.

As more and more women are joining organizations, the scope of knowledge-building in organization studies broadens and may take new directions when one considers that women have a different perception of reality. Traditional social science has been criticized by several writers (e.g., Harding, 1987) who argue that such science has begun its analysis only in men's experiences. That is, it has asked only the questions about social life that appear problematic from within the social experiences that are characteristic for

12

men. However, many phenomena that appear problematic from the perspective of men's characteristic experiences may not appear problematic at all from the perspective of women's experiences. On the other hand, some phenomena may appear problematic to women's experiences that may not be so for men.

The significance of this study, thus, lies in its attempt to show whether men and women construct reality in organizations in different ways, and in the process the study provides insights as to how it can enrich knowledge-building in organizational studies.

Limitations of the study:

The study is based on interviewing twelve informants- six men and six women. This small sample size does not help much if one is thinking about generalizing the results of the study. However, the methodological stance of this study upholds the importance of individuals as important actors in creating their own social reality. In this sense, each individual experience is as important as the experiences of hundreds of individuals. Garfinkel's study (1967) of Agnes is a classic case of the ethnomethodological approach to the study of an issue. It is not important to know how many women like Agnes exist in the real world: rather understanding how Agnes creates her social reality is important in itself. Similarly, understanding the experience of each of the informants in this study is by itself important simply because

the spirit of this methodology lies in discovering how each individual makes sense of his/her reality and how each of them creates his/her reality accordingly.

As explained by Schofield, "at the heart of the qualitative approach is the assumption that a piece of qualitative research is very much influenced by the researcher's individual attributes and perspectives. The goal is not to produce a standardized set of results that any other careful researcher in the same situation or studying the same issue would have produced. Rather it is to produce a coherent and illuminating description of and perspective on a situation that is based on and consistent with detailed study of that situation. Qualitative researchers have to question seriously the internal validity of their works if other researchers reading their field notes feel the evidence does not support the way in which they have depicted the situation. However, they do not expect other researchers in a similar or even the same situation to replicate their findings in the sense of independently coming up with a precisely similar conceptualization. As long as the other researchers' conclusions are not inconsistent with the original account, differences in the reports would not generally raise serious questions related to validity or generalizability" (Schofield, 1990, p.203).

However, it is only reasonable for one to argue that the

14

more the number of informants the more rich will be the stock of experience that a researcher can have as his/her resource.

Definitions Used in this Study

Work-role: a set of expectations about behaviors, attitudes, and values associated with a specific position. It is not synonymous to a job, which refers to a set of tasks expected of occupants of specified position.

Role-occupant/incumbent: a person who is occupying a position, and therefore a role, within the organization.

Informant: a person who provides information relevant to the situation and concepts under study and is "native" to the "cultural scene" being explored (Spradley, 1979, p.25).

Work-role construction: a process that incorporates (1) role-occupant's expectations from his/her role, (2) role-occupant's making sense of organizational expectations, and (3) role-occupant's constructing his/her negotiated role.

Male-dominated environment: an environment that reflects predominantly men's values, ideas, ideologies, interests, and worldview.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Three streams of literature are relevant to this study. They are the following:

1. The literature on the "different voice."

2. Comparative studies of men and women in organizations.

3. The literature on role theory and organizational role theory.

A review of this literature is given below.

1. THE LITERATURE ON THE "DIFFERENT VOICE."

The issue of gender differences is a highly controversial one. On the one hand, there are writers who point out that women have a "different voice." The results of several research studies, on the other hand, show no significant gender differences. However, much of the controversy disappears when one realizes that the latter work has focused mostly on measuring gender differences in abilities, not in attitudes or tactics. Furthermore, as explained by Huston (1988, p.7), "Any discussion of gender differences must begin with a few caveats. The most important of these is that females and males are more similar than different. On any of the attributes described, male and female distributions overlap much more than they diverge. The average levels may differ, but there are many individuals of both genders who depart from those group averages by a wide margin." **Thus a**

claim that the two sexes speak in different voices actually amounts to a claim that there are more women than men who think, feel, or behave in a given way.

Another important point to keep in mind is that there is evidence that female and male psychological characteristics vary from culture to culture. As Goode (1983) argues, for example, the John Wayne ideal of a strong and silent male is peculiar to the modern American middle-class ethos, and much greater emotional and affectional expressiveness can be found among men of other cultures and earlier historical times.

The informants of this study are all white Americans, men and women. This review, therefore, will pertain to American literature only.

Different writers have focused on different issues to document that women have a "different voice." These issues can be broadly classified into: (1) view of life and world, (2) needs and wants, (3) moral judgment, (4) thought pattern, (5) cognitive functions, (6) construction of knowledge, and (7) view and use of power.

In documenting women's different view of life, it is argued that women see caring as vital (Rivers, 1983; Gilligan, 1982); are sensitive and empathetic to others' needs (Ferguson, 1984); see relationship as the focus of life (Schaef, 1981). Gilligan's book "In a Different Voice" is one of the most influential works on women's view of life. In her

research on the moral development of women, she found that women have different ways of structuring relationships and views of morality and self that differ from men's. In her model, women are more inclined to define morality as responsibility and relationship and to their ability to maintain ongoing social ties than are men. As Gilligan argues (1982, p.127), for women "the truth of relationship . . . [lies] in a return in the rediscovery of connection, in the realization that self and others are interdependent and that life, however, valuable in itself, can only be sustained by care in relationships. Male development, on the other hand, is linked to morality, fairness, rights, and rules, and to the social good; men forge their identities in relation to the external world and strive for personal autonomy."

In several of the writings on motherhood, one finds appeals to a distinctively female way of looking at the world. As argued by Ruddick (1980), maternal thought involves a certain respect for and interest in preserving life. It is aware of the limits of what can and cannot be done, and, in this sense, it departs from the practice of science, which is a way of thinking that is grounded in control. Ruddick (1980, p.343) writes: "A mother . . . is committed to two philosophical positions: she is a mentalist rather than a behaviorist, and she assumes the priority of personhood over action." Here, Ruddick is suggesting that motherhood and

18

mothering involve reasoned thinking made possible by the mind's ability to think about and assess concrete situations; mothering is not a series of response to stimuli in any Pavlovian sense (Farganis, 1986).

Ruddick thus sees in mothering a love relationship, a sense of pride and concern for children, a belief, on the part of those who mother, that they can do right to those entrusted to them.

The work of Anne Wilson Schaef (1981), a psychotherapist, provides us with further evidence for women's different view of the world. Through analyzing how men and women talk about their world in therapy sessions, Schaef develops theoretical concepts that express the differences between men's and women's interpretations of the world. She finds that the center of focus for most men is self and work: "everything else must go through, relate to, and be defined by the self and the work. Other things in life may be important . . . but they are never of equal importance; they always occupy positions on the periphery of the man's life, on the outside circle" (Schaef, 1981, p.108). The female system, in contrast, argues Schaef, centers on relationships. "Everything else must go through, relate to, and be defined by relation-ships" (p.108). According to her, work for women becomes more than something one does to earn money; it becomes a "life work." Women's views of work complement the other aspects of

their lives so that their lives seem not to be profit-and-status oriented but rather center on creativity, bonding, humanness and service.

Melix & Lyttle (1986, p.158) cites Herbert Alf, a professor of psychology at the University of the District of Columbia, who promotes a theory explaining the differing rationales among nations: there are two prevailing value systems in the world --the Business Ethic by which everything in judged according to its profitability -- and the Family Ethic, which focuses on whether or not a consequence or system is good for people. Melix and Lyttle (1986) argue that most women are guided by this Family Ethic while most men are guided by this Business Ethic.

Sandra Harding (1981) documents males' belief about the world as made up of physically and socially disembodied "things" governed by ultimately predictable laws or rules that can be rationally perceived and controlled by human beings. The contrasting patterns of belief characteristic of the female world are those [that are] compatible with an identity of relatedness and an ethic of care. The world is viewed as constituted of essentially physically and socially embodied "things," which are concrete, particularistic, and continuous with one another. These "things" are governed by wants and needs and are thus resistant to rational control.

Such a view of life and world drives different

20

needs/wants for women. As Melia and Lyttle (1986) point out,
women want security -- the assurance that there are rules that
will lead to success. Women, they suggest, tend to focus more
on the process rather than on the goals at hand. They argue
that processes to men are important too, but only in the
context of predetermined goals. As they explain (p.48),
"Goal-setting . . .is essentially a male attribute. Our
[women's] goals are to survive, to raise our children, to
maintain our marriages, to keep our families safe and happy.
There is no end in sight. . . or in mind. We don't measure
such objectives in concrete terms; they cannot be graphed on
a computer like a profit: cost ratio. Attention to process is
the basis of the female political system." They continue, "we
recently overheard a man say, 'I think it is terribly
important for us men to become more sensitive to our
employees; it is good business', and so it is. His goal is to
make money; our goal would be to be sensitive. . . our goal
would be good process."

Gilligan (1982) says that the feminine orientation
predisposes women toward interest in human relationships,
while the male orientation predisposes men toward interest in
individual achievement.

Jung (Harding, 1970) sees women's psychology as founded
on the principle of Eros and men's on the principle of Logos.
The concept of Eros connotes psychic relatedness, while Logos

connotes objective interest. Ferguson (1984) upholds the view that a woman's experience of herself as continuous with others results in a great need for others, i.e., a dependency. It also often leads them to avoid risk and conflict, to be threatened by the open clashing of wills that an authentic, non-bureaucratic politics requires. Miller (1976) reports that change and growth are intimate parts of women's lives in a way in which they are not for men. She clarifies this with the instance of women's child-rearing, which gives them the experience of looking for change rather than for fixity.

In exploring women's conception of morality, Gilligan (1982) finds that women's conceptions of moral problems are concerned with the inclusion of diverse needs rather than with the balancing of opposing claims. Harding (1981) raises a similar voice. She holds the view that men tend to judge themselves and others by standards of achievement and competency, and to draw moral judgments on the basis of application of abstract and universal notions of individual rights. Woolf (1929) argues that women's typical deference is rooted not only in their social subordination but also in the substance of their moral concerns. Sensitivity to the needs of others and the assumption of responsibility for taking care lead women to attend to voices other than their own and to include in their judgment other points of view.

The literature on the "different voice" also argues that

women and men have different thought patterns. For example, Friedan (1981) distinguishes between the "Alpha" (male) and "Beta" (female) modes of thought. The former, according to Friedan, is based on analytical and rational thinking; the tendency is to abstract one particular task or demand from its surrounding. The "Beta" mode, on the other hand, is based on synthesizing and thinking intuitively. Its concern is the whole picture being presented rather than fixed quantities. Daly (1978), Schaef (1981), and French (1985) describe male and female thoughts in a similar way. They describe male thought as rational, logical, linear and female thought as reflective, associative, and circular.

Castillejo (1973) delineates male and female characteristics in terms of "focused consciousness" and "diffused awareness." "Focused consciousness" refers to looking at things and analyzing them into their component parts, in order to give us the ability to formulate ideas and the capacity to change, invent, and create. In contrast to this, Castillejo argues that most children are born with, and many women retain, a diffuse awareness of the wholeness of nature, where everything is linked with everything else and they feel themselves to be part of an individual whole. She points out the importance of remembering that though these qualities belong to both men and women in varying degrees, it is diffuse awareness that is more commonly found in women. As she

23

explains, from early life the small girl tends to delight in everything that concerns life and living while the small boy shows passionate interest in what makes the wheels go round, or why the kettle steams when it boils.

Such differences are also documented in psychological research which upholds two major gender differences in cognitive functions. The first difference is that men tend to process information more by concentrating on one particular stimulus at a time, while women tend to process information more globally, responding to a number of stimuli simultaneously. The second difference is that men tend to respond to stimuli separately from the fields in which they occur, while women are apt to merge stimuli with their settings. As Kraft (1984) says, this difference corresponds to what Ernest Grombrich calls the two functions of perception -- looking at objects and scanning for order.

Some writers argue that such different thought patterns result in different knowledge construction by men and women. Daly (1978) sees male knowledge as incorporating reasoning and objectivity, while female knowledge uses intuition.

McMillan (1982), a philosopher building on the work of Peter Winch, seeks to understand the nature of differences between men and women. "She starts with the position of Simmel, who, writing in a post Hegelian tradition that placed a high value on mens' ability to reason, to think objectively

and analytically about matters of the world, assumed certain a priori differences between men and women which were manifested not only in bodily appearances but also in ways of perceiving the world. For Simmel, men are trying to overcome this perceived dichotomy between an object and the idea of the object, while women see no apparent duality but, rather, see the real and the idea of the real as the same. The kind of reasoning that men have to engage in women do not; through intuition they come to know the world in which they find themselves" (Farganis, 1986, p.152). McMillan agrees that men and women hold different analytic styles. However, she argues, it is erroneous to consider reason as operating only in those fields where men preside and intuition only in those endeavors undertaken by women; for, even in such women's activities as domestic pursuits and mothering, there are thoughts and concerns that are far distinct from the kind of non-reflective behaviors that characterize animal life and that some have argued parallel very much the kind of "natural" endeavors in which women find themselves involved. In addition, what is missing from assessments of intuition is how much of what the assessors regard as unreflective, inner knowledge is, in fact, knowledge based on experience (whether, as McMillan shows, it is the "experience of the wheelwright or the mother"). Traditional women's roles, like mothering and child-care, share with other human roles historically constituted behavior

that distinguishes it from animal behavior.

McDermott (1988, p.102) explains, "It seems plausible. . . that nature created a relationship between women and near or proximal experience; this relationship, especially its core focus on the needs of offspring, may well have promoted an affectively oriented subjective style of processing information. Concomitantly, the more distant experience characteristic of men may have favored a more objective habit of mind. What is self-evident is that nurturing and loving involve processing the information of close and near experience. One can fantasize or adore at a distance, but to take care of someone one has to be close enough to know the needs of the other person. . . [and] to nurture effectively one must be not only close but perceptive."

Harding (1983) discusses how men's and women's views differ in regard to the nature of rationality. "A rational person for women, values highly her abilities to empathize and 'connect' with particular others and wants to learn more complex and satisfying ways to take the role of the particular other in relationships. A rational person naturally has problems when there is too little connection with the particular others and when she is expected only to take the role of the generalized other.. . . For men, in contrast, a rational person values highly his ability to separate himself from others and to make decisions independent of what others

26

think--develop 'autonomy'. And he wants to learn more complex and satisfying ways to take the role of the generalized other. For a man, a rational person has problems when there is too great intimacy or connectedness with particular others, or when he is expected to take the role of a particular other" (Harding, 1983, pp. 52-53).

Similar views are expressed by others (Held, 1985; Harding, 1987) who argue that women may have a quite different understanding of the same reality that men perceive.

Thus women and men are seen to have different perceptions of power and its use. On that basis some argue (e.g., Flamming, 1984) that a plausible case exists for a distinctive women's politics. The major change, Flamming asserts, is a movement away from viewing the political world from the Hobbesian or Lockean perspective of competing, hostile individuals toward viewing the world as a "politics of connectedness."

Hartsock (1983) shows how women writing about power describe it not as domination or ability to control, but rather as capacity, particularly as capacity of and for the entire community. Kirkpatrick (1975) in her study of political women found that women saw power as an instrument of public purpose rather than as a tool for personal ambition.

Through a longitudinal analysis of bills initiated in the Arizona state legislature between 1949 and 1986, one study

(Saint-German, 1989) investigated the qualitative and quantitative changes in the effects of gender on public policy. It found that women legislators generally initiated more proposals than men in traditional women's interest areas (e.g., child care, abortion, education, welfare, family) and on feminist issues (e.g., comparable worth).

Some scholars not only emphasize the different world views of men and women but also argue that women's view is better. For example, Rose (1985) argues that the distinctive way in which the feminine mind sees the world is not only different but better. As she says, "There is an epistemology which arises from feminism's capacity to unify different knowledge derived from manual, mental, and emotional labor, and that in this unification of 'hands, heart and brain' lie the grounds for a more complete materialism, a truer knowledge, which will sustain a transformative program within science and within society" (1985, p.6).

Causes of such differences among men and women

Controversy exists not only regarding the nature and extent of gender differences, but also regarding the causes of such differences. Four broad perspectives can be identified in this respect: the biological, the psychoanalytic, learning and/or socialization, and the feminist perspective.

a. <u>The biological perspective</u>: Hormonal differences, particularly sex-steroid hormones, are among the most common

biological causes given for behavioral gender-related differences (Jacklin, 1989). However, exactly how hormones affect and are affected by human behavior are processes still not well understood.

The working theory about how the system works has been derived from animal research. "Briefly, the theory posits two types of effects: sensitization and activation. Sensitization is believed to occur during the prenatal period, when circulating hormones act to program the fetal brain in a number of ways. This early sensitization may itself affect later behavior. During and after puberty, circulating hormones then activate or interact with the sensitized brain to produce behavioral effects" (Jacklin, 1989, pp.128-129). It is still very difficult to obtain hormone measures in humans before birth. Nothing conclusive has yet been found from the few studies that have been conducted. In the case of the role of circulating hormones, too, no firm findings exist. It has become clear that the relationship between hormones and behavior in normal children and adolescents is complex, and hence the simple models of hormone-behavior relationships developed from animal research are not adequate to explain the data from the normal human population.

b. The psychoanalytic perspective: Nancy Chodorow (1978) has been the single most influential theorist within this perspective. She argues that neither biology nor role

29

training can explain why women become the mothering, nurturant sex or why the sexes are not symmetrical in status and personality qualities. "Unlike traditional psychoanalysts, Chodorow does not think anatomy is destiny or that sexual inequality is inevitable. But she does believe that feminine and masculine psyches develop differently as a result of unconscious processes, particularly those of the early mother-infant relationship" (Tavris & Wade, 1984, p.202).

She explains that because in our society women typically are in charge of child care, especially that of infants, the first emotional tie for both sexes is to a woman. This means in psychoanalytic parlance, that everyone is originally "feminine-identified." This identification makes gender a problematic issue for males: Boys face substantial pressures to deny their early attachment when it comes time for them to assume a masculine gender identity. Chodorow writes, "A boy, in order to feel himself adequately masculine, must distinguish and differentiate himself from others in a way that a girl need not--must categorize himself as someone apart. Moreover, he defines masculinity negatively as that which is not feminine" (Chodorow, 1978, p.174).

c. Socialization/learning perspective: Several theories share this perspective, viz. social learning, cognitive, and gender schema. Social learning theory was articulated by Mischel (1966). Briefly, from the very beginning of life, parents and

other caretakers treat boys and girls differently. [Children, it is believed, also choose to imitate models of the same sex.] In short, social learning depicts the child as a somewhat passive recipient of culturally transmitted information. Cognitive development theory was developed by Kohlberg (1966). According to this idea, children cannot understand generalized concepts such as their own sex and its accompanying gender-role expectations until their cognitive abilities are sufficiently developed to a stage or level at which they can understand the constancy of gender. One of the hallmarks of cognitive developmental theory is the role of the child as an active processor of culturally transmitted information.

Evidence both disconfirms and supports these two theories.

A more sophisticated variant of cognitive development theory and social learning theory is gender schema theory. A schema is a set of ideas that helps an individual organize information. Schemata are changing and evolving networks of associations that people use to organize new information and perhaps even to filter information when deciding what they will and will not process. Gender schemata develop from all the diverse information that a child acquires that has anything to do with gender. Included in this information can be modes of behavior, properties of objects, people's

31

attitudes, and even feeling states. A considerable body of research findings (e.g., Bem, 1981) documents the existence of gender schemata, even though this is a very new area of research. One additional area of research on socialization of gender is being done outside of developmental psychology by psychological anthropologists. In a landmark study, Whiting and Edwards (1988) have analyzed eleven cultures for differences by sex in dyadic interactions of adults with children and children with children of different ages. The authors conclude that we are the company we keep, i.e., if an individual spends enough time with infants, he or she will become a nurturer.

d. <u>The feminist perspective</u>: Some feminists explain the existence of a "different voice" by pointing to ways in which women's experience differs from men's.

For example, Farganis (1986) points out that "women as socially situated persons are different from men, who bring a new perspective to old problems, for sex is but another factor--like class, nationality, religion, epistemological tradition--affecting how one sees" (p.153).

Hartsock (1983), a feminist writer, gives a Marxist argument for the existence of a "different voice" among women. She explains that since persons see the world differently as a consequence of the material conditions that shape their lives, those who have power impose their vision or

standpoint on others. Those others have to struggle for their standpoint, and out of this struggle they come to see the world and themselves in the world more clearly.

Critique of the literature:

Several criticisms exist in the literature regarding the issue of women's "different voice"; criticisms have been offered by some feminists' scholars too (e.g., Farganis, 1986).

Thus, some feminists argue that sex roles are socially constructed with the intent of legitimating power relationships of some over other; they see this social construction as an artificial set of constraints which keeps women from becoming their real or true selves. While there is some truth to such a position others, like Rossi (1964) and McMillan (1982), point out that these feminists have overstated their case and have created disputes where none really exist.

McMillan (1982) argues that this view of social construction ignores the existence of certain givens, like birth, death, and sexual behavior, which condition or structure, and, in this sense, place limits upon what persons can and cannot do. There is, for McMillan, this "human fact of birth" with which one has to reckon; if one fails to do so one is rebelling "against nature" as well as against convention. Thus she suggests that the feminists' goal ought

to be to persuade society to value feminine abilities rather than to achieve either an equality or an androgyny that denies biology in favor of a technology that embodies male values.

Hare-Muslin and Marecek's (1988) argument captures much of the core of the feminists' argument that denies the existence of any "different voice." According to them, "The issue of gender differences has been a divisive one for feminist scholars. Some believe that differences affirm women's value and special nature; others are concerned that focusing on differences reinforces inequality, given that the power to define remains with men. A paradox is that efforts to affirm the special value of women's experience and their 'inner life' turn attention away from efforts to change the material conditions of women's lives and alleviate institutional sexism.. . . Another paradox arises from the assertion of a female way of knowing, involving intuition and experiential understanding, rather than logical abstraction. This assertion implies that all other thought is a male way of knowing, and if taken to an extreme, can be used to support the view that women are incapable of rational thought and of acquiring the knowledge of the culture" (p.462).

In contrast to the literature of the "different voice," several studies exist which document that there are no major sex differences. Eleanor Emmons Maccoby and Carol Nagy Jacklin's work (1974) is considered a seminal piece on this

issue. They make an exhaustive review of over fourteen hundred published studies on the psychology of gender differences. They report no significant gender differences in achievement motivation, general intelligence, cognitive style, nurturance, sociability, and love. They found only three major gender differences: boys' greater mathematical and visual-spatial ability, girls' greater verbal ability, boys' greater aggression. Later works (e.g., Jacklin, 1989) further argue for no significant gender differences. On the basis of this contrasting literature arguing no gender differences, a general attitude exists that women do not differ from men psychologically. However, it is important to realize that studies which fall under this literature focus on measuring abilities and skills; they do not focus on the differences of men and women in terms of their perceptions, thoughts, and attitudes regarding different issues and realities --**which is the focus of the literature of the "different voice."**

As argued by Tavris and Wade (1984, p.78), " . . . yes, men and women do differ, but the differences that matter most are not necessarily the ones that capture academic curiosity or the public stereotypes.. . . Differences in physical strength don't mean much. Differences in ability are minor. Differences in personality are elusive . . . but men and women do have different images of themselves and of how the world works; they seem to have different moral premises; they seem

to regard conflict and choice from different directions."

Some critics (e.g., Whitmont, 1980) point out that the "different voice" is found in men too; others (e.g., Grant, 1987) point to figures like Margaret Thatcher and Jean Kirkpatrick, whose use of power is, similar to men's.

In response to these criticisms, it can be recalled that the writers who hold that women have a different voice are claiming that there are more women than men who perceive the world in a different way from men. Thus, while describing feminine leadership, Loden (1985) argues, "The qualities that define feminine leadership are by no means characteristics limited exclusively to women. These traits can certainly be found among men as well. It is also true that there are individual women who are comfortable with a predominantly masculine style of leadership, just as there are individual men who find [the] feminine approach more natural. But the key distinction is that, as a class, women exhibit these particular leadership attributes to a far greater degree than do men. The fact that feminine leadership is a generalization, and may not apply to each individual, in no way makes it less valid, relevant, or meaningful" (p.4).

Furthermore, it can be argued that in the case of some women, masculine attitudes, male behaviors, and power style may be an adjustment to competition in a male-dominated setting.

As one can see from the above review that no common perspective exists on the issue of why men and women differ in terms of attitudes, viewpoints, and world views. Each of these perspectives has its own logic and rationales.

Researchers or theorists who believe that anatomy is destiny promulgate the biological point of view. Others who believe that the environment influences the individual uphold the socialization perspective. This researcher, however, thinks that a variety of forces are working in the development of an individual's individuality. It seems that biology has some bearings on the individual. Among other differences, the fact that infant boys like to play with balls, cars, and guns while infant girls like to play with teddy bears and dolls bears testimony to the biological effects on such differences. Some may argue that parents may have encouraged such a choice [of toys] among infants. However, the researcher's own personal experience, especially her immediate personal experience with her two year old son, showed that even though such a choice was not encouraged [it was actually discouraged], such a pattern in choosing different toys does exist.

In addition to recognizing such biological influences, this researcher also realizes the strong effects that socialization has on the individual. That the way individuals construct every-day reality is influenced/constrained by one's

37

socialization is a personal belief/assumption on the part of the researcher. These two, the biological and the socialization factors, are the data bases that this researcher have used to make sense of why such differences among men and women exist.

2. COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF MEN AND WOMEN IN ORGANIZATIONS.

Several comparative studies have been undertaken to examine whether women behave differently than men in the organizational setting. The focuses of these studies have mostly been on communication, leadership/management style, power style, motivation, decision-making, and conflict management.

In some aspects, these studies found that women are indeed different form men. Thus, in communication patterns some major differences are found between men and women. Jourard (1958) found that women generally seemed to communicate more openly than men. John E. Baird, Jr. and Patricia Hayes Bradley's study (1979) found that females gave more information and placed greater emphasis on happy interpersonal relationships; they also were more receptive to ideas offered by subordinates. Males were found to be more dominant, directive, and quicker to challenge others.

In leadership research mixed results abound. Some studies (Borgotta and Stimson, 1963; Heiss, 1962) provide

support to the view that female leaders are more consideration-oriented and male leaders are more task-oriented. Other studies (e.g., Kanter, 1979) found no such difference. Heinen, et al. (1975) have stated that women have particular difficulty in managing interpersonal conflict among subordinates due to their cultural conditioning, which encourages them to smooth over hostile feelings rather than confront them. Caudrea (1975) and Kanter (1977), on the other hand, were unable to find sex or job-level differences in the leadership abilities of experienced managers.

Some studies found women and men to differ in the importance of intrinsic values; men put more emphasis on self-expression and extrinsic factors, and women placed more value on social factors (e.g., Taylor and Thompson, 1976). In contrast, in Brenner and Tomkiewiz's study (1979), no such clear preferences were found.

Albrecht (1983) reviews several studies that indicate that professional women either exclude themselves or are excluded from informal interaction within the organization (Kanter, 1977; Lincoln & Millar, 1979; Kutner & Brogan, 1981). More recently, Brass (1985) refutes the notion that women do not differentiate formal from informal organizational structures as well as men do.

Such conflicting results are found in other areas (e.g., decision-making, power styles, motivation, work-values)

too.

Thus, at present, contradictory results seem to dominate most of these comparative studies.

Critique of the existing literature:

Comparative studies of men and women working within the organization in general have been criticized as follows:

Some argue (e.g., Summer and DeCoties, 1988; Cheismeir and Mills, 1989) that most gender differences in research are not the result of workers' gender but rather a function of other variables having nothing to do with gender. For example, Varea et al. (1983) surveyed 200 male and 192 female graduates with the hypotheses that (1) men and women would be most likely to differ in satisfaction with pay and promotion; and that (2) these differences would be moderated by occupational level. Their study supported their hypotheses that males reported relatively greater satisfaction with pay and promotion in the higher occupational levels, and relatively lower satisfaction in the lower occupational levels.

However, as Summer et al. (1985) argued, several factors like income level, type of organization, type of job, and tenure are not controlled for. They point out that males reported substantially higher incomes than did females. Since employee tenure was not controlled for, women reporting dissatisfaction may have had a legitimate grievance.

Comparative studies within the organization are limited in other ways too:

1) They do not explain whether women's behaviors, as found in the organization, reflect their natural behaviors as emanating from their "different voice" or their adjusted behaviors as emanating from their efforts to adjust to a male-dominated organizational setting. Several authors have pointed out that in order to succeed in organizations, women have had to follow masculine norms and values. As Grant (1988) argues, women have had to identify with and emulate the male model in order to progress in the organization. She explains (p. 57), "for many women. . . being successful in an organization means suppressing or eliminating attitudes and behaviors that would identify them as 'typically female,' and therefore as ill-suited for leadership roles [as those roles are currently defined]" (p.57).

Furthermore, much of the discussion about gender in the management literature suggests that if women expect to succeed they must learn and adopt the behavior of the dominant gender. As Rosener and Pearce (1989, p.56) comment, "this message is communicated in the proliferation of books which tell women how to be assertive, more competitive, and less emotional, i.e., more male-like."

Considering the above reality, many studies comparing men and women within organizations are limited in the sense that

they do not focus on the processes which give rise to individuals' behavior within the organization.

2) Most of these studies use fixed scales or closed-ended questionnaires. The assumption guiding such a research methodology and method is that the researcher, who in most cases is a man, knows all the responses of his or her informants. [The fallacy of such an assumption in studies of gender seems obvious.]

3. THE LITERATURE ON ROLE THEORY & ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE THEORY.

B.J. Biddle (1986), in a review of the literature on role theory classifies the literature into five groups: functional, cognitive, structural, symbolic interactionist, and organizational. Functional role theory, in general, focuses on the characteristic behaviors of persons who occupy social positions within a stable social system. "Roles" are conceived as the shared, normative expectations that prescribe and explain these behaviors. Works by Parsons (1951), Parsons and Shils (1951), and Bates and Harvey's (1975) represent the functional approach. Norms are conceived as guiding behaviors. The functional approach is open to criticism first because it ignores other cognitive processes that might affect roles, and second because it fails to allow for the inherent instability of social systems.

Symbolic interactionist role theory upholds the view that

actual roles reflect a combination of norms, attitudes, contextual demands, negotiation, and the evolving definition of the situation as understood by the actors. Works by Heiss (1981), Gordon and Gordon (1982), and Turner (1979, 1978) take the symbolic interactionist position. The focuses of this approach are mostly on development of role identities, the learning of rules, and the enactment of roles. As Biddle (1986) argues, symbolic interactionist theory gives little attention to the actor's expectations for other persons or to structural constraints upon expectations and roles.

Structural role theory focuses on "social structures" conceived as stable organizations of sets of persons (called "social positions" or "statuses") who share the same, patterned behaviors ("role") that are directed toward other sets of persons in the structure (Biddle, p.73). Its focus is more on the social environment and less on the individual. Hence, the major criticism against this approach centers on its neglecting the individual who can think and act freely.

Cognitive role theory focuses on the relationship between role expectations and behaviors. Attention has been given to social conditions that give rise to expectations, to techniques for measuring expectations, and to the impact of expectations on social conduct. Janis and Mann's (1977) work on role playing, Moreland and Levine's (1982) work on group norms, and Brewer et al. (1981) work on anticipatory role

expectations represent some of the works done in this approach. This approach has been criticized as being too contextual, i.e., based on American culture only, and for tending to ignore the evolving character of human interactions (Biddle, 1986, p.76).

The focus of **organizational role theory** is on social systems that are considered as preplanned, task-oriented, and stable. Roles in such studies are assumed to be associated with identified social position and to be generated by normative expectations, but norms may vary among individuals and may reflect both the official demands of the organizations and the pressure of informal groups. Kahn et al. (1964) and Gross et al.'s (1958) works are the earliest seminal works on organizational role studies.

Most of the work done on organizational role focuses on role conflict, ambiguity, role transition and role perception. Role conflict is defined as incongruity of expectations associated with a role. Conflicts over scarce resources, diversity of role senders, and inadequate feedback mechanisms have been identified as leading causes of role conflict. Baird (1969), Haas (1964), Miles (1976) --are some of the researchers whose works focus mostly on identifying the causes of role-conflict.

Several types of role conflicts have been identified: intra-sender role conflict, inter-sender role conflict,

person-role conflict, inter-role conflict, and role overload. The best documented outcomes of role conflict are job dissatisfaction and job-related tension, which have been isolated among a variety of occupational groups (e.g., Brief & Aldag, 1976; Gross et al. 1958; House & Rizzo, 1972; Miles, 1976).

Role conflict has been demonstrated to be correlated with several other organizationally dysfunctional outcomes, among them unsatisfactory work group relationships, (French and Caplan, 1972), slower and less accurate group performance (Liddel & Slocum, 1976) and unfavorable attitudes toward role senders (Miles, 1976).

Studies of the effects of role ambiguity documented greater concern with own vs. work-group performance, lower actual and perceived group productivity, less concern or involvement with one's group, and lower job satisfaction. Caplan and Jones's (1975) study falls within this concern. Some contradictory results exist, too, however. For example, Tosi's (1971) study found no relationship between role ambiguity and tension or anxiety, whereas most studies report a positive relationship between these two factors.

Fried et al.'s study (1986) measured the role perceptions of physicians, nurses, and administrative personnel in a medical setting. It was hypothesized that differences in perception are related to professional aspiration level, and

that the greatest differences in perception would be related to the functions carried out by groups with the highest level of professional aspiration. The results confirmed these hypotheses. Nurses, highest in professional aspiration level among the three groups, showed consistently different perceptions in their role as compared with other groups' perceptions of their role.

Allen and van de Vliert's (1984) work represents studies which focus on role transition. Their works present theory and application papers focused on problems generated when the actor must cope with changes in social position or expectations for the actor's position.

Gender differences in organizational role perceptions and performance:

Few studies have been carried on to compare gender differences among similar positions within the organizational context. Through a longitudinal analysis of bills initiated in the Arizona state legislature between 1949 and 1986, Saint-German's study (1989) investigates qualitative and quantitative changes in the effects of gender on public policy. Women legislators generally initiated more proposals then men in traditional women's interest areas (e.g., child care, education, health, education) and on feminist issues (e.g., comparable worth). The author argues that such differences can be seen in the number, subject matter, and

46

enactment rate of women's bills as the proportion of women in the state legislature increased. This study suggests that proportional group size may be one important consideration in the evaluation of the impact of gender on public policy.

Thompson (1981) analyzed the role perceptions of women in the ninety-fourth U. S. Congress (1975-1976). She based her analysis on four different types of roles developed by Davidson (1969): tribune (advocate of popular needs); ritualist (mastery in legislature procedure); inventor (policy innovation); broker (balancing diverse interests); and opportunist (politics for reelection). In personal interviews with twelve congresswomen, Thompson found that most women tended to be either tribunes or inventors. Men, on the other hand, were found to be either tribunes or ritualists. However, none of the women appeared to be ritualists. Thompson tied such a difference to the fact that most women were predominantly democratic and hence provided an explanation of the popularity of the inventor role among those women.

Fry et al.'s study (1980) examined attitudinal differences between male and female members of the police. He used different measures based on the short form on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Porter's organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and fourteen items of role conflict and ambiguity as constructed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman.

Results showed no significant differences in attitudes on measures of organization commitment, job satisfaction, work anxiety, role conflict, and role ambiguity.

Critique of the literature:

Organizational role theory shares most of the concerns of the functionalist approach. Thus it assumes that roles are generated by normative expectations and that organizations are stable rational entities. Furthermore, as Biddle (1986) argues, its assumptions preclude the study of roles that evolve or roles that are generated by non-normative expectations.

Some critiques have focused on the methodological issues. For example, Van Sell et al. (1981), in their review of the literature on Role Conflict and Ambiguity, report that almost half of the studies that they have reviewed are based on self-report instruments developed by their authors to discover correlates of conflict and ambiguity for particular occupations, or across several occupations in field studies. Most of these scales consist of several general questions, although some focus on specific job activities. Van Sell et al. argue that the factor structure and the reliability of these instruments are, for the most part, unreported. Similar concerns are raised by McGee et al. (1989), who applied Confirmatory factor analysis to the conflict and ambiguity scales developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1977). McGee

48

_et al_. concluded that the fourteen items constituting the scales did not measure role conflict and role ambiguity as two factorially independent constructs.

Few studies that have been undertaken to compare men's and women's perception of their roles suffer from the same delimitations that most comparative studies share, e.g., use of the closed-ended questionnaire. In almost all cases, however, the focus is on measuring the informants' behaviors; causes of such behaviors are not given detailed consideration. In short, what women think about the organizational world, or how they perceive the organizational world is missing from these research works.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This section discusses in detail the methodology and method of this study.

METHODOLOGY

The discussion on methodology will focus on the following:

1. Ethnomethodology

2. Ethnomethodology and conventional role analysis.

3. Framework for the analysis of individuals' work-role construction.

1. ETHNOMETHODOLOGY

This study uses ethnomethodology as its perspective in studying the phenomenon of individuals' work-role construction.

As explained by Garfinkel (1967), ethnomethodology "seeks to treat practical activities, practical circumstances, and practical sociological reasoning as topics of empirical study, and by paying to the most common-place activities of daily life the attention usually to accorded extraordinary events, seeks to learn about them as phenomena in their own right" (p.1).

Thus, ethnomethodologists aim to illuminate the world as an object of common-sense perceptions and actions. In its essence, ethnomethodology broadly concerns the how of social structure --how social groupings emerge, how a sense of social structure builds up, how members make available to one another the organized character of their activities. Ethnomethodology, therefore, emphasizes processes.

Ethnomethodology belongs to what has been referred to as the 'subjectivist'/'humanistic' tradition of social inquiry in contrast to the objectivist or positivistic tradition. The intellectual origins of both these traditions go back at least to the philosophical debates of the 17th century.

The view which eventually predominated, and from which the objectivist or positivist tradition derives, is that

reality consisted of what was available to the senses, and that all knowledge has to have its basis in sensory experience.   In other words it posits the independent existence of an external world, independent of human subjectivity, which is made known to us by its acting upon our senses.   This tradition upholds the same logic of inquiry or method that is applicable in natural sciences.

The humanistic tradition emerged as challenging the positivist approach.   Humanists draw a firm distinction between natural and human phenomena, and they claim that each realm requires different methods of study.   Within the humanistic tradition, there are various approaches, viz. phenomenology, existentialism, symbolic interactionism, interpretive sociologies, and ethnomethodology.

Though often very different in both the theories they espouse and the methods they recommend, according to Morris (1977), each of these approaches to the study of social life shares the following assumptions:

(1) Human beings are not merely acted upon by social facts or social forces but are constantly shaping and creating their own social worlds in interaction with others,

(2)   Special methods are required for the study and understanding of these uniquely human processes.   The assumption is that human society and its history can be understood only in terms of meanings and not in the causal

categories of natural sciences.

Benson and Hughes (1983) refer to two types of ethnomethodologists: linguistic and situational. The linguistic ethnomethodologists (e.g., Cicourel, Sacks) focus upon the use of language and the ways in which conversations in everyday life are structured. "Their analysis makes much of the unstated, 'taken for granted' meanings, the use of indexical expression and the way in which conversations convey much more than is actually said" (Burrel & Morgan, 1982, p.249).

The situational ethnomethodologists (e.g., McHugh, 1968) cast their views over a wider range of social activity and seek to understand the ways in which people negotiate the social contexts in which they find themselves.

Garfinkel's study of Agnes

At this point it is important to discuss briefly one of Garfinkel's major works, his study on Agnes, to facilitate understanding and appreciation of the ethnomethodological approach. Garfinkel (1967) posits from the position that from the point of view of any actor, including ourselves, society is encountered as an external, given, pre-formed reality. The world is profoundly there as a world of everyday life, full of routine ways and familiar scenes. Garfinkel proposes to study this fact, avoiding the issue raised by the distinction between 'how the world really is' and 'how it appears to them'

by examining the social-world-as-it is experienced. His intention is to produce a better understanding of the way in which daily life acquires its objectivity, factuality, and so on.

Garfinkel's study of Agnes (1967) is a classic of ethnomethodology. The problem that exercised Garfinkel's interest in his study of the intersexed person, Agnes, was how Agnes 'passed' as a normal female despite the fact that she ran the constant risk of exposure. Agnes, at the time of the study, was a nineteen-year-old girl who had been raised as a boy. In addition to female measurements of 38-25-38, she had a fully developed penis and scrotum. Instead of asking such common sociological questions as the child's relationship to his/her parents or any ambiguous role model, Garfinkel's interest sought to find out how she passed as a normal female.

Agnes had achieved her claimed rights to female status while possessing bodily features which were manifestly male. For Garfinkel, Agnes was a practical methodologist. Because of her position she had to be extremely sensitive to the background and largely tacit features of interaction which 'normals' might see but not notice. At age 18, she applied to the UCCLA medical center for a sex-change operation. Garfinkel gathered information about Agnes while participating in an investigation of her eligibility for surgery. For the most part, his information originated in a series of

interviews that he conducted with Agnes during the
investigation. He gathered two types of information:

(1) Her version of events that were known by Garfinkel only
through her description. She described many of the techniques
she employed to conceal her physical irregularities and to
overcome her inexperience as a woman to convey that she was a
woman and also to make sense of herself as a woman.

(2) Information about Agnes's conduct during the investi-
gation. He directly observed this conduct. To be judged
eligible for the operation, Agnes needed to convince the
hospital staff that she was morally and psychologically a
woman. She was observed to manipulate the information she
presented to bolster that case. She idealized her past by
emphasizing her female characteristics and her success as a
woman. She minimized any favorable male experiences and
failures as a woman.

Garfinkel's stance is methodological rather than
philosophical. His study of Agnes points out that any and all
our inferences and findings about her 'femininity' are based
on what Agnes herself says and does. He is not concerned with
the truth or validity of her claims. Therefore, in general
terms, his concern is with the investigation of individuals'
method for producing the world of everyday life.

Central concepts and assumptions of ethnomethodology

The following comprise the central concepts and

assumptions of ethnomethodology:

Interpretive rules: Ethnomethodologists uphold the view that by employing different interpretive strategies members create a "sense of structure"; consequently, social reality is a practical accomplishment of the actor.

Ethnomethodologists have so far identified six interpretive procedures employed in creating a "sense of structure": (1) reciprocity of perspectives, (2) "Et Cetera Assumptions," (3) the film of continuity, (4) normal forms, (5) the reflexibility of talk, and (6) descriptive vocabularies as indexical expressions.

Indexicality: This means that the meaning of individuals' everyday talk is dependent on the context in which the talk occurs. That is, to understand a utterance, members must also know something about the particular circumstances in which the utterance was made, who the speaker was, the previous course of the talk, and so on. Thus, to make sense of different communications, members pay attention to the available contextual features (words, story, events, actions, or whatever) to achieve an interpretation.

Reflexivity: For ethnomethodology, the facts about society are features accomplished by the members of society using practical reasoning and common-sense knowledge in the course of their everyday lives. In this way, accounts of society and its workings become constituent parts of the very

thing they describe. They are, in short, reflexive.

Documentary method of interpretation: For Garfinkel, an "approximate description" of the process that best fits how professional and lay sociologist researchers actually go about their work as a practical activity is the "documentary method of interpretation." As Benson & Hughes point out (1983, p.89), the work done by researchers to make the correspondence between, or to justify the inference from, the concrete instances of talk, actions, and so forth, [that transpire in the data collection setting, and the general theoretical categories] are unexplicated. A body of knowledge of social structures is assembled, but we are not told how this is done.

The documentary interpretation of action is a process in which participants see each other's actions as expression of patterns, the patterns enabling them to see what the actions are. So that "on any occasion in the course of the interactions, the actions that the participants see each other performing are seen as such in terms of the meanings of the context, and the context in turn is understood to be what it is through these same actions" (McHugh, 1968, p.69).

A central feature of documentary interpretation is that later expressions or later actions may provoke a reinterpretation of the perceived pattern which, in turn, results in a reinterpretation of what the previous appearances "really were."

2. ETHNOMETHODOLOGY AND CONVENTIONAL ROLE ANALYSIS

The commitment of ethnomethodology to take into account the actor's own interpretive processes requires a modification of the methodological stance of much traditional role analysis.

Conventional role theory/analysis is based on the assumption that recognizable expectations govern everyday appearances. As Gross, Mason, & McEachern report, "Expectations are presumed by most role theorists to be an essential ingredient in any formula for predicting social behavior" (1958, p.18).

In ethnomethodology, social roles are viewed as epistemological constructs rather than ontological givens. Reality is a tenuous construct by the actor for his or her "purpose-at-hand" in creating order among multiple social stimuli, thus generating a sense of social structure.

For example, Cicourel (1970) suggests that uses of such labels as "status" and "role" are practical language games for simplifying the task of summarizing a visual field and complex stimuli "that are difficult to describe in some precise, detailed way" (1970, p.21).

Pfohl (1975), in an elaborate discussion of the ethnomethodologists' criticisms of conventional role theory, points out four major differences:

1. <u>Role theory presumes the existence of social structure</u>

whereas ethnomethodology sees social structure as an ongoing accomplishment of social actors.

In traditional analysis, roles are defined in terms of the consequences they have for existing patterns of social relations. In the language of Ralph Linton (1936) roles are the "building blocks of the social system" which link the individual to the system.

In contrast to this position, ethnomethodologists suggest that structure is but a construct in the consciousness of actors. They suggest that through different interpretive procedures actors create a "sense of structure" instead of facing a social structure. Therefore, this "sense of structure" is a practical accomplishment of the actor.

2. Role theory conceives of roles as behavioral expectations impinging on the actor whereas ethnomethodology sees roles as "types" constructed by actors.

These theories differ in conceiving behavioral expectations as "out there" (beyond a given actor's consciousness) or as "inside" the cognitive types created by an actor (within the actor's consciousness). In the first instance, the actor is understood to more or less fulfill expectations if she/he is to take her/his place properly in a social world. In the second she/he is seen as construing types of people which become her/his social world.

Egon Bittner's study (1969) of police "peace-keeping"

59

activities on "skid row" can be used as an example here. Certain persons are cast into violator roles, not because their behaviors are any different from others, but because police "know" that this type in that context means trouble for all if not stopped now. Thus, the types were the accomplishment of the various interpretive strategies.

3. Role theory conceives of socialization as the process whereby role expectation becomes internalized, whereas ethnomethodology sees socialization as the development of interpretive procedures by which actors create roles. To the ethnomethodologists, these are surface rules only. They hold that there are a repertoire of interpretive procedures which facilitates the actors' generation of what appear to be role requisites. Surface rules are internalized through socialization.

4. Role theory conceives of role performance as normatively sanctioned, whereas ethnomethodology sees role performance as the generation of surface norms by basic interpretive norms.

The distinction lies between a focus on surface rules as things in themselves as opposed to these as only creations of more basic interpretive strategies. The processes of subjective interpretation are emphasized in contrast to the presumed existence of objective contingencies.

3. FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUALS' WORK-ROLE CONSTRUCTION

As argued earlier, the commitment of ethnomethodology to take into account the actor's own interpretive processes requires a modification of the methodological stance of much traditional role analysis. The focus has to be on the subjective process of role creation. Accordingly, this study describes the construction of work-roles, on the part of the role-occupants, as a process which incorporates the following elements:

1. Role-occupant's expectations from his/her role.

2. Role-occupant's making sense of organizational expectations regarding his/her role.

3. Role-occupant's constructing his/her negotiated role.

These elements are described below:

1. Role-occupant's expectations from his/her role.

Role-occupant's expectations include the way he/she sees his/her role and/or would like his/her role to be.

2. Role-occupant's making sense of organizational expectations regarding his/her role.

The concept "sensemaking" implies that in every situation the individual, surrounded by an environment of ambiguous information, tries to make sense of things by reading and interpreting signs/symbols as texts; often trying to get behind the surface and disclose the underlying significance.

In the context of role construction, sensemaking involves reading and interpreting organizational expectations regarding the occupant's role behaviors.

Organizational expectations are found in the job description and in all other role-occupants' expectations (regarding his/her role) who have a vested interest in how he/she performs his/her role. Organizational expectations are expressed overtly (e.g., making demands, evaluative remarks) or covertly (e.g., signs, non-verbal communications).

Making sense of organizational expectations of one's work-role thus involves the process of reading and interpreting the job descriptions, figuring out who the "other role-occupants" are, and reading and interpreting information/signs which deliver their expectations regarding his/her role.

This created reality, the result of the sensemaking process, may or may not fit precisely with the concrete "facts" surrounding a certain organization. The presence or absence of alignment is not of particular importance; what is salient is that the individual perceives and behaves in accordance with these constructed realities (Brown, 1986). Thus, to dismiss these constructions on the basis that they lack factual "significance" may result in a narrow view of life within the organization that neglects a large body of rich information.

3. <u>Role-occupant's constructing his/her negotiated role</u>.

The concept of negotiated order emphasizes the tension between the individual and the structure and the emergent nature of roles. Negotiated order assumes that change is inevitable and continuous, and it recognizes that individuals and groups continually make adjustment to the situations in which they find themselves.

As applied to role construction, this concept implies that the individual makes a compromise between his/her expectations and the organization's expectations; however, the degree and nature of compromise vary from individual to individual. Negotiation theorists reject the radical phenomenological position that all negotiations are feasible. They hold that some actors have more power and greater control than others.

METHOD

Discussions on method will focus on the following:

1. Data collection

2. Questions asked

3. Sample of the study

4. Data analysis

5. Validity of the study

Data Collection

Ethnomethodology stresses the need to focus on the actor's experience itself in order to understand the phenomenon at hand. It, thus, necessitates nonpositivistic methods of data collection to treat "lived social realities." Usually, it subscribes to some combination of "hard" empirical data -e.g., films, tape recording, written description- and first-hand observation and participation.

This study uses several methods to collect data/information. These are discussed below:

(1) Indepth interviews: In indepth interviews, the researcher prepares a list of standardized questions, but during the course of an actual interview, the use of a specific question is guided by the progress of that interview. Based on the interviewees' responses, new questions are asked.

This study uses the indepth interview because it offers the following advantages:

(i) The interviewer has the opportunity to cast questions in

terms that are clear to a specific respondent and can ask the same question in a variety of different ways if there is doubt as to the respondent's comprehension.

(ii) Questions and response categories can be tailored to fit the respondent's way of looking at things.

The way this study conducted indepth interviews was that at first questions were prepared which were posited in front of each of the informants. The sequence of asking these questions varied from informant to informant. Some informants needed more explanation of a particular question or words used in a question; each informant's individuality was taken into account in deciding what to ask, as well as when and how to ask it. Based on the informants' discussion/responses, new questions were asked. The informant was given the opportunity to speak out on any issue in response to the questions asked. Any theme/discussion which appeared to be important was pursued by asking new questions.

The interviews were carried out on a one-to-one basis, and on the average each lasted for about one and a half hours.

After the first phase of the interview was over, some issues emerged which appeared to be important. So some informants were later contacted over the phone for a second phase of data collection.

(2) Written questionnaire: After the interview was over, each informant was asked to fill out a short questionnaire which

basically documented some of their background characteristics.

(3) Job Description: All the informants' official job descriptions were analyzed as part of knowing the organizational expectations of the informants' role.

(4) Field-work journal: A field work journal was kept which recorded the researcher's experiences, ideas, and problems that arose during the interviews. It also recorded the different expressions, feelings, ways of talking, and various nonverbal clues that were exhibited by the informants during the course of the interview.

(5) Telephone conversation: Each of the informants was contacted at first over the telephone. Later on, during the second phase of data collection, some of them were contacted again. The information and insights gathered during these telephone conversations appeared to be valuable later on.

Questions Asked

In addition to asking new questions based on each of the respondent's discussion of different issues, the following standard questions were asked of all informants:

THE STANDARDIZED QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Regarding occupant's expectations

1. Could you describe to me what you think your role is?

2. Why do you think that these are your role/roles?

3. What do you think a departmental role ought to be? Why do

you think so?

4. Considering a situation where you are given complete freedom to design your role -- what would you like to do?

II. Regarding occupant's making sense of organizational expectations.

1. Who are the other people whose expectations influence your role behavior?

2. What do these different actors expect from you?

3. How do you know that these are their expectations?

III. Regarding role-occupant's constructing a negotiated work-role:

1. How different is your role now as compared to your expectation when you first joined this position?

2. How much choice do you have in shaping your role?

3. If you want to do something new (may be a new project), what strategy do you usually follow? If your project fails to get approval, what would be your next step?

4. What are the factors you see as constraining your freedom to design your role in any way you would want to?

OTHER QUESTIONS

Some new questions (not formulated beforehand) were asked based on what the informants were saying. Some of those appeared to shed valuable insights in comprehending the informants' discussion. The following are those questions:

1. Could you tell me why you made the decision to join this

position as the Chair?

2. Did you had some idea regarding your role when you first joined this position?

3. If you had some idea of your role at that time, do you remember how your idea was formed?

4. Do you think now that your role is different from what you had expected?

5. Has there been any shift in your role since you have assumed this position?

6. How much are you satisfied with your job?

7. What are the things that you like most about your job?

8. What are the things that you dislike most about your job?

9. Are there any conflicting expectations regarding your role?

10. If there are some conflicting expectations, how do you deal with those?

11. In a conflicting situation (e.g., conflict among the faculty) what is your strategy to deal with that situation?

12. Have you recently thought of changing your job?

13. What kind of a job are you interested in?

SHORT WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE

The short questionnaire had the following questions:

1. Your age:

2. No. of months/years in this department:

3. No. of months/years in this position?

4. Any previous job experiences in administrative posi-
tion/positions: Yes   No

5. If the answer is "yes" for question no.4, list those job
title/titles:

Sample size

In qualitative research no general guidelines exist
regarding the sample size. A review of some studies which
have used indepth interviews shows a variety of sample size.
For example, Kahn's (1984) study of exaltation experience had
nine respondents; Krielkamp's (1984) study of psychological
closeness had twenty respondents; Lindsay-Hartz's (1980) two
studies on guilt and shame experience had nineteen and twelve
respondents respectively; Goodman's (1979) study of the impact
of change on members of contemporary society had 150
respondents; and Strub et al.'s (1976) study had forty-four
respondents. The sample of these studies varied in terms of
the available resources, time, and number of interviewers.
Thus, Goodman's (1979) study was conducted over a four-year
period, and Strub's (1976) study had two interviewers.

The reason for having a small sample in qualitative
research is tied to the fact that the utility of such a
research lies in the extent to which each of the respondents
informs us. The philosophy of qualitative research emphasizes
the importance of understanding the respondents' experiences

69

of the phenomena being investigated. Thus efforts are made to get as much information as possible from each of the respondents. Under such a situation, if the number of respondents is not narrowed down to a manageable number, the data/information may become unwieldy.

There is also a disregard for generalizability among qualitative researchers; their argument is that it is unimportant, unachievable, or both. Many qualitative researchers actively reject generalizability as a goal. For example Denzin (1983) prefers "thick description" to broad generalizations:

"The interpretivist rejects generalization as a goal and never aims to draw randomly selected samples of human experience. For the interpretivist every instance of social interaction, if thickly described (Geertz, 1973), represents a slice from the life world that is the proper subject matter for interpretive inquiry. Every topic . . . must be seen as carrying its own logic, sense of order, structure, and meaning" (pp.133-134).

The sample of this study consists of twelve respondents, six women and six men, each of whom is working as the head of an academic department in a university. Two universities were chosen as research sites. Half of the informants (three men and three women) were from one university and the other half (three men and three women) were from another university.

The justification of the above sample size is based on the following considerations:

1. It is anticipated that, at present, in the university setting, very few women will be found who are occupying the position of the head of an academic department.

2. All the interviews and the data analysis were conducted by the researcher herself.

Data Analysis

All the interviews were taped and later transcribed. The transcripts of these interviews were carefully analyzed. For example, after reading through the material to get a sense of the whole, each transcript was divided into units of meanings (each different idea that the respondent expressed).

After eliminating repetitions, a list of themes/categories was developed and analyzed in terms of the framework of this study. To do the mechanical aspect of data analysis, this study used a computer program, designed for qualitative researchers, called THE ETHNOGRAPH. THE ETHNOGRAPH enables the researcher to code, recode, and sort data files into analytic categories. As Seidal et al. (1988) says, "What was once done with pencils, scissors, and paste, can now be accomplished almost entirely with your personal computer."

Thus, through this software each of the ideas/themes that belonged to a particular broader theme was sorted and brought

together. Later on, the insights gathered from the field-work journal, telephone conversations, job descriptions, and the short questionnaire were all used to get a comprehensive and meaningful understanding of what the informants said during the interviews.

All the different themes were then displayed in tables and compared among the various respondents.

Validity of the study

The issue of establishing the validity of a study is a crucial one for both the researcher and the reader. According to Eisner and Peshkin (1990, p.97), "Validity, in a basic sense, pertains to the congruence of the researcher's claims to the reality his or her claims seek to represent. Valid interpretations and conclusions function as surrogates through which readers of research reports can know a situation they have not experienced directly."

In order to enhance its validity, this study followed Wolcott's suggestions. Wolcott (1990) developed nine criteria for enhancing the validity of a study. This study uses those criteria too. These are the following:

1. Talk little, listen a lot.

During the interview, informants were allowed to discuss or talk as much as they wanted on any issue. Sometimes they talked about different issues not related to the questions asked. Nevertheless, they were never interrupted. The spirit

of indepth interview requires such freedom of speech on the part of the informant.

2. Record accurately.

All the interviews were tape-recorded. They were later on transcribed by the researcher herself.

3. Begin writing early.

As mentioned earlier, the informants were all contacted over the phone. All issues that came up during this initial telephone conversation, including my initial impression of each of the informants, were documented in the journal. Before the interview, some questions were developed based on this initial impression. Writing on the informants thus had begun before the indepth interview.

4. Let the readers see for themselves.

In order to maintain the study's validity, quotes from the interviewees were provided during data analysis and reporting.

5. Report fully --even if data do not fit in the research.

All the information that was gathered through the different methods of data collection was reported. Some data did not bear any impact on the research findings, while others appeared to be irrelevant. However, all these were reported simply out of the understanding that such description will enable one to have a comprehensive idea of the informants.

6. Be a candid researcher.

During the writing, at several points my own personal feelings and reactions were also expressed.

7. Seek feedback.

Several individuals were consulted before the development of the final set of questions that were later posited to the informants. After the interview was over, some of the informants were asked for their suggestions regarding any questions that they thought were relevant or important to the phenomena being studied.

8. Try to achieve balance.

This means sorting the issue of how much the researcher's own personal feelings and biases have influenced the reporting and analysis of the findings. In this case, transcripts were read and reread several times; these were assessed in light of the information gathered through other methods. The objective was to ensure that the account that the researcher has created squares with the information revealed by the informants themselves.

9. Write accurately.

Since the interviews were tape-recorded, meeting this criterion was not a problem. As for the telephone conversations, attempts were made to write down, as much as possible, the informants' own syntax and diction.

This study, through meeting all these criteria, has tried to maintain the validity of the analysis. However, one has

also to acknowledge what Kant concluded long ago. "Kant argued that it is impossible to talk of the nature of reality with any sense of certainty because we can never know reality independent of the cognitive structures that influenced our perceptions" (Donmoyer, 1990, p.181).

CHAPTER IV

NARRATIVES OF THE INFORMANTS

This chapter presents the twelve informants of this study. In the first of the sections that follow, certain background characteristics of these informants are provided. Later, each informant is introduced and presented in terms of what he/she said/talked about during the interview. The informants' talks/discussions are organized in terms of both the previously explained framework of work-role construction and also any new theme/themes that emerged. **No analysis has been done in this section. However, my own personal impressions of these informants and my observances and readings of some of their non-verbal communications are also reported here.**

For the sake of maintaining anonymity, the informants are given pseudonyms. The names of the universities and the departments where these informants are working are also not mentioned.

Narratives are provided in terms of giving direct quotations from the taped transcripts. Also, at several points the quotation marks (") have been used to indicate the informants own syntax and dictions.

1. BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INFORMANTS

Certain background characteristics of the informants are gathered during the study. These are presented in the following tables.

TABLE-A

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FEMALE INFORMANTS

Informants	Age	University's size (Students)	College/ School	No. of students (approx.)	No. of Faculty	Faculty Composition
Mary	50	11,500	Arts & Sciences	275	16	Females = 11 Males = 5
Nancy	44	11,500	Nursing	400-500	13	All Females
Victoria	54	11,500	Business	300-350	6	Females = 4 Males = 2
Barbara	46	24,926	Arts & Sciences	121	22	Females = 3 Males = 19
Judith	51	24,926	Human Resource	258	19	Females = 14 Males = 5
Kathryn	62	24,926	Human Resource	185	10	All females

TABLE-B

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MALE INFORMANTS

Informants	Age	University's Size (student)	College/ School	No. of students (approx.)	No. of Faculty	Faculty Composition
James	50	24,926	Human Resource	300	11	Females = 4 Males = 7
Steve	52	24,926	Arts & Sciences	1,200	104	Females = 59 Males = 45
Robert	52	11,500	Arts & Sciences	450	22	Females = 2 Males = 20
George	50	11,500	Arts & Sciences	500-600	8	Females = 1 Males = 7
Richard	41	11,500	Health, Physical Ed. & Recreation	500	25	Females = 5 Males = 20
David	68	24,926	Business	650	7	All Males

2. NARRATIVES OF THE INFORMANTS

INFORMANT # 1: Judith

Judith, age 51, is the chairperson of a department within the college of Human Resources. She has been working in this position for a year. When I first contacted her over the phone for an interview, she seemed to be very cautious and somewhat unwilling to sit for the interview. She wanted to know very clearly what my theses's topic and objectives were. For almost half-an-hour, we talked about my theses. At one point she expressed her doubts about the small sample size: she thought that it was an inadequate sample size. She also asked me to send her a copy of my proposal. While talking with her over the phone, I got the impression that she was a very cautious person, who wanted to know very clearly all relevant issues before making any commitments, and that she was a very good listener.

A few days later, I called her back and at that time, having read my proposal, she agreed to sit for an interview. I was, to some extent, surprised when I met her. In contrast to my expectations, I saw a very friendly and relaxed person who was very eager and interested to talk. She helped me plug in my tape-recorder. She smiled a lot and maintained eye-contact almost constantly. Her door was open while we were talking.

Judith has been here in this department for almost

sixteen years. The department has undergraduate, master's and a Ph.D. programs.

According to Judith, when she applied as a candidate for this position, she had not put too much thoughts. She actually thought that probably she would not be selected and therefore was surprised when she was offered the position. As she said, "I had about two weeks to think about my job." She feels that it is important for her to ease into this new position and gradually make sense of her role.

Role Definition

When Judith started to talk about her role, she pauses several times-- seemingly still trying to figure out what it was. She then defines her role in several dimensions:

1. as a facilitator,

2. as a listener to students,

3. as an advisor to student and faculty, and

4. as a moderator, i.e., a communicating bridge between the faculty and the dean.

Several times, she mentions that these should be her role and that she thinks that these are her role. She defines her role as a facilitator in a broad way: "facilitating somebody or something to happen." So in her facilitator role she is including management too.

She also "feels" that she should spend time on developing a good working atmosphere within the department. She says

that her previous idea about her role has changed. There have been some surprises, as she says, "I did not know how much on a daily basis . . . how much work there was that you have to respond to."

Organizational Expectations

Judith refers to the dean, the faculty, the students (graduate and undergraduates) and staff while discussing other's expectations. Judith is "sure" that the dean expects her to administer the department efficiently, to solve problems/issues within the department and to treat each faculty member individually. As she explains:

> "He would expect you to treat people equally fairly . . . to consider each faculty member individually . . . to treat them as fairly as possible."

The faculty, she thinks, expects her to be assertive in seeking resources, and to handle the paperwork efficiently.

With regard to the students' expectations, she emphasizes listening to their problems. She feels it is important because, as she explains, "You know they do not have anyone else to turn to." According to Judith, the staff's expectations from her are centered on getting fair treatment and having an improved work-atmosphere. All these are Judith's own personal assumptions. As she points out:

> "I have no concrete evidence to base my assumptions but I do perform in certain ways for several people . . . but they do not say these things to me, that is what

I am trying to say. . . (laughs) . . .
they do not. . . it is not explicit."

Her assumptions are based on her previous experience as a
faculty member, on her observation of how other heads act and
behave, and on her educational background. (She has a Ph.D.
in higher education which she says has helped her a lot.)

Most of the things she is learning on the job. She
explains, "you learn by doing it."

Freedom

Judith "feels" that she had more freedom as a member of
the faculty. The constrictions that she feels are with the
immediate details that have to be taken care of, responsibi-
lities tlhat keeps her from the time to reflect on what the
future might be. This bothers her because, as she says,

". . . I think that it is an important
aspect of being . . . a leader . . .
being able to look at the future . . . to
be able to think about what you should be
able to do."

She also regrets the fact that she does not get enough
time to spend on her scholarly activities, viz. research and
publication, which are very important to her. She "thinks"
these are important for personal growth; also it is the medium
through which she can apply her thinking on something that is
important to her.

Judith says that if she had 100% autonomy she would have
turned this program into a nationally recognized one. She

emphasizes her limitation of time and some personnel problems

(i.e., tenured faculty) as major constraining factors.

Laughing, but seriously, she adds one other item:

> "you know there are one or two example of
> people that you would . . . I mean if
> you are totally free to improve your
> situation . . . I would send them back
> to another university."

Role Performance

She finds some conflict between her expectations and

organizational expectations regarding her role. These she

defines in terms of "wanting to do away." In her words:

> "I would like to be able to move as much
> of the detail work as possible for the
> faculty . . . I feel I need to protect
> the faculty because you know as much is
> expected of them and the freer they are
> from all those details then that will
> give them time for their own classes,
> with their research, with whatever their
> professional activities are."

So she is willing to take on as much as she can. But her

worries are that, "It will totally consume my thoughts . . .

and it's hard that I won't get around [to] looking at the

bigger picture."

She insists that these should be her role, and that she

also should try to develop the program by increasing not the

quantity [of students] but by [increasing] the quality of

students recruited.

When talking about conflicting situations she emphasizes

that "each situation is unique." Generally speaking, she

"would" first try to gather information but in the end she
"would think" in terms of each situations long-term impact on
the program. However, as she points out, "doing whatever is
most important in long terms . . . probably would be a much
easier decision but they are not." She laughs and adds:

> "I have had a few difficult situation
> where I had to weigh . . . probably
> trying to satisfy both sides to some
> degree . . . so . . . they both can go
> away somewhat unhappy."

She further comments:

> "I would hope that I would never be in a
> position where you know . . . even
> wanted to be in opposition as to what
> they (the faculty) are saying. . . that
> has not happened yet . . . Probably the
> first year . . . . is your easiest
> year. You know . . . they give you some .
> . . latitude . . . that they might not
> give you in future [she laughs]."

Judith says that her strategy when moving ahead with a
project is to get as much participation from faculty as
possible since in her words, "their support is not only
important but essential." She explains that she does not want
to be a leader who operates by giving directions.
Furthermore, she thinks that issuing commands will only lead
to resentment and in the end the project will go nowhere.

She wants to move ahead . . . do new things. At one point
she says:

> "We have given so much effort to the
> undergraduate programs . . . now we have
> made the decision that it's time to focus

84

on the housing program."

She does not feel any different because of her present role as compared to being a faculty member. She is surprised, however, when she sees "the deference some people have shown simply by stepping in this room." This surprises her because she has been a member of the faculty in this department for sixteen years.

She writes a lot of letters to prospective students who inquire about their program. If there are students who have high qualifications she spend more time on their letters. She teaches a graduate seminar; she also meets with the students informally. She has encouraged them to bring their lunches and meet once a week in one of their labs.

She "guesses" that "she is an egalitarian" because she believes that "everybody is important to the system." She insists strongly that clerical help should be treated with equal respect. This contrasts, she argues, to other people who "see a hierarchy."

Job Satisfaction

When asked about her job satisfaction, Judith replies that she is not sure about that, but she does not dislike her job. The activities/things she likes most in her job are related to thinking about the departmental long-term goals . . . "as to where we are going." She dislikes the details involved in her administrative work.

She thinks that her professional activities have come to a standstill. She sees her professional activity as separate from her departmental head's role. So one "real concern" is whether she "wants to stay in teaching or in administration."

Discussing the importance of listening to both sides in situations of interpersonal problems, she reveals that:

> "it usually does not end in listening . . . that's the hard part. If you are just the listener then that would be all right. . . makes both sides feel good. But it usually does not end in there. Usually there is an issue that has to be resolved . . . it cannot go on . . . and I am the only person to do it . . . so it is not simple or easy because of that."

She teaches two graduate courses, [which she thinks is] an added responsibility. Her reason for taking such a teaching load is that she enjoys teaching. Also, she "likes the idea of getting acquainted with at least some of the students." Another reason was to have an alternative to her administrative position.

INFORMANT # 2: Mary

Mary is the chairperson of a department within the College of Arts & Sciences. She has been in this position for a year and a half.

During our brief conversation over the phone, she appeared to me a straightforward person. She asked me a few questions and gave me an appointment. I got the impression that she was viewing me as a student working on her dissertation and felt some sense of responsibility to help me in some ways.

I waited outside her office. When her secretary informed her of my presence, she came outside and greeted me.

My initial impression of her matched pretty closely when I met her personally. She was straightforward . . . very direct in her discussion. She listened very carefully to my questions, then did not talk much but answered them clearly and concisely. She seemed to be very confident and well adjusted to her position. Her door was open all the time. Her secretary's office was just next to hers. During the interview, I noticed that most of the time she was leaning toward the table. She moved her hands frequently while talking and also maintained close eye contact. She smiled often.

Her reason for applying for this position was not something very well thought out. Actually, as she told me,

she was asked by the faculty to be the chair. The previous chair was removed from this position by the initiative of the faculty.

Role Definition

Mary "sees" her role as a leader and as a manager. She explains leadership in terms of being a cheerleader and a role model. As she says:

> "I see sometimes myself as a . . . cheerleader . . . when people do things, I think I need to go out and tell people about it . . . I try to make people feel good about what they do."

She emphasizes her being a role model:

> ". . . what I expect my faculty to do I better be able to do it myself, and try to set it as a role model . . . so from the leadership standpoint, if I expect them to do research . . . I better be actively involved in active research process."

Her other role as a manager means managing the departmental work efficiently.

As we discuss several other issues, I realize that Mary's conceptions of her role are emanating from her personal beliefs and values:

1. she is convinced that recognition is important to people,

2. she believes in hard work. Her work ethic is heavily influenced by her coming from a farm background.

She thinks that there are lots of similarities between a business and a university, and therefore several principles of

administration are applicable in both these spheres. As a result, her philosophy of management has developed mainly from reading some major books on management. She refers very often to some famous books on management: **Passion for Excellence, Thriving on Chaos, & The Leaders.**

According to Mary, her initial expectations about her role have remained accurate.

When I asked her what she thinks a departmental head's role should be . . . she at first was not sure what I meant. So I had to explain again. Her comments are that she does not get that much time to write grants and do research, i.e., scholarship activities, because of her emphasis on management and teaching. She thinks that she is expected to do some scholarly activities. She says that if department heads are expected to do research, they should be given more time.

Organizational Expectations

Mary refers to the students (graduate and undergraduate), the faculty, the dean, the vice-president, the president, staff, and the alumni. . . as persons whose expectations she needs to take into consideration. The graduate students see her as an advisor and "as a friend . . . [they] see me as someone that they can come to." The undergraduates, as she says, expect her to be a mediator. The faculty, she thinks, expects her to see that the management side of the department runs smoothly (e.g., upgrading equipment). They also see her

"as someone [to whom] they can come to [to] help them do a better job in the classroom." The dean of her college expects her to be a leader and a change-master, and also to carry on her scholarly activities. The President wants her to contribute to the mission of the university. The staff expect fair work and rewards from her.

She emphasizes that most of these expectations are "covert" expectations, as she says that "people do not tell you upfront . . . clearly that this is what I expect from you," rather it is mostly from "wandering around," listening, and talking informally that she has become aware of these expectations. She explains:

> "I think that you just have to be alert
> to people like if I am going to come to
> the curriculum meeting, or if I am in a
> faculty meeting . . . you have to be a
> good listener and you . . . have to read
> between the lines sometimes."

She also points out that she was a faculty member before and she knew very clearly what the faculty expected from this position.

She points out that she does not foresee any major changes in her role in future, so it is going to stay as being mostly management and partly leadership.

Freedom

Mary describes her degree of freedom in the following words: "I have a lot of freedom within the restrictions of limited resources . . .

any proposal we put forth the dean will
listen . . . they are very supportive . .
. not that they are always going to say
yes . . . they may say yes and the Vice-
President will say no because she does
not have the funds."

If Mary had complete freedom, she would improve the equipment,
move to a bigger building, and hire some more faculty. She
claims that "money . . . the availability of money" is the
only factor that she can think of as constraining the things
that she would like to do.

Role Performance

Mary thinks that she has faced situations where there are
conflicting expectations regarding her role, but not many.
She cites the example of her summer hours, when she was
working part-time and some new faculty members, who were
unaware of her status, complained of her unavailability.
Mary, however, emphasizes that these are minor conflicts, in
her words, "small things . . . which can be settled by more
communication and explanation."

When there is a conflict situation among the faculty
regarding a particular project, Mary points out that the
relevant committee (faculty, curriculum) will be there first
to make a recommendation to her; she, however, has to make the
final decision, although she emphasizes that she has disagreed
only a few times with the committees' decisions. But even
when she disagreed she talked it over with the committee

members to make sure that "they understand all the ramifications of what they are asking us to do."

When deciding to move ahead with a new project, Mary involves the faculty in all phases. As she says, "it's just inherent that the faculty and I would work on it together." Her method is to make a draft of her proposal, present it to the dean, and then revise the plan according to the dean's suggestions. If her project fails to get approval, then she will "go back to the drawing board and start all over." She asserts that if the dean has the resources she will accept her project.

She has sixteen faculty members and she talks with them almost every day. She tries not to be in her office all the time, but "wanders around," and goes to different organizations' meetings.

She keeps her office door open so that the faculty can come and see her anytime; they don't have to make an appointment. She tries to maintain close contact with the students as well. She is always in her office on advisement days. She always goes to the student organizations' meetings, or picnics.

Job Satisfaction

According to Mary, she is "very, very much satisfied" in her position. The things/activities that she enjoys most in her job are the following:

1. working with younger faculty,

2. initiating change,

3. working with people,

4. seeing things happening.

She dislikes doing evaluation. Her reasons are:

> "...well it makes them feel unhappy,
> makes them feel uncomfortable, and I just
> do not like to do that . . . I'd rather
> tell everybody that I can recommend them
> for promotion, that they are doing a
> wonderful job, but I cannot do that."

INFORMANTS # 3: Nancy

Nancy has been working in her position for over six years.

During my initial telephone conversation with her, she seemed interested in talking with me, but she wanted to see a written summary of my proposal before the interview. Among all my female informants, she seemed one of the busiest chairpersons. Frequently she was either out-of-town or in some meeting. I had having a hard time getting in touch with her. At one point, her secretary told me that most probably she could not give me the time for the interview. Eventually, however, she found the time for the interview.

On the day of the interview, she took me to a different room. I thought she needed the privacy. She was very friendly and eager to talk openly on various issues. All the time she maintained close eye-contact. She had a smiling face.

She was hired to start the graduate program, so she had to hire all new faculty. She brought with her clear objectives regarding the direction and set-up of the program. The program is now a nationally accredited program. She appeared to me to be a very confident person, one who had a vision of the future and felt very relaxed in her position.

After the interview was over, she asked me about the progress of my dissertation; she also tried to help me by giving me the names of some chairpersons to contact for more

interviews.

Role Definition

Nancy describes her role in the following way:

> "I think my biggest responsibility is to allow the faculty to grow . . . I think . . . that I facilitate. . . I think I need to be future oriented and know where I think the department is going, where I think this particular field is going so that I can do a good job in hiring and encouraging the faculty to do the best job that they can do."

She facilitates/helps faculty members' growth in several ways, including adjusting the class schedule to suit the faculty's convenience, having resources available for them, and above all, through "encouraging the faculty to do the best job that they can do." When asked why she feels responsible for the faculty's growth, her response is, "so they can allow the students to grow . . . they can act as role models." On several occasions, she emphasizes the students and their needs.

She thinks that her role has changed a lot. She gives the following reasons for such a change:

> "as you get faculty, and faculty grow and develop, and you form a cohesive unit then you can look further down the road . . . can start doing new things."

Since the program is established now, they are now in the implementation phase. She says "I came in as one person, now I feel a different one."

Nancy says that "probably" in the future her role will change again.

Asked her opinion about the "ideal role of a head," her response was, "I think I do more of what I think a departmental head should do than lots of people on this campus." She argues that the chair in an academic department needs to have some time to help the department grow. She explains that teaching is important but one cannot do both teaching and perform his/her role as the head, i.e., there has to be a line somewhere. She feels herself fortunate in not having to teach more than one course and therefore having the time to perform her role.

Organizational Expectations

According to Nancy, her role as a chair is a role which she "created . . . because it was the first graduate program . . . and I am the first departmental chair for this particular unit."

Nancy thinks that the dean, faculty, and students are her primary "others" whose expectations she needs to take into consideration.

The dean entrusts her with responsibility for the faculty. In her words:

> "because I am a graduate department
> chair, where the responsibilities of the
> graduate faculty are certainly mine . . .
> to make sure that I have faculty and that
> faculty members can do the expectations

which are required of them, which means
that when I start to develop schedules .
. . for example, faculty's have to have
some time to do research and creative
activity and publishing, . . . go to
meetings, . . . so when I develop budgets
I need to include those things because
faculty need time to do those things."

In other words, she is responsible to the dean for recruiting
faculty with the required background and seeing that the
faculty members get help and support from her in doing their
work.

The faculty members expect her to represent their cases.
The students expect her to be a "good role model."
She explains:

"They would like to see what I have done
and use that kind of guesses to decide
what they can do. And I think that is
true for students and for the faculty."

Nancy sounds similar to Mary when she mentions that she knows
all these expectations mainly through indirect ways: corridor
talks, informal lunch breaks. She points out that part of the
responsibilities and expectations that she accepts are given
by the university, and these are described in her job
description.

Freedom

Nancy "thinks" that she has quite a bit of choice partly
because "in academia I am a professor and I am tenured."

She thinks that her emphasis, now, on sharing and
developing together are constraining her freedom to some

97

extent, but as she points out:

> "I think that the choice is even broader
> now than what I had before because now it
> involves all of us. Initially when I had
> all of the choices I also had all of that
> responsibilities. And now I can share
> that. So maybe. . . I don't have all the
> choices but I also don't have all of the
> responsibilities [she laughs]."

She says that if she had total freedom she would get together
all the faculty and spend six months writing grants and
activities, and developing the research creative part of the
program --no teaching for six months. She cites money as the
major constraining factor.

As I mentioned before, Nancy strongly emphasizes applying
for grants, writing articles, and doing research by all
faculty members. Her reasons for such emphasis are the
following:

> (1) "That allows all of us to learn . .
> . to critique better the literature that
> is out there."
> (2) "It gives faculty confidence if they
> can bring in money . . . that is a way to
> enhance their work . . . certainly their
> productivity."
> (3) "It allows student to see faculty as
> the role model in that area."

Nancy "thinks" that finance is the only constraining
factor.

Role Performance

According to Nancy, it is "certainly true" that people
sometimes hold conflicting expectations regarding her role.

She explains this by giving examples with promotion, tenure, and class scheduling which she has "to weigh in terms of what other people in the department need to do."

Her approach to conflicting situations is to talk to each person individually. She argues:

> "the first thing you do . . . I think is
> try to sit and talk to the person, that
> you are having the conflict with, uh . .
> . and try to get some idea about what
> each of you, whether there is one person
> or several persons . . . what each of you
> want or where each of you stand."

She explains, "sitting down and talking about those (problems, conflicting needs) can establish priorities." She believes in consensus but does not think that it means that "everybody agrees." Consensus, according to her, means to "try to talk it out . . . it's that people know where you are going and what you want." She tries not to be authoritarian but in crisis or conflict she may have no other choice.

She "trusts" working through group projects. Thus, when staring a new project she will first talk her idea out informally . . . "an informal way to start with." Then she will present it formally. She explains:

> "So that by the time I would take it to
> the meeting half of the people had
> already talked about that . . . and that
> is part of getting
> consensus too."

She points out:

> "The group process works and as I work in

> different projects I will involve
> different faculties, each hopefully to
> their abilities and interests so that as
> we all work together. . . we can do
> different kinds of things. That is really
> fun to do."

If any of her projects fail to get approval, she tries to find

out:

> "why is it that they are not supporting
> it, whether or not that means that you
> have not explained that to them
> sufficiently. That is always the first
> thing I will do I think. The question
> will be can I communicate this better if
> I think that is really important."

In her department, she has established a procedure whereby

students are represented in all of the committees in the

department. Thus,

> "Anytime, the committee meets for
> admission, for example, there is a
> student representative."

In her department, the faculty meets once a month, and all of

them meet with the dean once a month as well.

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

When asked about her job satisfaction, she keeps quiet

for some moments and then says:

> "it varies day to day, so there have
> been times when I hated this job . . .
> there have been times when I have loved
> it."

She says that overall she is well satisfied. However, she has

also considered changing her job.

The things that she enjoys most in her position are

negotiating, talking to students, and working with faculty.

One thing she enjoys greatly is seeing the development or

growth of a project or work. In her own words:

> "I mean I feel sometime like having a
> child . . . you know. . .[she laughs]
> where people are doing this and working
> on it for six years . . . because you
> cannot do things for other people, . . .
> you know you can facilitate them . . .
> you can help them but basically they have
> to do it. And when they start to do it I
> feel like their mother. . . all right. .
> . that is when I feel the best."

She dislikes paperwork. She elaborates on that:

> "You cannot .be a visionary . . . you
> cannot be forward-moving if what you
> would like to do is shuffle papers,
> because papers are here and now and [the]
> future is out there somewhere."

INFORMANTS # 4: Kathryn

Kathryn joined her department nineteen years ago and has been a chairperson for three and a half years. When I first tried to talk to her over the phone, she was out-of-town. Her secretary, however, fixed an appointment for me to see her.

When I met her personally, I saw in her a very friendly and open person, wanting to contribute as much as she could to my thesis. She sat very close to me and showed interest in the discussion.

She joined this position because she felt that it was time for her to change her work/job. Also other professors asked her to apply. She believed very strongly in the positive role that a chair could perform for the department.

I got the impression that she prefers to work in an informal manner; she does not like too much formality. She frequently moved her hands while talking and maintained very close eye-contact. Her door was open widely during the interview. The department's office was just next to hers, and we could even hear the secretaries' conversation. When it was over, she walked with me to the front door, wished me good luck and told me to contact her if I needed any further assistance.

Role Definition

Kathryn feels that her main role is to maintain a good working environment within the department. "Working

environment" includes relationship within and among the faculty members, students, and staff. Her reasons for emphasizing a good working environment are, in her own words:

> "everybody has to be involved in getting things done in a department . . . each student, faculty, and staff has a part to play. Unless there is a good working environment these people won't feel motivated, or be happy to work. Furthermore, we spend so much of our time in our work-atmosphere it is imperative that we all try to live in a friendly, comfortable environment."

She says that she tries to maintain this by helping people organize their activities, understanding what other people's roles are and determining how they can work together cooperatively.

She thinks that most "probably" her role includes the following:

(1) leading which includes helping people organize, listening to their comments and understanding what their roles are so that all can work together cooperatively toward the development of the program.

(2) promoting a good working environment.

(3) improving the department's program.

According to Kathryn, her role is different now, in certain aspects, compared to her initial expectations; as she points out:

> "I had no idea as to how an organization works . . . I mean the administration

world was almost an alien world to me
when I first joined this position . . .
you know I had to get used to so many
different things that in that sense I
have to say that some of my initial ideas
about my role have obviously changed."

Kathryn "feels" that a department head should emphasize

developing a good working atmosphere in the department.

Organizational Expectations

Kathryn thinks that she needs to take into consideration

the expectations of the dean, student, faculty, and staff

regarding her role. She hesitated a few moments when I wanted

to know their expectations.

She considers the students the most important group to

whose expectations she needs to pay special attention. When

I inquired why she thinks so, she responded:

"because   . . . I think our main
objective is to serve the . . . student
body and since I am the head of this
department I. . . . see it as part of my
responsibility."

She emphasizes that the students expect her to listen to

their problems and also to provide suggestions/advice. The

faculty, she says, is "probably concerned about fair/honest

and efficient utilization of the resources." With regard to

the dean's expectation, she thinks that he wants her to

develop a good working environment within the department.

Also the dean expects her to contribute toward achieving the

mission of the university.

While talking about the staff's expectations, she thinks for a while and then says that they want fair treatment from her. That means fair evaluations, fair recommendations and reasonable workloads.

She says that she has become aware of these expectations mainly by observing various nonverbal clues and symbols. For example, she looks at the dean's projects, the money he allocates, and that way gets some idea about the dean's expectations. She senses that the faculty want more information on where the funds are going. Her department has a "suggestion box" for the students. She reads those suggestions regularly. Besides that, she finds it revealing to talk with students and listen to their problems.

Freedom

Kathryn says that she has a "wide latitude" of freedom in her position. When asked what she would do if she had complete freedom, at first she said "I am not sure." After keeping silent for some moments, she was able to "think" of the following:

1. have a good working atmosphere.

2. do more research.

When I asked why research is so important for her, her response was:

> "research is needed to remain in the
> forefront of knowledge development . . .
> also important for personal growth."

105

She refers to the tenured faculty and university regulation as major constraining factors. She comments on the tenured faculty, "most of these tenured faculty have been here for a while and are resistant to change."

Role Performance

In situations where there is a conflict her strategy is to listen to both sides. In the end her decision will be based on what is contributory toward achieving the long-term goal of the department, in other words, "what does this mean . . . in terms of its impact on the department in the long-run."

Her strategy in moving ahead on a plan or project is to have a very good plan which should be the result of a thorough and thoughtful exercise, then she would take it to the dean. If her project fails to get the required approval she will try to learn from that experience. She will not drop the plan. Instead she will listen to others' comments and incorporate those and then will move again.

She says, "I look at each and every memo . . . so that I can be at the top of everything. I am still doing this. But later on, maybe, I will delegate some of these."

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Kathryn says that she is "well satisfied" with her position. In her work she enjoys looking at the long-term issues, spending time with the faculty and students and developing the department's program.

She says that "frankly I do not feel comfortable when I have to deal with various kinds of conflicting situations." One of the reasons for this is that she thinks that although expectations are well-presented, the problem is dealing with individual needs vs. collective needs. As she says:

> "the hardest part of making decisions
> under these circumstances is that often
> individual needs get hurt."

She dislikes paperwork and the university rules and regulations. She discusses how difficult and time-consuming it is when she has to be well aware and abide by the policies related to security, affirmative action, due process, financial accounting, and documentation. These policies limit her in the sense that because of them she must spend less time on important things, i.e., thinking and planning. Currently, she is thinking seriously about going back to teaching full-time.

INFORMANTS # 5: Victoria

Victoria joined her department, within the School of Business, as a faculty member twenty-two years ago. She has been serving as the chairperson for seven years.

She was interested in the interview, but she wanted to have a written summary of my proposal before the interview. On the day of the interview, she came out of her office and greeted me. She seemed to be very relaxed and smiled most of the time. She also maintained close eye-contact. Her department has a graduate and an undergraduate program.

Reflecting back on her initial days of being the chairperson, she remarked, "It was just sort of an accident by which I became the departmental chair." According to her, the department had to fill the position internally but no one wanted that position. Finally, she decided to apply. She said:

> "I guess one night I thought about it and
> said well maybe . . . I won't mind."

Listening to her, I felt that she was feeling relaxed in her position; she enjoyed her work. She wanted to know whether I had found some differences among my male and female informants. She seemed to be very interested, and wished me good luck.

Role Definition

Victoria "feels" that her role is:

> "to manage the department in the best
> possible way so that we maintain
> enrollment and that we have a good work
> atmosphere for the faculty and that we
> are an . . . integral part of the School
> of. . ."

Basically, she sees her role as a manager. She describes her
managerial role in terms of handling paperwork, making the
best schedule for the faculty, being available to students and
faculty, and developing a good work-atmosphere.

She emphasizes her role in helping the faculty to feel
comfortable and happy. According to her:

> "faculties make up the university and if
> you do not provide an environment where
> you have members who are creative and
> happy in their environment then I do not
> think that you have a classroom
> environment that is conducive to
> learning."

When I asked her whether she thinks that she is managing
more compared to making decisions, her response was:

> "I have to guess but I have to think
> about that. . . because I don't know."

Her role has changed a lot. She thinks that it is
different every year; she laughs and adds, "I have been trying
to figure out this summer what it is."

She thinks that a department head's role has to be a
"balance of a number of things, like management, decision-
making, and creativity." She argues that she is doing part of
what a department head should be doing. She would like,
however, to have more time to read professional journals, do

research works and provide more direction to the department. She explains regretfully, "You know I get an idea for something, or an idea that I want to pursue and I do not have the time to pursue it and I may need some time to get the data collected and in a year later my topic becomes old by that time." "Or maybe," she adds, "that is just my managing . . . I don't know [she laughs]."

Organizational Expectations

Victoria was silent for a while when I asked her about the expectations of "others". She needed more clarification; in the end I had to give her some clues by mentioning the faculty and the dean. She says that "obviously" the faculty is an important actor, and then the dean is important too.

The dean expects her to handle the situations within the department without always having to go to him. Both the dean and the faculty "want" her to manage the department and to manage conflict within the department.

She says:

> "They I perceive . . . that they would want me to manage the department and handle conflict in the department . . . I would expect that although I have not discussed that with him that the dean would expect me to handle the situations within my department without always having to go to him . . . and the faculty I think would expect me to do that too."

She explains further:

"The academic community is relatively
structured in terms of what you can and
cannot do and so although not really
"expectations" you also have to work with
other departments within the school . . .
so that whatever we do in this department
we cannot do without considering the
effects on   other departments . . .
particularly within this school."

When asked about the students' expectations, her comments

were:

"Well, I suppose you would have to say
that the students have some expectations
from the department . . . I think that
their main expectations would be that the
courses that they receive are as they are
advertised . . . and that classes meet
and grades are given fairly and that sort
of thing."

She was not sure as to how her perceptions of these

expectations were formed. Later she argued that mostly these

came from one-on- one informal discussion with the faculty.

Freedom

Victoria thinks that she "enjoys quite a bit of freedom."

She explains:

"maybe I work the system to get that
freedom . . . I guess that I . . .
really almost any decision that is made
other than those little decisions need to
be faculty's decisions,"

but she continues, "I have already mentioned . . . I have a

really good group to work with and it is not hard to get

faculty consensus . . . at least in the meetings . . . I guess

[she laughs]."

111

When I asked her what would she like to do if she had 100% autonomy she laughed and asked me "Are you saying that I have the money to do it?" If she had the needed money, she would equip a model office for the students with the latest in technology and more equipment.

As expected, she thinks money is the main constraining factor. She also points out that the university structure can be a constraining factor. She explains:

> "the length of time it takes to get programs approved . . . you know if we have something that we wanted to do and we are really excited about it . . . but by the time we can get up through all the structure we need another year to . . . so that is a constraint that is a little irritating at time."

But she adds "I understand why it is necessary."

While discussing her role Victoria, at one point, laughed and said that:

> "when I became the chairman of this department I had lots of ideas . . . and lots of thoughts about what we can do . . . and how we would do it . . . When I became the chair I became more realistic in what you can do with the faculty that you have."

Most of her ideas were related to curriculum revision. She points out the tenured faculty as one major hindrance to bringing any change.

Role Performance

Victoria could not recall any instance or situation

112

where she saw conflicting expectations regarding her role.
She comments that the probable reason for that is her
faculty's respect toward authority. As she explains:

> "if the dean has some expectation then we
> tend to follow through it because he is
> in the upper hierarchy."

She keeps silent for a while and adds:

> "I think that my department is probably
> unique in that respect . . . in that we
> all respect authority . . . I don't know
> whether that is healthy or not but that
> is the way it is here [she laughs]."

The strategy that Victoria follows while moving ahead with a
new project is this: first, with another faculty member she
meets with the dean with a tentative plan/idea. They will
then brainstorm some ideas which she thinks helps her "draw
the ideas as to what we might be able to do." Then she will
form a committee. She thinks it is important to brainstorm
the ideas because without that she will not be able to provide
some direction to the committee. Making the project/idea much
more focused helps the committee to work better. Asked about
failure of a project, she smiles and says "I would not like
that at all." She argues that she will talk with enough people
prior to forming a committee to ensure success.

In situations of conflict among faculty, Victoria's
"secrets" are to carry on one-to-one discussions with various
individuals; then group discussions; and finally call a
faculty meeting on those issues.

She gives strong emphasis to listening to other faculty members' ideas and suggestions and then pursuing those. She explains in her words:

> "so that it just does not become something that someone mentioned and we did not do anything about it . . . pursuing it may not mean that we do it but at least it means that we discuss and look at all the options."

She believes that the faculty have more contact with the student than she does. The department does not have any structure for formal or informal interaction with students.

In her department they have faculty meetings probably three times a semester, and at the beginning of the year they have a large long meeting called a "retreat." She meets with the dean twice a month and feels free to go to the dean's office in an informal way too.

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

According to Victoria, she "likes her job." The things that Victoria enjoys most are coming up with different ideas and carrying them out.

Later on, she says:

> "one of the exciting and challenging things about becoming chair was the feeling that by the faculty that I could recruit I can change the direction of the department."

She dislikes paperwork.

Victoria remarks that making decisions is the hardest

part of the job because "when you are not absolutely certain which direction the department should go but ultimately decisions have to be mine based upon the faculty's input." She adds one other item:

> "What happens when you are a departmental chair . . . or what has happened to me is that this job become so all-consuming that then your professional productivity . . . you know writing and research suffers. I cannot do both or do them very adequately."

INFORMANTS # 6: Barbara

Barbara's department is within the College of Arts and Sciences. She has been in this position for five months. When I first talked with her, over the phone, she seemed very eager to talk. She told me that she was still trying to make sense of her role and that most probably she would be talking mostly from her "ignorance." At that time, she had only two months' experience of being a chairperson. However, she was very enthusiastic, and gave me an appointment, which was almost three months later. The reasons for such a delayed meeting were that she would be out-of-town several times and was also very busy at that time.

I was surprised, almost shocked, when I met her. She appeared to me a person who was not too interested in talking and wanted to get the interview over as quickly as possible. When I asked her whether she had any questions to ask me she abruptly responded, "no. . . we can just start the interview." She asked me whether I could close the door. She herself plugged in my tape-recorder, offered me coffee, and then sat for the discussion. She talked fast, smiled often. I noticed that most of the time she was looking at her coffee-cup; we did not have much eye-contact.

Barbara's department has under graduate and graduate programs, including a doctorate. She came from an outside university to this position. She discussed very openly her

116

opinion on several issues surrounding her position, her department, her colleagues, and also the university. The impression I got was that she was to some extent frustrated over several issues and wanted to get out of this position as soon as possible.

When I asked her what made her apply for this position, her response was, "It was time for me to be a head somewhere." She felt that eventually she could have been the head of the department where she previously worked, but wanted to move to this department because it had more resources and more productive faculty.

Role Definition

Barbara sees her role as a job. She believes that her job is to act as a facilitator for the faculty, be an intermediary between administration and the faculty, and develop good work-environment.

In her words:

> "my job is to facilitate faculty to do their job better. I am the intermediary between the administration and them; my job is to find out how the administration defines their goals, find out what my faculty is doing and translate that into the goals of the administration . . . my job is to look at the process too. . . i.e., to improve the work-environment of this department, so that people can stop fighting with each other and feel more comfortable and friendly with each other."

She facilitates faculty members' work by advocating for

resources on their behalf in front of the institution. She also believes that "they should . . . being a good faculty . . . all of them should work better . . . they could do better research and do better at class. My job is to see that they can do it and feel positive about this."

She sees her job as part of her life. However, she describes her own expectations from this job in the following words:

> "I expect to get out of it as soon as possible. . . I am not interested in administration. . . I don't think that I want to be an administrator, I am a researcher. . . that is what I do best. . . my contribution will be in my research . . . so I intend to stay in this position as short a period as is considered socially correct and then I will go back to be a faculty member."

Barbara thinks that the role of a departmental head should "always be a facilitator. . . a facilitator for the faculty and the students."

Organizational Expectations

Barbara mentions the students (graduate and undergraduate), faculty, dean, and the staff as important actor influencing her role.

The graduate students, she believes, expect her to be supportive of them and to provide a learning collegial atmosphere. The undergraduates, who, according to Barbara, do not have a clue as to what a head does, want her to sign their

118

classes. The faculty expect her to help them in working together. She mentions several times her perceptions of her faculty in the following way:

> "the faculty . . . they are a very important group . . . this is a notoriously factious group that you don't get along too well."

The dean's expectations are several: improving the work atmosphere, increasing the national visibility of the program, and managing the department well. She thinks that the staff expect respect and fair treatment from her. Her perceptions of these expectations are formed through practicing her philosophy of "management by walking." She also maintains close contact with the students, formally and informally. She maintains an open door policy. She calls meetings with graduate students where they voice their concerns.

When she first came for the interview, the dean asked her to lay out her goals for the department; therefore, the dean knows what she wants to do. Basically, she is interested in doing research, and accordingly, the dean has provided her the resources to carry on her research.

Freedom

Barbara argues that she is "not constrained nearly as much as others are." Her reason for feeling so is:

> "I can quit any time. . . if I want to . . . because I do not want to do it . . . and that gives me tremendous ability to say what I want to say."

Under complete freedom, she would delegate more of the routine work to the faculty and would want to do more research, grant-writing, and publishing. Research is important to her because it helps her to contribute to new knowledge. She does a lot of policy-related research, and she thinks that by doing that she can change people's lives and she feels "that is really important . . . these are much more important things than what happens in the department of . . . , that is pretty uninteresting quite frankly . . . I am not [smiles] very much interested in people fighting with each other."

The constraining factor, she thinks, is the academic tradition which she says is very individualistic. As she comments, "they [the faculty] want to be left alone to do whatever they want to do."

Role Performance

When there is a conflicting situation, Barbara argues that:

> "you don't meet with people in groups
> when they are in conflict with each
> other, i.e., you meet individually."

Her strategies are to talk to people, learn where they want to go, make them put those goals into writing, and then call a group meeting and a discussion. In her own words:

> "Once you know what people are going to
> do you make them put that in writing,
> then you can have a group meeting and a
> discussion but I don't ever have a group
> meeting where I don't know what's going

to happen."

Her strategy to go ahead with a plan is to meet informally on a one on one basis. Then, she continues:

> "you get their agreement . . . you work
> it through the hierarchy appropriately .
> . . saying this is what people want."

She also points out that it is important to form alliances for resources. She argues that people in "social sciences" do not understand it. These people, as she says, have a tendency to hold big meetings and make demands. She thinks that these are ineffective ways to get things done.

If any of her projects fails, she will try again. Also she argues, "I don't set impossible goals which if you lose you cannot regroup in a slightly different way."

"I believe," she says, that "we live by examples." She explains:

> "If I were not publishing I think then I
> would not have any legitimacy at all so
> when I tell them (the faculty) to get
> grants and I am getting them grants . . .
> when I am telling them to publish and I
> publish them. . . that is how you get
> things done."

She points out the importance of looking at the large picture. As she explains:

> "You also have to see out that everything
> you do fits into the larger picture."

In her case, she explains the larger picture reflects the goals and objectives of the university.

She maintains close contact with the students and faculty. According to Barbara:

> "I am here from 7:30 in the morning to about 8:00 at night . . . I keep the door open so they can see that I am here and most people spent time talking to me. . . those who do not I go and make appointments to see them . . . I am trying to see people one on one basis and I call meetings of the graduate student. . . we have a lot of graduate students representatives and I met with them . . . they tell me what they are doing and they voice their concerns to me."

She tends to work with small groups. So she does not have a lot of faculty meetings, only two or three a semester. Her reasons for having few faculty meetings are the following:

> "Men faculty members unfortunately have a tendency to posture in front of each other . . . they will make a game cock or something who likes to show off their verbal prowess in front of each other and I don't enjoy watching that. So I try to minimize their opportunity to do that."

She communicates with the dean frequently and constantly by electronic mail. She wants to be clear on her expectations and what she is doing, so, as she says:

> "If I have a question I sent it right over to the dean's office . . . I will always go through channels . . . I make sure that he knows exactly as to what goes on here . . . so that he is never surprised."

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

When asked about her job satisfaction, she smiles and says "it is o.k. but I don't love it." She would prefer to

work in a private organization where she thinks leadership is much easier. In her case, the department does not have any collective goal so she has to spend time on goal-clarification. In the case of a private organization, she argues, "you know what you are trying to do . . . you are very clear as to what you want to do."

Her frustrations with her job are manifested in several of her comments. The following are just a few among them:

> "There are certain things that I have to do that drive me crazy like promotion and tenure stuffs."

> "People tend to deride women's research."

> "This department never had a tenured woman."

> "I don't like administrative work . . . at least the thing about the department head's role is you learn a great deal about the university and in the course of doing that you can really facilitate people . . . you can help people do things better . . . and that is important to me."

She thinks that this is an extremely highly administrative university. As she says:

> "I have never been to a place where they have so many deans, associate deans, vice provost, assistant vice provost . . . just far too many administrators . . . what they tend to do is make more work for the faculty when their job is to make work easier for the faculty." Also, " a lot of paperwork gets lost in the chain of command."

She enjoys the following:

1.   seeing faculty members change

2.   having graduate students feel enthusiastic about the program.

  She also enjoys teaching.

  She dislikes the following:

1.   putting together the class schedule.

2.   occasions when she cannot persuade people to do things which they are supposed to do.

3.   forming committees.

  The hardest thing, she thinks, is evaluating the faculty. She points out that when she starts making decisions about salary and promotion . . . nobody will be happy. She smiles and says that her role will change once she does the faculty evaluation.

INFORMANT # 7: Steve

Steve, the head of a department within the College of Arts & Sciences, has been in this position for just five months.

Over the phone he was very polite and eager to sit for the interview. His door was open when I came for the meeting. He asked me to sit and offered me coffee. He went to the secretary's office and brought a cup. He sat relaxed and wanted to start the interview.

The way he talked and his discussion led me to believe that he was very confident and a very practical-minded person.

He was an associate head in another university, but he wanted to be the head of a more resourceful university and thought this university was the right place for him to apply. He came with me to the secretary's desk to ask for his job description. He told me that he would like to read my thesis.

According to Steve, the previous head of this department was very autocratic and consequently was removed from his position by the faculty. He sees the faculty as a very important force with whom department heads need to get along. According to Steve, one of the major problems in his department is the clash of principles and intellectual traditions between older and newer generations. He thinks that "one of the reasons that I was hired was that it was hoped that I would be a kind of middle of the road . . . I am

125

in an age where I am not old but I am by no means young and I
might have a chance to get along with both of these groups."

Role Definition

Steve, like Barbara, sees his role as a job. He
describes his job, i.e., role, in the following way:

> "getting   . . . people working
> effectively to achieve departmental
> goals, . . . departmental goals involve
> . . . what we call service to the
> university-wide student population . . .
> i.e., mostly writing composition courses,
> teaching effectively; the department is
> concerned with research and publication .
> . . at least the tenured track members of
> the department are . . . so one of my
> aims would be to create situations where
> departmental members can succeed."

In short, he adds, "creating situations where people on my
staff can achieve the kinds of things that we want from them."
He has not seen any basic change in his role.
He explains:

> "The hiring committee knew pretty much
> what they wanted from a head and was able
> to tell me that and get from me my
> feelings. So the requirements for the job
> have not changed."

He emphasizes that a department head's role should give
priority to increasing the excellence of the faculty. This
can be done by bringing in resources for the faculty,
assigning courses in such a way so that faculty members can
offer courses in their specialized areas; and providing them
with travel funds and comfortable office spaces.

Organizational Expectations

Steve thinks that it is absolutely necessary to consider other people's expectations. He thinks:

> "it is a circular process. . . I look at my faculty and I think of the way I would like the vast majority of them performing and then I try to perform that way myself. . . so that I don't just ask them . . . I try to demonstrate that by myself to them. So I try . . . I guess define the role and then I want to play it."

He refers to the dean, president, and the faculty as very important actors whose expectations he should consider very seriously. According to Steve, the dean has a very definite expectation in terms of accomplishing the goals of the department. The dean also wants to have some tangible results (e.g., publication records of the faculty); to know how well they are meeting students' demands (e.g., through teaching excellence and extensive course offerings); and be able to leave care of the administrative side of the department to Steve.

He adds further:

> "Rather than concentrating on how I accomplish those goals he wants to see me accomplishing the goals. If they are accomplished then I think he gives me a lot of latitude . . . if they are not accomplished then I fully expect him to enter in and become more vocal in terms of giving me advice."

The faculty, he thinks, have two different kinds of expectations. As he explains:

> "one is to be a leader of the department
> and to move the department as a whole in
> directions which they approve of and the
> other kind of expectation they have is a
> more narrowly defined in terms of their
> interests . . . they would like me to
> facilitate situations so that they would
> be successful teachers . . . scholars."

The president, according to Steve, expects him to contribute toward fulfilling the mission of the university.

Steve says that the dean tells him his expectations directly, face to face, mostly in formal meetings. The faculty also convey their expectations to him in a very "articulate way." He maintains an open door policy and any one faculty member can simply enter his room and "just sit down and talk to me . . . briefly telling me what's bothering them." Steve keeps a list of those who come in to see him and those who do not. If there is someone who does not come to see him within a semester, he makes a point to seek out that person and to talk to him/her.

I asked him about the students' expectations. According to Steve he does not know their expectations since he is so new here. At present the group that he is working with is the faculty. Currently he is not advising or teaching.

He says that right now the quality of the faculty is his first priority. As he explains:

> "I guess I am very much cognizant of the
> fact that the heads before me were
> thought to be too autocratic . . . they
> went ahead without consulting and that

this was not well received."

Freedom

Steve thinks that there is a fairly large area where he is free to maneuver. He adds, "But there are definite parameters which I have to check back and now." He sees himself in between two groups . . . the faculty and the dean (both of whom Steve says have a legitimate command over him). He points out that he constantly needs to check these two groups to see whether they are with him or not. He emphasizes, "you do not go on without their support."

In situation of total freedom, he would like to start a Ph.D. program so that "it can serve a diversity of needs." He mentions resources, in terms of personnel and library facilities, as major constraining factors.

Role Performance

Steve says that "sure" there are conflicting expectations regarding his role. He gives an example with the issue of defining the curriculum. He explains that the extremely liberal faculty want to have a loosely defined curriculum. On the other hand, according to Steve, the conservative faculty want to spell out the curriculum very carefully. As he says, "I am constantly in a position of balancing these extremes . . . making a compromise that would work for both extremes."

When there is a conflict, Steve argues, it usually gets decided mostly by voting. He also points out that there are

also committees working on several issues. If a committee makes a recommendation counter to the majority, Steve will not accept their recommendation. He explains:

> "I might not be inclined to say absolutely no to them . . . I would be more inclined . . . at least my first move would be . . . to say, look the department is against this by a significant quantity of votes and I do not want to place something that the department will be unhappy with . . . so let's take a cool look and do not work on it for a month. Let's come back to it and see what can be done."

His way of moving ahead with a new project is to frame an idea first, appoint a committee to investigate the matter and to come up with a plan, and then to submit it to the faculty for their feedback.

If any of his projects fail to get approval, Steve says that he will be disappointed, but he adds, "There are enough good things to shift my energy . . . I will still be happy with my job doing other things." So he will give up the idea of implementing such project/projects for a couple of years.

When I asked him how often he holds meetings with the faculty, he explains:

> "I hold. . . our broad procedures spelled out that I must hold a meeting with the entire faculty once every semester. But we have probably a dozen committees that are fairly large. By large, I mean six or more faculty (on a committee). And almost every activity that we engage in has a committee that advises me in that area. So I will say that I work a great deal

with intermediate size committee much
more I do with the faculty as a whole."

He thinks that as a teacher he has to set an example, because
"everything I do will be watched by the department." He
explains:

> "I have to be very careful . . . that I
> would teach the same range of courses
> that I ask the member of our department
> to teach, perhaps be a little harder on
> myself."

He argues that "ensuring fair play and looking out for
significant minority are important parts of my job." He does
this by making sure that minorities who are interested in a
certain kind of scholarship have a room or place where they
can voice their thinking and have some classes where they can
teach according to their discipline. He thinks this is
settling the tone: to be professional and to judge people by
their scholarly output.

He argues:

> "The main thing to do is to see that
> neither group is disadvantaged."

He adds:

> "Sometimes you have to say 'no' to their
> particular interests for the good of the
> department . . . I just have to be aware
> that sometimes some feelings will get
> hurt and try to do it and get over it as
> quickly as possible and then repair the
> damages."

He stays in close touch with committees because he has to
give them direction when asked.

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

When asked about his job satisfaction, Steve comments that he enjoys it "very much." He likes the people that he is working with. He enjoys helping people do their jobs. He adds:

> "I am aware that perhaps I am living in a special honeymoon period but up to now it does seem to me that the people that I am working with are so good at what they do in terms of teaching and writing, particularly the younger people, that I find it very energizing and I find my job is to try to create a work-situation . . . in which these people can succeed . . . it is a very worthwhile venture for me to do because of the chance that these people will succeed and so facilitating them in that is really a very significant job."

INFORMANT # 8: Richard

Richard was the chairperson of a department within the College of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. He came to this department three years ago as a faculty member and has been the chairperson for the last two years.

He was very informal and enthusiastic when I talked with him over the phone. He asked when I needed the interview. He was going on a vacation, so he scheduled an interview just after that.

When I arrived, he was waiting for me in his office. He greeted me and asked me to sit. We talked about my thesis for some time. He seemed very interested in my research. He asked me to close the door just before I started the tape-recorder.

He moved his hands frequently during the conversation. He sat leaning back in the chair.

Richard had been a chairperson in his former university. He came to this department with the goals of teaching and doing research. He was, however, asked to take the acting chair's position by the faculty and later was given this permanent position. As he says:

> "I have been kind of . . . not forced . .
> . but pushed into the situation of
> becoming a chair."

He raised his doubts about the role of the chairperson and his perception of it. He seemed very interested to talk.

Later on, he gave me his own copy of the job description. He told me to contact him if I were in need of anything.

Role Definition

Richard describes his role as being a facilitator and a middle-man between the dean and the faculty. Facilitation to him means:

> "making tools available to the faculty to teach, to do research, to be productive, to do scholarly service to the community and so forth."

He explains that his department is in charge of carrying out some objectives, and he sees his role as facilitating the process of implementing those objectives.

According to Richard, his role has not changed much. He argues that a chair should always be a facilitator of what goes on in his/her department. He thinks that is what he is doing mostly. It is not a managerial job. He points out that universities are unique organizations; they are not like corporations or businesses, although his concern is that, "I do think that more and more we are becoming business-like the way we do things."

Organizational Expectations

He says that "obviously" there are people whose expectations he has to consider. They are the faculty, students, upper administration, the dean, the vice-president, and the president. He thinks that the alumni are important

too.

The dean expects him to take care of the problems within the department. He also wants Richard to be a leader in securing enrollment and improving the program. In his words:

> "I think that at that level of the administration . . . they expect us to take care of the problems within the department. . . to control any problem. . . to handle any problem that occurs."

The faculty, he thinks, expect him to provide the tools they need to do their job. That includes taking care of details, e.g., scheduling, assigning classes, in his words, "facilitating what they do . . . to try to get them do their job better, make available what they need to do their job better." Both the dean and the faculty expect him to represent their views to each other and in that respect Richard thinks himself as a middle-man.

The students, he thinks, expect him to be a leader in providing a good quality program, a competent faculty, fairness from the faculty (in terms of grades and professional dealings).

He explains:

> "They expect a good program, a quality program, they expect that we hire faculty members who are competent, who are going to do a good job in teaching, research, and service . . . and they expect that they will get their money's worth . . . and they expect that I be the leader of that and (that) I should make sure that it happens."

The alumni would like to see continuing respect for their program, enduring reputation of their program and want to feel proud about the institution. The staff's expectation from him, as the chair, is that he make sure that the faculty treat them in a professional manner. Richard also thinks that they expect him to facilitate their careers.

He says that the dean's and faculty's expectations are explicit. He argues that these are explicit because whenever they are talking informally or in formal meetings these become "pretty clear." Also his past personal experience of being a student and faculty member have helped him to understand what these two groups are expecting from him. He also encourages students to come in and to discuss frankly their concerns with him. He knows the alumni's expectations from the responses that he gets to the newsletter sent to alumni.

When he first came to this position, he had some idea about his role because he had been a chair before. But he sees some differences in his new position because of the larger number of faculty that he heads now. He does not think that his role has changed much over the two years he has held the position.

Freedom

According to Richard, for the most part he feels quite free, though sometimes he feels some pressure to go in a certain direction.

When asked what he would like to do in situations of total freedom he responds:

> "I guess I have never given a lot of thought. . . I did not have that freedom to do that."

So he thinks for a while and says that he would like to have a collegial professional atmosphere in this department where everybody will feel comfortable to challenge either him or the dean. He thinks that is missing right now.

He also would like to see more interaction among students and members of the faculty, and a greater development of a family feeling.

Role Performance

He thinks that there are conflicting expectations regarding his role. He discusses one such conflict which he considers is an "ongoing problem" since last year. The conflict arose out of conflicting views of the dean and the faculty regarding the role of the chair. According to Richard, the dean views a chair mostly as an administrator and less a faculty member. Faculty members, on the other hand, view him primarily as a faculty and less an administrator. He emphasizes that "this has been difficult for me . . . I feel kind of caught in the middle here."

Richard prefers to see himself primarily as a faculty member. . . not a manager. He points that though he does some managing he would like to see himself primarily as a faculty

member and he thinks that he is a little more traditional in holding that idea. The university's handbook also describes the chair's role mainly as an educator, but he thinks that the dean is interpreting it differently. In this conflicting situation, he has asked the dean for role clarification and delineation and the dean has given a written statement on that. The written statement matches pretty well the description in the handbook, but Richard still sees some conflict at certain times. As he argues:

> "I think we tried to resolve it by getting a statement that everyone knows. . . that the faculty sees the statement, the dean sees the statement. . . and so that we all understand where the chair stands . . . however, there are still those times when I see those conflicts."

He points out other issues which are problematic from his perspective: (1) Due to his position and role he has to be careful in his interactions with people to avoid the appearance of favoritism or special treatment. He feels some restrictions in that. (2) People hold back some information, or do not tell him everything because of his superior position.

In a situation of conflict, his strategy is to vote on issues. He says that if conflict is not resolved in discussion, then "we actually do it in a democratic process." He prefers to talk to the group as a whole because he has found that "if I do not do that I do not get all the points

that need to come out." In few cases, he has asked key people to come to his office for discussion.

If he has a new idea he will talk first with all the division directors and committee members. After getting their feedback (if positive) he asks them to present that idea in the division's committee meetings. He emphasizes that "I want everybody feel that they got an idea and let us look at it." He further emphasizes that he does not want them to feel that all ideas came from him because "I do not profess to have all the good ideas in my head." If the presentation gets positive feedback, then he proceeds with a motion.

If it does not get the needed approval, he will put that idea on hold. His philosophy is:

> "if it does not get their support there
> must be something wrong with it."

His department has a club where the students come, and therefore they have some interaction. He wants to stay in teaching because it gives him the opportunity to interact with students, and he thinks that "it is really important to keep in touch with the students in terms of what they are doing."

His department holds regular faculty meetings, once every two months. He also acts as a faculty member in some divisional committees that meet "pretty regularly."

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

He says that he enjoys his job but he is still adjusting to

it. He has some frustrating times and his frustrations arise

from his realization that:

> "basically people do not understand the
> way that I am operating." He explains,
> "when I say things . . . I think they
> have trouble believing me that I really
> meant it."

He enjoys teaching. He enjoys seeing people succeeding (e.g.,

faculty members getting awards) and working together. He

enjoys scheduling classes and solving problems. He dislikes

attending meetings. According to him, some meetings are just

a waste of time: "nothing of importance is discussed." He

also feels uncomfortable in deciding salaries because, as he

says:

> "whenever you evaluate people it is
> uncomfortable. . . because you are going
> to make a decision and somebody is not
> going to like it."

He has thought of changing his job. As he says, "I do not feel

that this is something that I want to do forever." One of the

reasons is that he thinks that due to his involvement in

administration he is sacrificing a lot in his research and

teaching. At this point, therefore, he is not sure, but he

says that after his term is over he will evaluate what he

wants and what the faculty wants, and then he will make a

decision.

George has been the chairperson for almost 14 years. His department is within the College of Arts and Sciences.

My first encounter with him, over the phone, lasted for only a few minutes. He very easily agreed to arrange the interview. On the day of the interview, I knocked his office door, as it was closed. He asked me to come in and to take a seat. He wanted to finish some paperwork that he was doing at that time. So I waited for around 15 minutes.

When we started our conversation, I thought he was informal, but not totally relaxed. He made a lot of hand movements and leaned back on the chair.

Fourteen years ago, he was asked by several faculty members to apply to this position. At first, he was not interested in administration. But then, as he says:

> "I see this position as a necessary evil
> . . . we need to have a representative."

So he had waited a long time before making his decision and was trying his best now not to make it an administrative job.

When I asked him for a copy of his job description, his response was:

> "I saw it somewhere but did not take it
> seriously because I know that was just
> administrative nitty-gritty, it does not
> mean anything to me."

Role Definition

George strongly emphasizes the difference between a

141

president or a vice-president, whom he considers administrators, and the chairman of a department. In his words:

> "I see the chairman of a department as an educator, who just happens to be also responsible for maintaining the department."

Accordingly, George sees his role as an educator; and "the administrator role is a very minor part of what I see as my role."

Therefore, he says:

> "I am an advocate for my department. . . so my role probably would be . . . really. . . an equal faculty member with just a few extra privileges."

His philosophy regarding his work-role came from his strong belief that a straight administrator, who knows nothing about or cares nothing about the discipline, is not well-suited to act as a chairman.

Over the past years, his role has changed only gradually. Asked what a head's role should be, he is silent for a while, then says that he does not know. He emphasizes "I am not sure what it should be." Pragmatically, however, he thinks that a department should be represented by someone and the best way to represent a department is to have a teacher to do that. So, in short, he thinks that he is doing what a head should be doing.

He emphasizes that if somebody who is only an

administrator becomes the head of this department, he will not like that. He continues, "I do not think that my faculty would like that either."

Organizational Expectations

At first he did not know what he is "supposed to do." He was told only to represent the faculty, and the dean. He thinks that "it is probably the kind of job where you grow in," but his background on counselling has also influenced his dealings with people.

In counselling, he argued:

> "rather than confronting we try to mediate things . . . we try to work them out."

He got defensive when I asked about "others'" expectations. He responded by saying:

> "I represent the entire department . . .
> I am not an autocratic person. . . I do
> not make decisions on my own. If I see
> myself as an administrator then I would
> make the decision which I think is good
> for the department . . . you see that is
> not the way that I would operate."

I had to explain him specifically that I thought that maybe the dean or the faculty have certain expectations from him.

George refers to the president, dean, faculty, and the students' expectations. He thinks that the students see him as a "super-faculty member. . . someone who can do everything." The dean expects him to represent the entire department.

He explains:

> "I am certain that the dean expects me to
> represent the entire department. . . she
> wants to know what my department feels,
> she wants to know those sorts of things .
> . . she sees me certainly different from
> the rest of the faculty but it is   only
> because I am recognized as . . . their
> representative."

The faculty wants him to advocate their cases, and to involve them in all decisions. He emphasizes the strong role that faculty members play. In one discussion he says:

> "my authority comes from the faculty. I
> have all the authority they will allow me
> to have . . . my faculty controls my
> existence."

The president expects him to live within the broader norms and rules of the university.

He meets with the students on several occasions: (1) meet and talk with each transfer student, (2) confer with students with problems on advisement or registration day (3) advise students on major day. He also maintains an open-door policy. He explains:

> "even though that sometimes gets into the
> effectiveness of some of the things that
> I have to do, that is the only way to get
> in touch with the students."

George has regular meetings with the dean and the faculty and that is his major way of knowing all these expectations. He strongly emphasizes:

> "I share everything with them (the
> faculty). . .I do not keep anything back.

> I don't believe in the idea that
> information is power that you do not
> share with people . . . I do not work
> that way."

When he first joined this position, he had no idea as to what he was "supposed to do." He emphasized that he was only told to represent the faculty and the dean.

He says that there have been gradual changes in his role but no abrupt changes.

Freedom

George thinks that the structure of the university does not allow any head to have too much freedom. In his case, he says, "my faculty controls my existence . . . I have all the authority they will allow me to have. . . ." He also feels some major constraints from administrators above the dean's level-- administrators whom he thinks have taken a defensive stance in terms of not making any pro-active decisions but only reacting.

When asked what he would like to do under conditions of 100% freedom, he responded, "That have to be above the dean." Here he was making the point that such a hypothetical situation should include freedom from above the dean's level too.

He thinks that under such a situation probably he would double the faculty and then he a Ph.D. program. One of the constraining factors is the university's defensive stance.

This means that upper-level administrators do not plan seriously and do not realize that they have some very qualitative programs which could be improved more if given attention.

Role Performance

George says that he has not seen that many conflicting situations, perhaps three or four in the last fourteen years. His strategy under such conflicting situations is to be open with faculty, to call faculty meetings, to discuss both sides of the issue, to look at the strengths and weaknesses of both sides, and then as he says "We hammer on till we come to an agreement."

He notes that some departments make decisions on a majority vote, but he does not do that. He stays in the discussion with the faculty until he ends up with 100% support. He points out:

> "unless you get 100% of their support you don't last. . . making decisions on a majority vote normally allows the chairman to be a chair for 3 years."

When George decides to start a new project, he takes his idea to the faculty who help him "iron out" problems and then he takes it to the dean to get her support. The dean carries it from there. If it fails to get approval, he will reflect back to decide whether it is a "stupid idea" or a "good idea." If it is a stupid idea, he will let it go; if not, then he will

go back and try to convince the players of its usefulness. If that does not help, then he will take the idea to the dean, informing her that the faculty are against it, and will also inform the faculty about his going to the dean.

George emphasizes:

> "I believe in working within the system and I think that it is not very productive to beat your head against the wall."

He sits with the staff and talks with them frequently; sometimes he goes to lunch with them. He says that he treats them almost as equally as faculty.

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

George emphasizes that he is "well satisfied" with his job. He explains:

> "I have been here for fourteen years, so obviously I am satisfied with it. . . I don't know, I guess it is because of the way I look at the job . . . you know, I don't see myself as an administrator . . . you know there are some people who see this job as an administrator. . . and their view is to move up. . . and I am not interested in that. . . I am very happy in the classroom."

The things he enjoys most are the following:

1. Having the opportunity to see how creative he can be in facilitating faculty members do their job.

2. Having the ability to structure his own class in ways that not only meet the students' needs but are convenient for him too.

147

He hates attending meetings. He argues that in several meetings that he has attended nothing was discussed that related to this department. He also hates paperwork. He argues:

> "It seems to me that chairmen do an awful
> lot of paper generation and get very
> little back. . . we are always being
> asked to write a report on this or that .
> . . to meet deadlines and this is not the
> dean's level. . . it is above the dean's
> level. We have a deadline to submit
> something and we rush in . . . turn it in
> . . . probably put our best efforts . . .
> then maybe six months later it will come
> back for updating which means that
> somewhere along the lines there was a
> lot of time wasted."

Eight years ago Robert came as the head of this department, which is within the College of Arts & Sciences.

I felt from my initial encounter with him that he would be the most difficult person to establish contact. On the phone, when I first contacted him, he spoke very little and most of the time was silent. He just said, "hello" and kept silent. I told him who I was, what I needed from him, etc. -- and all that time he was maintaining total silence. So I had to ask him very directly whether I could have an interview with him. He said "yes," and then remained quiet again. When I asked him about the time, he responded, "you can come today." I choose to go the next day, however, because I thought I needed to think in a new way to get him to talk.

During the interview, he did not smile at all. He told me that I could start with the questions but he would not be able to give me more than one hour. The door of his office, a large room, was open. All the other offices were located a bit further away.

He joined this department as the head. His main reason for joining this position was that he thought he wanted to move upward and since he was a faculty member already, before this was the only position where he could move in.

He was not relaxed at all. I thought he was very cautious as to what he was saying, but he was also honest in

expressing his thoughts. He did not talk much. During our
conversation, his phone rang. I got the idea that he was
talking with a student. I noticed that he was talking in
monosyllables, as he had with me.

In the end he asked me how many interviews I needed to
take and wished me "good luck."

Role Definition

When asked about his role, Robert responded after a long
pause: "keeping up everybody going up in the
same direction."

Upon further discussion it became clear that he saw his role
in terms of a facilitator. In his own words:

> "we have a lot of energy, we have a lot
> of talent, and my role is to see that
> those people can accomplish that . . .
> and [that] all move generally in the same
> direction . . . so that they have their
> individual goals as well as the
> department's goals [accomplished]."

He adds that his role is to find out what they want to do, and
he tries to coordinate that in order to "get these parts of
the department get together for the benefit of everybody."

When asked how he is doing that, he explains:

> "The goals of this department have
> already been set up by upper
> administration, . . . and the faculty . .
> . each of them has his/her own personal
> goals. . . I am here to see that both get
> accomplished . . . I am not a dictator .
> . . this is not a privately owned
> corporation. . . where I am the sole
> owner. If I were I can tell people what
> to do . . . but I don't see that as my

> job . . . or my role. My role is to find
> out what they want to do, that is what I
> meant earlier when I said getting them in
> the same direction."

Robert says that there have been no major changes in his role since he came in here.

He emphasizes that he thinks that he is doing what a department's head should be doing.

Organizational Expectations

Robert refers to the dean, faculty, and the vice-president when discussing the expectations of "others". The dean, according to Robert, expects that he has total power over his department. He grumbles:

> "the dean and the vice-president seem to
> have a tough time understanding that my
> word is not law . . . they think that
> whatever I say goes."

The faculty expect him to make sure that the paperwork is done correctly, and that "their individual level interests are taken care of." They also expect him to "be an energetic chair . . . also expect me to set the agenda for the department."

Robert emphasizes that these are all his impressions based on observing "the way they ask questions, the way they write to me . . . "

When asked about the students' expectations, Robert says that he thinks the students do not have the slightest idea what a chairman does. He adds, "I think that their only

expectation from me is as a faculty member."

He emphasizes that "certainly" he had ideas about his role, because he was a chair before in another department. His role has remained basically the same.

Freedom

Robert says very clearly and strongly that there are major constraints in terms of shaping his role. He comments that "I realize that the common typical response to that is there are lots of freedoms." He argues, however, that the higher one goes in the organization the more constraints one faces. As he explains:

> "the expectations become extremely constraining in considering what would be considered appropriate behaviors."

He continues:

> "the way I dress, I use the telephone, have already been shaped by the position . . . maybe once in a while I would talk to people over the phone in my own ways, but I cannot do that. Because you represent all of the people in the department, plus the university. So there are ranges of behaviors that have been set appropriate which narrow you considerably as you rise."

When asked what he would like to do given complete freedom, Robert argues that in an organization there is no such thing as complete freedom. He further adds that he has not thought anything related to that because it won't have any practical value.

Role Performance

Robert argues that there are "certainly" conflicting expectations regarding his role. He gives an example where the dean expects him to decide on something within 24 hours and that has to be the expression of the department. The department, on the other hand, wants to operate democratically on a consensus basis which obviously would take more time (i.e., it cannot be done within 24 hours).

In a conflicting situation, Robert's strategy is to negotiate, to "try to find places where you can compromise . . . try to find objectives that overlap." If that does not work, then he makes a choice/decision. But he emphasizes, "I don't particularly like to do that . . . before that I try to find some consensus . . . some kind of negotiation."

He argues that his strategy in moving ahead with a project varies with the nature of the project. He says that if it has something to do with administration, he does it on his own, because "nobody else knows or cares." But if it involves curriculum or teaching procedures he does a lot of face to face work, does a lot of sharing, and asks people's opinions. His basic strategy is to "give a slice of the pie to everyone."

If any of his plan/proposal fails to get approval, he will not spend any more time on it.

Robert meets with the dean, and with selected faculty

members every week.

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

According to Robert he is satisfied with his job. When asked what part of his work he liked most, he kept silent for a few minutes. Finally he commented that it is a tough question to answer. He guesses that he likes solving problems --selecting a problem, thinking about alternative ways of solving the problem, and solving the problem. Such problems can be on any issue--research, students, funds, etc.

He dislikes doing paperwork. He argues:

> "I think that we have a lot of nonsense
> paperwork, that we have to make up forms,
> sign forms, . . . which can be done by
> telephones . . . sometimes you don't even
> have to do anything about those . . .
> because nobody pays attention to those."

If opportunity arises, he will consider changing his job. He is interested in working as a dean because he thinks that the dean deals with real and large problems with the outside world and cities. He also may work in a private corporation just to see whether he can do it; he thinks that he can.

He thinks that he is doing what a department's head should be doing.

INFORMANT # 11: DAVID

David is the chairperson of a department within the School of Business. He came 21 years ago with the goal of teaching. For the last 8 years he has been working as the chairperson.

During our telephone conversation he asked a few questions about my thesis. At first he had some reservations about the recording of the interview. At one point, he asked me whether I was going to talk with any other faculty or staff regarding his role behaviors. When he was assured that I would not, he agreed to sit for the interview. I thought he was cautious but friendly too.

On the day of the interview, he came out of his office and greeted me. He offered me coffee, and started talking informally about different things . . . my job, career, courses, etc. He closed the door. At one point, the secretary knocked his door and asked him something.

Role Definition

In David's words:

> "I am supposed to be the leader of the
> faculty and I should plan well our future
> activities . . . the future direction of
> the department . . . as the leader . . .
> I should be the spokesperson for the
> department, and speak out on any issue
> that might affect the department and also
> speak out to administration for anything
> that might affect our department . . . so
> I am the spokesperson as well as the
> leader."

According to David, the future direction of his department is coming from outside sources, mainly from professional associations. He thinks that as the leader of the faculty he oversees the development of the department along the lines required by those outside sources.

He says that he did not had much pre-conceptions about his position before accepting it. He explains that at that time, when he first joined this position, the basic aim of the department and also the university was teaching, but since then it has become a teaching-research institution.

He thinks that his role has changed. As he points out:

> "When I first joined this position . . . several years ago . . . we had less faculty . . . and we had just as many students as we have now. And all we could do was try to find out how to teach the masses. But since then by the end of the year we have changed from a teaching orientation to a teaching-research orientation institution. The whole school has . . . and consequently there has been an evolvement from teaching to teaching and research . . . and accordingly my role has also changed."

He thinks that his role will further change because:

> "we are in the computer age right now . . . I read in an article that we are trying to develop more PCs and the whole thing is changing. We are going through preregistration now . . . we hope to go to telephone registration . . . or maybe in the managing of the department. If that happens, I have to plan how many sections or classes on . . . do we need . . . which we hope to manage well . . . scheduling of classes is one of the main

functions that the chairs do."

When asked what a chair's role should be, he laughed and said, "I think what I am doing is what a chairman should be doing but the only difference is that you should be doing it better."

Organizational Expectations

He points to the tenured faculty, the dean, and the vice-president as the major actors whose expectations he needs to consider. He also mentions the President, Board of Trustees, and the State's Board of Higher Education. He says that the dean and the faculty want him to be the spokesperson of the department.   They also want him to provide leadership in efforts which may lead to the improvement of the program.

I asked him what the students might expect from him. He keeps silent for a while and says that they want him to solve their problems with the grades. As he says:

> "They   think   that   the   department
> chairperson can change their grades . . .
> if they get an F or D that I can simply
> go ahead and change it to a C."

He knows all these expectations from the chairs' meetings with the dean who asks each of the chairs different questions on various issues. As he explains:

> "We have meetings of all the chairs in
> this school with the dean and at that
> meeting he will ask questions about
> procedures that he wants us to do or
> maybe any new concept that is coming down
> and will ask what does the department of

157

> . . . feel about this, or what should the
> department feel about this. As for
> example, about hiring of faculty,
> recruiting students . . . he will ask
> questions about those and then I have to
> talk."

I asked him about the staff's expectations. He keeps silent for a while and says that they do not have any expectations besides the official day to day work.

Freedom

David argues that though he "has a lot of freedom," he has to live within the constraints of their faculty's handbook. He explains that the faculty's handbook spells out the duties and the responsibilities of the chairman, and "so" he has to live within those boundaries. He explains:

> "The faculty handbook spells out the
> duties and responsibilities of the
> chairmen, and so I have to live within
> those boundaries, those constraints . .
> . aa . . . it's quite broad, but there
> are something . . . . you know . . .
> that I am supposed to be alert to and .
> . . know about . . . you know."

In situations of complete freedom he would like to have more qualified students in his program. He says:

> "I would like to go back where we were
> before. We were for a number of years,in
> the commencement exercise,the top
> graduating class . . . we had a number of
> good students . . . we don't have that
> anymore, if I could I would like to get
> that back. It is missing."

He points out that to get more qualified students it is important to improve the quality of the program. He thinks

158

that the shortage of tenured faculty is the major constraining factor for such an improvement.

Role Performance

David agrees that there are conflicting expectations regarding his role. He gives an such example the fact that the dean thinks that he has a lot of power with the faculty and the faculty think that he has a lot of power with the dean. At times, too, some faculty are unhappy with the schedules that they get.

Under conflicting situations, he tries to negotiate. If that does not work then he makes a decision. He says that when he decides to go ahead he will "have to consult with the tenured people in the department." He argues:

> "if it is something which has major effects you better get their support . . . you want to include them in your project . . . otherwise it is not going to be done."

He emphasizes that he will need their wholehearted 100% support. When I asked whether it is possible to get 100% support he responded, ". . . well you have to have a majority at least, and anything above it is a great use . . . a plus."

If it fails to get approval for something he considers a good idea then he will try again to persuade the opponents. He explains his tactics:

> "If I don't get their support then I have to work out on individual members, then I have to sit down and talk to them and say

> look I think that this is what we have to
> do . . . then try to explain and answer
> their questions, answer any concerns that
> they might have. . . and then go on from
> there."

He does not have any formal occasion where he can meet

the students. He says that there is a student organization in

his department which seldom asks him anything; instead they go

to the faculty for advice.

They have formal faculty meetings once a month. He adds:

> "But there are a lot of things that are
> done here by myself going to other
> person's office or simply running into a
> couple of faculty beyond the wall but
> generally . . . if I have something on my
> mind I can go to a faculty's room and say
> look this is what we are going to do . .
> . do you want to do it?"

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

He says that he likes his job. He adds, "You got to like

this job because you don't get that much pay (laughs)." The

things that he enjoys most are meeting with the students and

teaching. He dislikes listening to students' complaints about

grades because he thinks that they think he has so much power

to solve all their problems. As he explains, "They think that

you run the department, you dictate it."

He has not thought of changing his job mainly because of

his age and his satisfaction with his job.

He is very concerned about the use of calculators and

computers. He thinks that by using those the students are not

160

thinking anymore. As he says, "we are losing out something
here."

He is also concerned with the way certain classes are
held, e.g., pass/fail courses.

INFORMANT # 12: JAMES

James has been the chairperson for 14 years within the College of Human Resources.

Among my male informants he was the most difficult to contact. He seemed to be very busy in meetings, seminars, and workshops. His secretary told me once that she could give me an appointment four months later. I left my telephone number, however, and was surprised when one day he called me back. He was very empathetic, apologized for not calling me earlier and scheduled a session for our meeting.

We were supposed to meet at 3.00 in the afternoon, at which time I was waiting in front of his office. It was 4:00 p.m. when he came out of a meeting.

He was very close to what I expected: informal, friendly, open, and a very confident person. He leaned toward me and seemed very relaxed all the time.

This department was the youngest one in the university but had received the strongest rating that year. This department was at first a part of another department where James was a member of the faculty. He became the head of a new department in 1975. Actually, he was given the responsibility to create and build this new department.

He has been head of a community college in a heavily unionized setting, so, he has good negotiation experience. When he first came to this university, he was not actually

looking for administrative positions but positions where he could apply his thinking, and this position suited his purpose well.

Role Definition

James says, "I try to consider my role" as one of maintaining a balance between a facilitator and a leader. He sees his leadership role as:

> "best implemented by being a good environmental scanner, looking for those elements of the environmental factors that are threats and opportunities for us as an organizational unit . . . and then attempt to get the faculty involved in the process and in sharing in that process so that when we decide where we are going they are supportive of the process."

James started strategic planning in his department six years ago.

He describes his facilitator role in terms of the path-goal theory of leadership:

> "to help each member of the faculty and staff and student to achieve what they need to achieve in order to function successfully in their positions . . . to clear their paths. . . and not to clutter their path."

James appears to me as a strong entrepreneur, a person who has a mind of his own and who tries to stick to it.

James says that he is doing what a departmental head should be doing. He says that his role has not changed much because for the most part, he is the one who has created this

role.

Organizational Expectations

When talking about others' expectations, James refers to the dean, president, and the faculty. The president, James thinks, "obviously"expects him to listen to his vision and mission and to those of his chief executive and executive group. In regard to the dean's expectations, he comments, "From the dean's point of view, the expectations would be . . . keeping the store, maintaining the quality and standard and improving them if necessary." He clarifies:

> "I don't think he views me only as the
> caretaker . . . he would like to see me
> as the leader."

The dean also expects him to operate within the norms of "what a quality university is supposed to be."

The faculty's expectations, according to James, are as follows:

> "The faculties expect from me . . . they
> told me to find opportunities for them to
> allow them to self-actualize . . . if you
> would say . . . and I think that they
> expect me to continue my performance as
> an academic at the level that has always
> been . . . I would be surprised if they
> would have been otherwise tolerant of me
> to continue my research and teaching you
> know."

He gives his thoughts regarding the students' expectations on getting them out of trouble in the following words:

> "You know. . . they miss an exam,
> regardless of the reasons . . . they

> expect me to help them out . . . that I
> am not sure is a fair set of
> expectations."

The faculties in James' department are all involved in strategic management planning. That is a major source for James to know the faculty's expectations. He also sends his performance evaluation form to all faculty; their responses give him some indication of their thoughts. Also, they often tell him face-to-face their expectations. His encounter with the dean is mostly done on an informal basis; he reiterates occasionally that the dean is a very informal person.

He has become aware of students' expectations out of his many focus group activities with the students. The students also evaluate him annually. He also maintains close contact with alumni.

James emphasizes that he does not believe in guessing. As he explains:

> "If I read something I will go and ask .
> . . I don't believe in guessing because
> you may misread your perceptions and my
> perceptions are always different . . .
> so I will ask him or her if there is any
> message there."

Freedom

Given complete freedom, he would like his department to assume a leadership role where they can bring something to their field which no one else is bringing. He laughs and says, "I do not want this to be misinterpreted." To implement

that, they would develop global policies; and ultimately it would become the best place for information, education, teaching, and thinking on important issues related to the field. Traditional thinking about what a university should be is the major constraining factor according to James. He explains that the world has changed so much and their field is so tied to an industry that is moving so rapidly that there is need for change in this department's goals and curriculum design. He argues that it does not mean that the entire system should be destroyed; on the other hand, it means, allowing opportunities for creativity and change within a structure.

Role Performance

He says that there are some conflicting expectations regarding his role. The conflict arises basically between his expectations and others' expectations of his role. He argues:

> "When there is a mismatch in expectations
> I yield to the mismatches if they can
> make a good case of my being wrong."

He feels that he is also obligated to provide evidence as to why he is right. So he thinks that such issues could and should be resolved by careful deliberations and proof of right/wrong.

In his words:

> "They [faculty members, students] know
> where I am coming from. . . if there is a
> mismatch in the expectations I yield to

the mismatches. . . if they can make a
good case . . . if I am right I am
obligated to prove that I am right; first
of all I must not ever go far without
giving a lot of thoughts, deliberation,
and concentration but if I am right then
I feel that I am obligated to provide
evidence as to why I am right. Likewise,
I would want someone to proof me why they
are right from a rational basis so . . .
those are simple rules that you try to
take care of and they work I think."

He also adds:

"It's just the contingency theory people
speaking best . . . that you must
consider the followers, the leaders, the
situation and try to balance all of that
while still going forward so that you
fit."

He says that their strategic planning sessions are often very

intensive and these end in setting up a very clear direction

for them and the department. So, when a conflicting situation

arises between two groups of faculty, he looks at the

strategic plan and sees whether it fits within it. He

emphasizes that because of this plan, "we never had that

opposing perspectives."

He and his faculty meet with the dean once every two

weeks. He argues that since they operate on a management by

program objective program, the faculty and he meet almost

constantly.

He says that he is a "prospector by nature," meaning

that he is always looking for new opportunities. When he has

a new idea he will find out how many people have bought the

idea. Then together they will find out who has the resources to do it and what are the constraints. If he sees the way clear, in terms of people and resources, they go ahead and do it. If not and if it is outside their missions, they just drop it.

When asked how he will feel if any of his projects fail to get approval, James smiles and says:

> "I remember the first day in one of my jobs . . . my supervisor told me that 'I hope that you have a good strong self-concept because in this job you will experience 90% rejection.'"

Then he says that such occasions will not arise because "I will not bring anything that is outside the strategic plan."

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

He says that he "loves his job." He clarifies:

> "I cannot remember a day when I . . . you know . . . not wanting to come to work . . . I never found a day when I was just bored."

Implementing the strategic plan is the most enjoyable part of his job. He enjoys seeing people (faculty, students) grow. He dislikes dealing with administrative details, e.g., deciding who is going to teach this or that course.

He points out that from a personal standpoint, "I had a chance to self-actualize . . . I had a chance to be free to apply my thinking and . . . I just never found a day when I was bored." He has not thought of changing his job.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS

This chapter analyses and compares the information that was gathered through the different data collection methods, viz. indepth interviews, informants' job descriptions, the short written questionnaire, and the telephone conversations. The discussion that follows is presented in two parts.

In part 1, the focus is on analyses and comparisons between the men and women informants in terms of the framework of the study.

In part 2, the focus of comparison and analysis is on issues not related directly to informants' work-role construction but which are related to the issue of the "different voice."

PART 1: ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN IN TERMS OF THE FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The analyses and comparisons between men and women are organized under the following three process-elements of work-role construction:

1. Role occupants' expectations from their roles.

2. Role occupants' making sense of organizational expectations regarding their roles.

3. Role-occupants construction of their negotiated work-roles.

Discussion of almost all of these issues and elements is preceded by a synthesis of the informants' responses in the form of tables.

1. ROLE OCCUPANTS EXPECTATIONS

This includes informants' (i) description of their roles; (ii) understandings of the "ideal" role of a chairperson; and (iii) thoughts on what they would like to do given complete freedom.

i. Role definition/description

TABLE-1 (A): Role definition/description

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Role	Meaning
Mary	Leader, manager	Cheerleader role model, efficiency.
Nancy	Responsible for faculty's growth, facilitator, leader	Future direction of the dept., students' growth.
Victoria	Manager, develop good work-atmosphere	Handling paperwork, being available to students, good work-atmosphere
Barbara	Facilitator Intermediary between admn. & the faculty, develop good work-environment	Advocate for faculty & students supportive to students' needs
Judith	Facilitator, listener to students and faculty, moderator, develop good work-environment	facilitating somebody/something to happen
Kathryn	Maintain good working atmosphere, improve the program	Everybody can work happily.

TABLE-1 (B): role definition/description

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Role	Meaning
James	Balance between a facilitator & a leader	Strategic planner, help all do their job
Steve	Leader, middleman, mediator,	Providing tools to faculty, mediating among faculty & dean and faculty
Robert	Facilitator	Leading everybody in achieving departmental goals & personal goals
George	Mostly Educator, & administrator	A faculty member with some administrative duties
Richard	Facilitator, middleman	Providing tools to achieving the department's goals; tools for faculty to teach and do research
David	Leader of the faculty, spokesperson for the dept.	Planning, scheduling classes

After an analysis of the informants' discussion of their "role" as the head/chair of their departments, two broad but distinctive categories/archetypes emerge. These are:

(1) concern for program/department goals and development,

(2) concern which goes beyond the program/department's goals, resulting in a concern for people --doing something for

people.

Women and men chairs of this study clearly differ greatly in terms of what they think their role is. **Mary, Nancy, Victoria, Judith, Kathryn, and Barbara's descriptions of their role fall in the archetype of "concern for people".** Mary shows this when she sees her role as that of a cheerleader: her need to go and tell people when they do good things and her desire to make people "feel good about what they do" express her concern.

Judith's emphasis on the need to listen to students' problems and to improve the work-atmosphere and Nancy's feeling responsible for the faculty's growth (so they can help the students to grow) show their "concern for people". Victoria shows this concern through her emphasis on creating a happy and comfortable environment for the faculty, which she thinks is conducive to a good classroom learning environment. Kathryn's feeling that her main role is to maintain a good working environment in order to have motivated and happy people clearly shows her "concern for people."

Barbara's emphasis on creating a good work-environment, and on being supportive to the needs of the students (who she thinks are the main clients of the university) show her concern for people.

Men chairs, on the other hand, see their role in quite different ways.

Richard sees his role as that of a facilitator (providing tools to faculty to do their work) and a middleman between the dean and the faculty. Robert thinks that his role is to achieve both the departmental goals and individual members' goals in teaching and research. Thus, both Richard and Robert conceive their roles in terms related to their program/department's goals. David voices similar concerns by seeing himself as the leader of the faculty (overseeing the development of the department) and as spokesperson for the department. Steve sounds similar to Richard, Robert, and David. He is basically concerned with achieving departmental goals (offering courses) and the faculty's goals (research, publication).

George appears a bit different when he says that he sees himself as an educator, and not as an administrator. However, as an educator, his concern also lies in improving the department by helping faculty do their work. And as an educator, he sees his role as similar to that of a faculty member. James sees his role as that of a strategic planner for the department. As a facilitator, he also tries to help the faculty to achieve their goals in teaching and research.

All these "role-conceptions" of the male informants clearly show their strong role commitment to the department's/program's goals and improvement.

174

ii. "Ideal role" of a chair/head

During her discussion of what her role is, Judith emphasizes several times that these "should be the role of a departmental head." She sees her professional activities as separate from her departmental head's role. She therefore thinks that the emphasis on management should be decreased so that heads can concentrate more on doing research activities.

Mary sounds similar to Judith as she says that ideally the departmental head's role should include more emphasis on scholarly activities, i.e., writing grants and doing research activities. Therefore, less emphasis should be put on management and teaching.

Asked her opinion about the "ideal role of a head," Nancy's response is that she is doing more of what she thinks a departmental head should be doing. She argues that the chair in an academic department needs to have some time to help the department grow through helping the faculty and the students grow and by remaining in the forefront of research and scholarly activities.

Kathryn "feels" that a departmental head's role should emphasize developing a good working atmosphere in the department.

Victoria thinks that she is doing part of what a department head should be doing. But she would like to have more time to read professional journals and to provide more

175

direction to the department.

According to Barbara, a departmental head's role should always be that of a facilitator for the faculty and the students.

Among the men chairs, Steve thinks that a department head's role should give priority to increasing the excellence of the faculty. This can be done by bringing in resources for the faculty, by assigning courses in such a way that faculty members can offer courses in their specialized areas, by providing them with travel funds, comfortable office spaces, and so forth.

Richard says that a chair's job is not a managerial job. A chair should always be a facilitator of what goes on in his or her department.

George is not sure at first what a head's role should be. As he says, "I am not sure what it should be." But he adds later that a department should be represented by someone who is an educator.

Robert argues that he is doing what a department head should be doing.

David's response was, "I think what I am doing is what a chairman should be doing but the only difference is that you should be doing it better."

James's response is that the ideal role of a department head should be to encourage the department to grow.

In short, all the male chairs indicate that they are doing what a chair should be doing.

iii. <u>Working in a situation of full autonomy/freedom</u>

TABLE-2 (A): under full autonomy

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Would like to do, or see happening	Constraints
Mary	Improve equipment, get more computers, hire more faculty.	Resources
Nancy	Will not teach for six months, instead will write grants, articles for that period with all the faculty members.	Economics
Victoria	Get the latest in technology, change the curriculum.	Money, tenured faculty, university's rules
Barbara	Spend more time on research	individualistic academic tradition
Judith	Spend more time on research, turn the program into a nationally recognized program, send some faculty to other universities	people
Kathryn	Do more research, achieve a good working atmosphere	tenured faculty

TABLE-2 (B): under full autonomy

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Things to do, or see happening	Constraints
James	Turn the program into an excellent program	Traditional thinking
Steve	Start a Ph.D. program	Resources
Robert	Cannot think of anything	
George	Start a Ph.D. program, double the faculty	Defensive stance of the university
Richard	Develop more collegial professional atmosphere	Hierarchy
David	Attract more qualified students	Resources, lack of enough tenured faculty

The above tables show that Nancy, Barbara, Judith, and Kathryn mention doing more research; Mary focuses on equipment and resources; Victoria focuses on equipment and curriculum. **Mary and Victoria are talking about things related to the program. The other four were talking more in terms of professional development.**

James, Steve, George, and David mention activities related to improving the program. Robert did not answer this

question because as he says, "there is no organization without 100% autonomy...therefore, it is useless to think what I would do under 100% freedom." Richard would like to see a more professional collegial atmosphere in the department.

In regard to the constraining factors, no coherent pattern emerged, **except that more women faculty (Kathryn, Victoria, Barbara, Judith) refer to "tenured faculty" as one major constraining factor.**

2. ROLE-OCCUPANTS MAKING SENSE OF ORGANIZATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

This includes the informants' (i) identification of individuals, within and/or outside the university, whose expectations regarding their role are important for them to consider; (ii) description of these others' expectations; and (iii) informants' mode of knowing these expectations.

i. Identification of "others" whose expectations are important for informants to consider.

TABLE-3 (A): Identification of "others"

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	"Others" whose expectations are important
Mary	Students, faculty, dean, staff, president, vice-president
Nancy	Dean, student, faculty
Victoria	Dean, faculty
Barbara	Students, faculty, dean, staff
Judith	Dean, faculty, students, staff
Kathryn	Dean, student, faculty, staff

All the women chairs, except Victoria, mention the dean, faculty, and the students as actors whose expectations they need to take into consideration. Victoria did not mention the students. In addition to this, Barbara, Judith, Kathryn, and Mary mention the staff's expectations too. Mary also refers to the president and the vice-president.

TABLE-3 (B): Identification of "others"

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	"Others" whose expectations are important
James	Dean, president, faculty
Steve	Faculty, dean, president
Robert	Dean, vice-president, faculty
George	Faculty, president, students, dean
Richard	Faculty, student, dean, vice-president, president, staff
David	Faculty, dean, vice-president, president, Board of Trustees, Board of Higher Education

Among the male chairs, all of them mention the faculty, dean, and the president's expectations. In addition, George and Richard point to the students as an important group. Richard also includes the staff within important "others."

To be clear as to their thoughts on students' expectations, I asked Steve, Robert, James, and David whether they thought students might have certain expectations from them.

ii. Description of the expectations of "others"

TABLE-4 (A): Description of the expectations of "others"

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	"Others" expectations
Mary	Students: friend, mediator Faculty: management; Dean: leader, scholarly activities; Staff: fair work, President: carry on the mission of the university
Nancy	Dean: responsibility for faculty Student:keeping them abreast of her activities, be a good role model; Faculty: represent them
Victoria	Faculty: management; Dean: decision-making, conflict handling, remaining up-to-date; Students: fair grading
Barbara	Students: supportive, create a learning atmosphere; Faculty: help them to work together, feel good about themselves; Dean: work atmosphere, administration, program, Staff: respect and fair treatment
Judith	Dean: administration, problem solving, fair treatment, to consider each faculty member individually; Faculty: resources, paperwork; Students: listening to their problems; Staff:fair treatment, work atmosphere
Kathryn	Dean: good work atmosphere; Students: Listen to their problems Faculty: resources to be spent honestly Staff: respect and fair work load

TABLE-4 (B): Descriptions of the expectations of "others"

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Expectations of "others"
James	Dean: Leader, live within the university's norms, management; President: mission of the university; Faculty: find opportunities for them, good performance.
Steve	Faculty: leadership in direction of which they approve, facilitate their career; Dean: accomplish department's goals, administration; President: contribute to the mission of the university.
Robert	Dean: Exercise total power; Vice-president: exercise total power; Faculty: administration, take care of faculty's personal interest.
George	Faculty: advocate their cases, to involve them in making decisions; Student: super faculty member; Dean: represent the department; President: live within the broad norms and rules of the university
Richard	Faculty: providing tools, administrative details, represent them to the dean; Students: good program, competent faculty, fair treatment; Dean, vice-president, president: program improvement, solving departmental problems; Staff: to make sure that all faculty treat them in a professional manner and to facilitate their career development
David	Faculty, Dean, Vice-President, President: spokesperson of the department, leadership

Women chairs give various description of their understandings of the students' expectations from them. The most important ones are (1) friend, mediator (Mary), (2) listening to their problems (Judith, Kathryn), (3) supportive,

creating a learning atmosphere (Barbara), and (4) fair grading (Victoria).

Two male chairs referred to the students' expectations. George thinks that the students think that he can do anything; Richard says that they expect fair treatment and a good program from him.

When asked about the students expectations, Robert says that he does not think that the students have any other expectations from him besides being a faculty member. Steve, due to his newness, does not know any of these expectations. David shares George's idea that they think he can do anything, like changing their grades. James includes getting them (the students) out of trouble.

Women's descriptions of students' expectations related mostly to more personal items and men's are related to their professional relationship.

Mary, Victoria, Judith, and Kathryn mention that the faculty expect them to perform their managerial work. Barbara points out that their expectation from her is to help them work together. Nancy emphasizes that they want her to represent their cases.

George, James, Steve, and Robert emphasize the need to take into consideration the faculty members' own personal interests. David and Richard see their expectations in terms of representing their colleagues.

The managerial focus seem to be less than for women.

With regard to the dean's expectations, **all the male informants think that their expectations are mostly related to achieving departmental goals,** management, or being the spokesperson for the department.

Among the women informants, Mary, Victoria, Barbara, and Judith point out the dean's expectations in terms of their managerial roles. **But women chairs also give some other kinds of expectations,** viz. responsibilities for the faculty (Nancy); good work-atmosphere (Barbara, Victoria); and fair treatment in which each faculty member is considered individually (Judith).

iii. __Mode of knowing these expectations__

TABLE-5 (A): Mode of knowing

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Mode of knowing
Mary	Covert (mostly), "wandering around", listening, talking, experience as a faculty member
Nancy	Indirect, some from job description, talking
Victoria	Perception, informal discussion
Barbara	"Management by walking", contact with students, informal meetings on a one to one basis
Judith	Assumptions, experience as a faculty, observing other heads' performing, educational background
Kathryn	Indirect, nonverbal, look at "suggestion box," dean's project, faculty members questions on different issues

TABLE-5 (B): Mode of knowing

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Mode of knowing
James	MBO, faculty tells him, students' talk in focus group activities, informal talk with the dean
Steve	Face-to-face talk, meeting with the dean
Robert	Impressions, writings, ask questions
George	Meetings, open door policy
Richard	Dean explicitly tells those in meetings, faculty talks, personal experience of being a faculty member and a student
David	Talks, ask questions

A major contrast appears among the male and female chairs on the issue of how they have become aware of these expectations.

All the female chairs emphasize the "covert" nature of these expectations. They argue that these are their own "perceptions" or "indirect expectation" or "assumptions", and that their mode of knowing these is mostly through indirect ways, e.g. "wandering around," "informal discussion," "management by walking," "observation."

Men chairs, on the other hand, point to the relatively explicit nature of these expectations; they know these mostly through meetings, formal discussion, and face-to-face talk.

3. ROLE-OCCUPANTS' CONSTRUCTING THEIR NEGOTIATED WORK-ROLE

This issue is analyzed in terms of the following:

i.   informants' official job description,

ii. informants' level of job satisfaction,

iii. previous job idea, if any,

iv. differences from their initial expectations, if any,

v.   reasons for joining this position,

vi. other important feelings and thoughts related to their job and role.

Informants' official job descriptions

Informants' official job descriptions are compared and analyzed in terms of their own description of their role (table 1-A and table-1B). The purposes of such comparison are to see whether and how much the informants do conform to the official and/or institutional expectations as documented in their job descriptions.

Mary's job description

Mary's job description consists a list of the following duties:

1. Equitable allocation of instructional resources among all areas within the department.

2. Advisement of graduate/undergraduate students.

3. Class scheduling and teaching assignments of the department.

4. Program development at the graduate and the undergraduate

level.

5. Supervision of clRichardal and support staff.

6. Teaching graduate and/or undergraduate courses.

7. Service on College and University committees.

8. Research/scholarly/creative activities.

9. Public relations and recruitment.

10. Other administrative duties.

Mary's job description, thus, is a description of mostly administrative functions with the addition of doing some scholarly activities. However, in contrast to her official job description, Mary has defined her role in other ways (as cheerleader and role model). She is, thus, conceiving/thinking her role beyond this job description.

Kathryn's job description

Kathryn's job description states the following: "Administration of all programs within the department. Provide leadership in maintaining the quality of existing resident instruction, research, and extension programs, and guide the continued growth and development of the department. Teach in area of specialization and conduct research and/or creative activities. Represent the university within the university and professional community."

Her definition of her role emphasizes other aspects of her role. For example, she strongly emphasizes her role of maintaining a good work-environment. This is her personal

definition of her role.

Victoria's job description

Victoria refers to the faculty handbook when talking about her official job description::

"The department chairperson is the administrator responsible for all departmental activities. He or she must provide leadership in departmental decision-making. In addition, the chairperson is an advocate of the academic interests of the faculty in curricular matters; is the spokesperson for the department in matters that concern personnel and resource issues; represents the interests of individual faculty and the department to the administration; and conveys the administrative position and decisions to the faculty."

Table I-A shows that Victoria also has defined her role beyond this official job description, which does not say anything about "developing good working atmosphere".

Nancy's job description

Nancy's job description includes her administrative role and her responsibilities to the faculty. Some of these are given below:

"A. Responsible to Dean, School of ....

B. Administer the graduate program in the School of ....,

   including:

1. Monitors the planning and development, implementation, and evaluation of the graduate program.

2. Monitors printed materials and literature describing the graduate program.

3. Performs administrative functions for graduate program in articulating overall school needs.

4. Maintains liaison with the Dean of Graduate Studies.

C. 1. Establish department faculty search committees and forward the recommendations, along with their own, to the dean.

2. Prepares evaluation for faculty's appointments, retention, promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and awards. These evaluations will include recommendations for rank, salary, and merit."

As we can see from Table I-A, Nancy's role as related to faculty's growth is her own definition.

Judith's job description

Judith's job description also includes responsibilities which are identical to Kathryn's. Both Kathryn and Judith are working within the same school in the same university. Thus they have the same job descriptions. According to the table (table I-A), Judith describes her role in other ways. For example, she sees herself as a facilitator, and also as a listener to students. She, thus, sees and defines her role in her own way.

Barbara's job description

Barbara's job description describes the head's role in a

very broad and general way:

"The head will provide strong leadership for a diverse faculty."

Barbara too has defined her role in her own way which includes being a facilitator and also developing a good work-atmosphere for the department.

Steve's job description

Steve's job description has the same content as Barbara's because they are working in the same School within the same university. Thus his job description says the following: "The head will provide a strong leadership to a diverse faculty."

As table-I(B) shows, the way Steve has defined his role is very much consistent with his job description. For example, he emphasizes being a leader for the faculty.

David's job description

David's job description states the following: "The chairperson is responsible for the continued development, administration, and leadership of the department within the School. . .. The chairperson is responsible for the maintenance of an environment conducive to development of the faculty in fulfilling the department's objectives of quality teaching, research and service. Other responsibilities include faculty recruitment, teaching, course scheduling, budget preparation, administration of departmental resources

and administrative services; liaison with the local business community; representing the faculty in its relations with the School ...and the university; and the coordination through the dean's office, of activities that cross departmental lines."

David's description of his role pretty much reflects his job description. He sees himself mostly as an administrator and a leader for the faculty.

Robert, Richard, and George's job description

Robert, Richard, and George refer to the faculty handbook. All of them work in the same university, and therefore they have the same faculty handbook. They work in the same university as Victoria does; therefore have the same job description. As mentioned earlier, the faculty handbook describes the chairperson's role in the following ways:

"The department chairperson is the administrator responsible for all department activities. He/she must provide leadership in departmental decision making. In addition, the chairperson is an advocate of the academic interests of the faculty in curricular matters; is the spokesperson for the department in matters that concern personnel and resource issues; represents the interests of individual faculty and the department to the administration; and conveys the administrative position and decisions to the faculty."

As interpreted by Victoria, the faculty handbook describes the chair's role as that of a facilitator and a

spokesperson.

Both Richard and Robert define their role in ways which are consistent with the handbook. As discussed earlier, George sees himself mostly as an educator and not as an administrator. In this sense, he is seeing his role beyond the official job description. However, as an educator his concern lies mostly in improving the department by helping faculty do their work.

James' job description

James works within the same school that Judith and Kathryn do, and therefore has the same job description. He sees himself mostly as a leader and a facilitator. His description of his role, therefore, is based on the contents of his job description.

An analysis of women's self-definition of their role as compared to the content of their job descriptions shows that most women are creating their roles. Their job descriptions basically discuss their administrative and/or managerial duties and activities. But all of the women, to a greater or lesser degree, define their role in a broader way to manifest their "concern for people."

Men, on the other hand, seem to define their role mostly on the basis of their job descriptions. **On the basis of such an argument, one may argue that men are conforming more to the institutional requirement.**

But such an argument does not stand when we look at the informants' responses to the questions concerning the "ideal role" of a department's chair and their level of job satisfaction.

It is reasonable to assume that if these informants feel co-opted by the institutional requirement, they would describe differently the ideal role of a head (reflecting more of what they would like such a role to be). However, as discussed earlier, all male respondents emphasized that the "ideal role" of a departmental chairperson should be whatever they were doing. All female respondents also emphasized that the ideal role of a head should include what they are doing. Most of them also emphasized the importance of engaging in scholarly activities.

Respondents views on their job satisfaction are important here, because if someone is compromising more it is reasonable to expect that it will result in a lesser degree of job satisfaction.

TABLE-6 (A): level of job satisfaction

(Responses of the female informants)

Informants	Level of job satisfaction
Mary	Very, very much
Nancy	Varies day to day
Victoria	Like it
Barbara	O.k but "don't love it"
Judith	"Not sure"
Kathryn	"To some extent satisfied"

TABLE-6 (B): level of job satisfaction

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Level of job satisfaction
James	"Love it"
Steve	"Enjoy it very much"
Robert	"Yes"
George	"Obviously well satisfied"
Richard	"Enjoy it but still adjusting to it"
David	"Yes..got to like this job because you don't get that much pay"

Among the female chairs, Mary emphasizes that she likes her job "very very much." The way the others describe their job satisfaction makes it appear that they do not dislike their job but they do not like it that much. **Nancy, Victoria, Barbara, Judith, and Kathryn--none say very strongly that they are satisfied with their job.**

Among the male chairs, all of them used relatively strong language (e.g. love it, enjoy it) to describe their job satisfaction.

Under such circumstances, the possibility arises that men already knew what to expect from their role and that matched well with their own expectations. Thus three questions are important here to examine: (1) how much idea they had about their role when they first came to this position, (2) how much it differed in comparison to their initial expectations, and (3) their reasons for assuming this position.

TABLE-7 (A): Previous ideas about their role

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Previous ideas about their role
Mary	Some--from being a faculty member before
Nancy	Experience as a consultant, somewhat created it
Victoria	Some from being a faculty member, but became realistic when came to this position
Barbara	Experience as director of a research lab, and Faculty Senate President yes, wrote it all down
Judith	Some from being a faculty member, learned on the job
Kathryn	None, but had the experience of being a faculty member

Though almost all the women chairs say that they had some idea about their role when they first joined this position, **none of them actually had any direct experience.**

TABLE-7 (B): Previous ideas about their role

(Responses of the male informants)

Informants	Previous ideas about their role
James	Experience of being a head in a community college; also created it
Steve	Was an associate head before; also the search committee told him all
Robert	Experience as a chairperson
George	Experience as a Director of a research unit, learned on the job
Richard	Was a chairperson before
David	Not really, experience of a secretary/treasure of a corporation

Among the male chairs, four say that they had some idea of the nature of their job. Three of them (James, Richard, Robert) had previous experience as a chair. Steve was told by the search committee what was expected of him; he also had been an associate head before. Although they see themselves as having learned the job by doing it, both George and David had previous administrative experience.

TABLE-8(A): Difference from initial expectations

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Difference from initial expectations
Mary	Pretty much the same; some changes
Nancy	A lot
Victoria	Different every year
Barbara	Yes
Judith	Yes
Kathryn	Has to adjust to several things

Among the female informants, all except Mary say that there have been some major changes in their role.

TABLE-8 (B): Difference from initial expectations

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Difference from initial expectations
James	Not much because mostly created the role
Steve	Has not changed
Robert	No
George	Only some gradual changes
Richard	Not much
David	Yes -- started as a teacher now work as a teacher and a researcher

With the exception of David, all the other five male informants emphasize that their roles have not changed that much-- maybe just some gradual changes.

TABLE-9 (A): Reasons for joining this position

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Reasons for joining this position
Judith	Did not give it too much thought; was surprised when she was offered the job
Mary	Not a very well-thought out decision; was asked by the faculty to apply for this position
Nancy	Came with clear objectives to start a graduate program
Kathryn	Other faculty asked her to apply for this position; it was time for her to change her job
Victoria	It was sort of an accident
Barbara	It was time for her to be a head somewhere

The above table shows that for most of the women informants the decision to apply for or to assume the position of a chair was not a highly calculated decision. Only Nancy said that she had very clear reasons for joining this position.

202

TABLE-9 (B): Reasons for joining this position

(Responses of the male informants)

Informants	Reasons for joining this position
Steve	Wanted to be a head of a resourceful university
James	Gave an opportunity to apply his thinking
Robert	To move upward--to move to administration
George	Sees it as a necessary evil; also the faculty asked him
Richard	Was a head before in another university; also, some faculty asked him
David	Interested in administration

Compared to the women, most of the men chairs had some well-thought-out reasons for joining this position. Four of them seem to see it as a way to improve their professional lives.

At this point, one other issue was studied, focusing the informants' perceptions of the extent/degree of freedom that they thought they had within their job and role behaviors.

The following two tables summarize their responses.

TABLE-10 (A): Degree of freedom

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Degree of freedom
Mary	Lots within the restriction of limited resources
Nancy	Quite a bit, have more choice now as she can involve all faculty now, and so does not have to bear all the responsibility -
Victoria	Quite a bit, but all decisions are basically faculty's decisions
Barbara	Total freedom as she can quit any time
Judith	Had more freedom as a faculty member
Kathryn	Wide latitude

TABLE-10(B): degree of freedom

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Degree of freedom
James	Fair degree
Steve	Some; has to work between two groups (faculty & dean)
Robert	Lots of constraints
George	Not much power because of the way the university has been structured
Richard	Fairly free--feels some pressure to go in a certain direction
David	A lot but have to remain within the constraints of the faculty's handbook

In general, both groups see themselves as having some freedom but some constraints too. Barbara and Robert's responses were interesting. Barbara said that her knowledge that she can quit this position anytime gives her tremendous freedom.

Robert got almost angry at the question because, he said he cannot even conceive of a hypothetical situation in which he could have 100% freedom.

Other important feelings related to informants job/work

Men and women mention more or less the same kinds of activities/things that they enjoy doing in their roles.

Men chairs point to some common activities/work that they dislike, e.g. paperwork, meetings. Some of them mention some other problems/disliking associated with their work.

Thus, George discussed his difficulty with the administration above the dean's office. According to him: "This university has taken a defensive stance in the last 15 years, that they seemed not really to know how to deal with declining environments, and rather than making some hard decisions they left the decisions totally on . . . sort of handling themselves. . .I guess I would like to see more movement in terms of putting resources where the students are...this university has not acted very strongly in that direction."

David is concerned about the widespread use of calculators and computers. He also thinks that the quality of teaching has gone down. He expressed his lack of confidence over courses which are offered with a "pass" or "no pass" grade. James voiced some dissatisfaction as he sees a mismatch between the academic world and his field, which has been moving so rapidly.

Richard thinks that there are conflicting expectations regarding his role. According to him, he prefers to see his

role primarily that of as a faculty member with few administrative duties, but he argues that the dean expects him to be an administrator. Such conflicting expectations are creating some sense of dissatisfaction in him. He is not sure as to how long he will want to stay in this position. He dislikes doing evaluations, a task which he feels is "uncomfortable."

Women chairs, in general, also mention meetings and paperwork as activities that they dislike. But they also talked about other disliking/problems, too, which shed more light in understanding their psychology.

Mary dislikes doing evaluations. Her reasons are: ". . . well it makes them (people) feel unhappy, makes them feel uncomfortable, and I just don't like to do that..I'd rather tell everybody that I can recommend them for promotion, that they are doing a wonderful job, but I cannot do that".

Nancy was hired with the objective of starting a new graduate program. At one point she remarks, ". . . unless I change my mind this will be the last program that I create, it is very very hard work . . . and there are a lot of crises involved in creating programs and many decisions that you have to make alone and I think that I am more into the maintenance phase of my life now. . . I am tired and it is exhausting."

She says that if opportunity arises, she would like to change her job and take one of the following options:

1. serve as the vice-president of the university.

2. work in a private foundation.

3. work in Washington in health policy.

Barbara clearly is frustrated with her job. As discussed earlier, she expressed her dissatisfaction with the university, department, and her faculty (male faculty). She is very conscious that her department had never had a tenured women before. She expresses her lack of required control over people when she says that she dislikes situations when she "cannot talk to people to do things which they are supposed to do." She argues that the hardest thing is evaluating the faculty. She believes that once she starts making decisions on salary and promotions, nobody will be happy. At one point she clearly expresses her lack of interest in her job. As she says:

"There are much more important things than what happens in the department of...that's pretty uninteresting quite frankly..I am not very much interested in people fighting with each other."

She would prefer to work in a private organization, where she thinks leadership is much easier. Her concerns can be summarized in the following:

1. lack of control.

2. making some hard decisions.

3. unhappiness with the university and faculty.

4. missing research very much.   `

Judith feels that she had more freedom as a member of the faculty. She thinks that she lacks the time to think about the future, which is important for a leader. She is worried about this and she fears that "it will totally consume my thoughts . . it is hard that I won't get around to looking at the bigger picture."

She emphasizes her important role as a listener to others. However, she also sees this as the "hard part" of her role. As she explains, "if you are just the listener then that would be alright . . . makes both sides feel good. But it usually does not end in there. Usually, there is an issue that has to be resolved . . .it cannot go on . . .and I am the only person to do it. . .so it is not simple or easy because of that."

Judith also seems to feel uncomfortable in making decisions in situations of conflict. As she says:
"I hope that I would never be in a position where you know...even wanted to be in opposition as to what they [the faculty] are saying...that has not happened yet." Her example sees the opponents as herself and her faculty.
Her concerns are the following:
1. lack of time to think about the future.
2. making decisions when there is disagreement about the correct decision.

3. lack of time to do research.

   She feels frustrated when she hears/sees the faculty's problems due to inadequate space and does not have any control or power to solve it. Her greatest concern is whether to remain in this position or to move to teaching.

   Kathryn, too, does not feel comfortable when dealing with conflicts. She is greatly concerned that to meet collective goals, very often individual needs get hurt. She sees tenured faculty as a major constraining factor in bringing about any change. Currently, she is planning to go back to full-time teaching.

   Victoria regrets not getting enough time to do her research. She suffers from a lack of control. She argues that almost all decisions are the faculty's decisions, not hers. She thinks that making decisions under uncertainty is the hardest thing to do.

   On the basis of the above discussion, two main findings can be drawn regarding negotiation:

1. Women are self-creating their roles. In that sense, they are not compromising themselves very much to meet institutional requirements. However, in another sense, it seems clear that most women are worried that they are not getting enough time to do their research activities, which they see as one of their important roles.

   In addition to this, most women dislike certain aspects

of their job, or the reality of the work-environment. These factors are causing some sense of dissatisfaction with the job.

2. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to follow the institutional requirements of their job. They are more satisfied compared to women, do not complains as the women do, and seemed to be more adjusted to their roles.

PART 2: COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS IN TERMS OF OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO THE "DIFFERENT VOICE"

During the interviews, since many questions were asked on-the-spot depending on the nature and flow of conversations, some other areas came up where men and women seemed to be different. These are not related to role-construction, but they give further evidence of the existence of a "different voice" among women.

One of the issues that came up during the interview was regarding conflicting situations. Specifically, the informants were asked how they deal with conflicting situations. The following tables summarize their responses.

TABLE-10 (A): Strategy in dealing with conflict

(Responses of the female informants)

Informant	Strategy in dealing with conflict
Mary	Talk it over the involved parties, look at committee decisions, but final decision is hers
Nancy	Talk to each person individually
Victoria	One to one discussion, then go to a group meeting
Barbara	Meet individually, negotiate
Judith	Gather information in terms of long-term effect on the program
Kathryn	Listen to both sides separately first, then call a faculty meeting, look at the long term effect on the program

An analysis of the table shows that women chairs, when faced with conflict, emphasize the importance of communication. Another important finding is that most of them prefer to talk to the conflicting parties on a one to one basis. They prefer to call a group meeting with all parties only after they have talked to all of them on an individual basis. Two of the women chairs mention the importance of looking at the long-term impact of a issue.

TABLE-10 (B): Strategy in dealing with conflict

(Responses of the male informants)

Informant	Strategy in dealing with conflict
James	Criterion is whether it fits the strategic plan
Steve	Vote
Robert	Negotiate, compromise
George	Compromise which satisfies all, call meeting
Richard	Vote, talk to the group as a whole
David	Maintain a balance

Men chairs, on the other hand, seem to focus on rules or principles, e.g. voting, compromising, balancing, in dealing with conflicting situations. They are also different from the women chairs in their tendency to talk to the group as a whole.

One of the other questions that was asked during the course of the interview was related to the issues of the strategy/strategies that the informants adopt when they decide to move with a plan and what they do if their plan fails to get the required approval. The following tables show their responses.

TABLE-11 (A): Strategy in moving ahead with a plan

(Responses of the female informants)

Informants	Strategy to move ahead with a plan	If it fails what to do
Mary	1. involve the faculty; 2. make a draft; 3. go to the dean's office; 4. revise it if needed	start over again
Nancy	1. talk informally; 2. present formally	more explanations more communication
Victoria	1. meet with the dean with a faculty; 2. talk with enough faculty; 3. form committees	will dislike it
Barbara	1. mobilize resource; 2. form alliances; 3. work through the hierarchy	do it again, more explanation, If it is a good pursue it
Judith	1. talk with faculty; 2. form advisory boards;	learn from your mistakes
Kathryn	1. think thoroughly; 2. have to be a very good plan; 3. place it before the dean	listen to others' comments; incorporate these and move again

The above table shows that three of the women chairs prefer to go to the higher authority first (in this case the dean) with their plan. Four women would talk informally with the faculty. Most of them say that if their plan/proposal does

not get the needed approval they will try it again.

TABLE-11 (B): Strategy in moving ahead with a plan

(Responses of the male informants)

Informants	Strategy to move ahead with a plan	If fails what to do
James	1. involve others; 2. if enough resources, move with it; if scarce resources, drop it	it won't fail; because won't do anything outside the mission
Steve	1. formulate idea; 2. announce it; 3. form a committee; 4. submit it to the faculty	drop it, move my energy to a different direction
Robert	give a slice of the pie to everyone	won't waste my time on it
George	1. share the idea with the faculty; 2. then go to the dean; 3. dean carries it from there	if the idea is a stupid one drop it, if a good one explain more
Richard	1. involve others in developing idea; 2. get their feedback; 3. present it to divisions	put it on hold
David	1. consult with the faculty; 2. include them in the project; 3. need their 100% support	talk with tenured individual members of the faculty

Five of the men chairs emphasize the need and

importance of involving the faculty in the initial phase of the development of the plan/proposal. Three of them comment that if their plan fails to get the approval they will not pursue it any further.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The comparison and analysis show that the "different voice" does finds its expression in women's construction of their work-roles. This is manifested in the differences between men and women on the different dimensions of work-role construction.

How the "different voice" finds its expression is discussed in the following three parts:

Part 1: Differences between men and women informants

Part 2: Differences within each group of informants

Part 3: Differences on other issues not related directly to work-role construction.

PART 1: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

1. The role occupant's expectations from his/her role.

On this dimension, major differences are found between the male informants and the female informants. All the women informants' descriptions of their roles fall in the typically "feminine" category of "concern for people." Male informants, on the other hand, unanimously show a "concern for program and/or department."

However, this does not mean that women show a total lack of concern for their programs/departments. It is important to realize that the differences that are found on this aspect indicate that women show **much more** "concern for people" compared to men who show more "concern for program/department" than women. For example, Mary sees herself as a cheerleader and as a role model. However, she also sees her role as that of a manager who needs to emphasize efficiency in work-procedures. The latter role-description manifests her concern for the department. Similarly, Nancy considers herself the leader in providing the future direction of her department in addition to being responsible for faculty members' growth.

Among the male informants, Robert sees himself as a facilitator in achieving both departmental goals and individual members' personal goals, the latter reflecting concern for people. However, though Robert's responses show "concern for people" and also a "concern for program," in

219

general men chairs definitions of their role preponderantly show their "concern for program."

Women chairs in different ways (e.g., listening to students, cheering people, developing good working atmosphere) show their "concern for people." Such concerns express their caring, sensitivity, and empathy to others' needs. Most writers who have documented women's "different voice" argue that women see caring as vital (e.g., Rivers, 1983) and are sympathetic and caring to others' needs (e.g., Ferguson, 1984). Virginia Woolf (1929) points out women's sensitivity to the needs of others and in the assumption of responsibility for taking care of others. Gilligan (1982) argues too that the feminine orientation predisposes women toward interest in human relationships.

Gilligan (1982) explains that women see self as interdependent with others and strongly emphasize care in such relationships, whereas men strive to identify themselves with the external world and want personal autonomy. Jung (Harding, 1970) also points out that women are more inclined toward psychic relatedness, while men are inclined toward objective interest.

Men, in this study, seem to feel much more comfortable and at ease with identifying their role with issues that relate to the administration and program of their department. For example, James emphasizes his role as a strategic planner

and a facilitator; Steve and Richard see themselves mostly as mediators between the dean and the faculty; David and George focus on administration; Robert focuses on achieving departmental and individual members' personal goals. With the exception of Robert, all the men chairs seem to be more focused in attaining goals related to the improvement of the program.

This matches clearly with Melia and Lyttle's (1986) argument that women focus more on the processes than the goals at hand. They add further that processes are important to men too, but only in the context of predetermined goals.

All of the informants say that they are doing what a chair should be doing. In addition, four of the female informants also assert that a departmental chair's role should put more emphasis on conducting scholarly activities.

2. Role occupants making sense of organizational expectations.

A major difference emerges on the issue of whose expectations the informants need to pay attention to. All the women chairs, except Victoria, mention the students in addition to the dean and faculty as important actors. Among the male chairs, only two mention the students. All the male chairs mention the President/Vice president in addition to the faculty and the dean. Only Mary refers to the President/Vice president. Mary, Barbara, Judith, and Kathryn also mention the staff's expectations.

It is revealing to see how women's caringness and sensitivity to others are reflected in these responses. It is important to point out that the students and staff do not have any administrative authority over the chairs. The president and vice-president, on the other hand, have administrative and political authority over the chairpersons. The tendency of men to refer to the president and the vice-president shows their concern to pay importance to what these people in upper hierarchical positions expect them to do.

Ferguson and Hummel's comments regarding how bureaucracy works on the individual bureaucrat are worth mentioning here. According to Ferguson (1984), individuals in bureaucracy come to see themselves as objects of administration. The source of the norms and rules governing their behavior, the "general other" of the organization, is precisely the rules of the organization itself. Thus the bureaucrat is required to take the perspective of the organization both onto himself/herself and onto the client.

Hummel (1977, p.30) makes the same caution as he points out that "the primary relationship you engage in is that between you and your manager, not you and your client. And that functionary-manager relationship is a control relationship." Here, both Ferguson and Hummel are making the point that the bureaucrat is required to take the perspective of the organization and not the client. In that sense, the

bureaucrat is co-opted by the organization.

If Hummel's and Ferguson's observations are correct, then the greater tendency among men to think about and to take into consideration expectations (regarding their role) of the people who are in higher hierarchical positions (dean, vice-president, president) indicates that they are much more co-opted by the institutional requirements then are the women.

Major differences are found between men's and women's descriptions of "others' expectations." Women's description of students' expectations related mostly to personal needs and problems and men's to professional relationships.

For example, Mary says that students see her as a friend; Kathryn and Judith indicate that students want them to listen to their problems. In contrast, the two men chairs who think that students' expectations are important for them to consider describe their expectations in terms of wanting fair treatment and a good program. Other chairs, when asked about their thoughts on students expectations also referred basically to a professional kind of expectations. At this point, one may recall Harding's (1983) argument on the different perceptions that men and women have regarding what a rational person does. She says that for women a rational person values highly the need to empathize and to connect with particular others and wants to take the role of the particular other in relationship. Men, according to Harding, think that

a rational person should develop his ability to separate himself from others; the belief is that a rational person has problem when there is too great intimacy with particular others.

Men's descriptions of their respective faculty's expectations show an interesting feature. While most women (five of six) argue that the faculty want them to focus on the management side of their department, most men, on the other hand, describe the faculty's expectations in terms of looking after their (i.e., the faculty's) personal interests in research and teaching. In their descriptions, the managerial focuses seem to be less.

This is an interesting feature because, men chairs view faculty members' personal interests as important while remaining apparently oblivious to students' personal needs and wants. It is important to mention here that though all informants (both men and women) emphasize the faculty as a very powerful and important body in their department, men chairs appear to pay much stronger emphasis on their importance. For example, David argues that one needs to get 100% support from the faculty if one decides to move ahead with a new plan or project. Steve emphasizes his role as the leader of the faculty. At one point, he says:

"I guess I am very much cognizant of the fact that the heads before me were thought to be too autocratic . . . they

went ahead without consulting and that this was not well received."

George goes further when he says that:

"My authority comes from the faculty. I have all the authority they will allow me to have . . . my faculty controls my existence."

Womens' discussions regarding the faculty's importance do not show such a strong deference on them (the faculty).

One possible reason for such a difference may be related to the way women view politics and power. Even though powerful, most women chairs think that the faculty want the chair to look after the interests of the department. In contrast, men seem to view faculty as expecting them to facilitate achieving their personal goals more than achieving the departmental goals.

Flamming (1984) argues that men see the political world as a world of competing and hostile individuals; in contrast to this, women view the world as a "politics of connectedness." Bardwick (1981) also argues that while women are especially prone to seek friendship in the office, men seem to experience the work universe "as composed of political alliances and cliques, of relationships centered around territory and power" (p.11).

In regard to the dean's expectations, all the male informants think that the dean's expectations are related

mostly to achieving departmental goals, management, or being the spokesperson for the department. Women chairs point out the dean's expectations in terms of their managerial roles too. But they also describe the dean's other expectations too, viz. responsibilities for the faculty (Nancy); good work-atmosphere (Barbara, Victoria); fair treatment, to consider each faculty member individually (Judith).

Looking at both the ways the informants see their roles and the way they describe "others'" expectations regarding their role, one can see that all of them have defined their roles consistently. That is the way an informant perceives his/her role matches neatly with the way he/she perceives "others'" expectations regarding his/her role.

All the women informants emphasize the "covert" nature of these expectations. That is, they argue that they have come to know these expectations mostly through indirect ways. For example, for Mary it was from "wandering around," listening, talking, and from some experience of being a faculty. For Barbara, such understanding came from practicing her philosophy of "management by walking."

Men chairs, on the other hand, point to the relatively "overt" or explicit nature of these expectations.

Such differences among men and women reflect their different ways of knowledge construction. In short, the literature suggests male knowledge is reasoned and objective,

while female knowledge is intuitive (e.g., Daly, 1978; Held, 1985; Harding 1978). Friedan's (1981) argument is important here. According to Friedan, men have a tendency to abstract one particular task or demand from its surrounding and to focus on what is obvious. In contrast to this, women focus on the whole picture being presented, a focus which reflects women's synthesizing and intuitive thinking pattern. Kraft (1984) also points out that men tend to process information more by concentrating on one particular stimulus at a time and tend to respond to stimuli separately from the fields. In contrast to men, argues Kraft, women tend to process information globally by responding to a number of stimuli simultaneously and by relating the stimuli to their settings.

3. Role-occupants' constructing their negotiated work-roles.

Several issues (e.g., job description, job satisfaction, previous idea about their role, reasons for joining this position) are examined here to explore the differences between men and women in terms of the degree and nature of compromise that they make when they construct their work-roles. The results at first appear to be ambiguous. However, after examining all the relevant issues some major findings emerge on this issue.

One of the important findings is that women are self-creating their roles more than men. This became evident when a comparison was made of the informants' definitions of their

roles with their official job descriptions. The job description represents the official/institutional expectations of a role. An analysis of the job descriptions of all the informants shows that these mostly emphasize the administrative and leadership role of the chairperson.

However, it is found that the way women are seeing their roles includes some elements of their job description but also incorporates other things not mentioned in official expectations. For example, Mary sees herself as a cheerleader; Kathryn, Victoria, and Barbara emphasize their role in developing a good work-environment; Nancy feels responsible for her faculty's growth; Judith sees herself as a listener to students problems. These role ideas are not incorporated in the official job description. This indicates that women are perceiving their role beyond that of their official job descriptions, thereby reflecting their "concern for people."

Men, on the other hand, are found to define their roles in a way consistent with the contents of their official job descriptions, which basically reflects a "concern for program/department." James, Steve, Robert, Richard, and David's descriptions of their roles matched pretty well with their official job descriptions. Only George's definition is different from his job description. He sees himself mostly as an educator and not as an administrator. As an educator,

228

however, his focus is mostly in improving the department by helping faculty do their work.

Based on the above findings, it appeared that men are conforming more to institutional requirements.

However, when informants' job satisfaction and other issues related to their work and job are examined, a different picture of negotiation emerges. It is expected that people who feel/think that they are compromising more to institutional requirements will speak less favorably about their job satisfaction compared to those who feel less compromised. However, in contrast to this expectation, after analyzing several other issues it appeared that women are less satisfied with their job compared to men. With the exception of Mary, it became clear that women do not dislike their jobs but they do not like or love it that much either. Some of them are even thinking of changing their jobs.

Men, on the other hand, are found to be more satisfied with their job and more adjusted to their roles.

At this point several other issues are analyzed which shed important insights on the issue of negotiation:

(1) Women chairs strongly emphasize the importance of doing scholarly activities (viz. research, publication). This response emerged in their description of the "ideal role" of a chair and in their thoughts on what they would like to do given complete freedom. Their reasons for seeing such

activities as important are various. For Kathryn, they are needed for personal growth; they also help one to remain in the forefront of research. Nancy thinks that scholarship allows one to learn the literature, gives the faculty confidence, and allows students to see the faculty as role models in their own areas. Judith also emphasizes the importance of research for personal growth. She argues that it helps her to apply her thinking through which she can contribute to the development of the field. Victoria sees research as a medium for applying her thinking. Barbara wants to contribute to new knowledge. She also thinks that by doing policy-related research she can change people's lives. According to Mary, she is expected (by others within the university) to do scholarly activities.

Although they emphasize its importance, they are also worried that they are not getting enough time to do their research activities. Among the men chairs, none of their responses show this need and this concern.

Schaef's (1981) argument holds in this case. She explains that women's view of work complements other aspects of their lives so that their lives seem not to be profit- and status-oriented but rather center on creativity, bonding, humanness, and a service orientation. Hennig and Jardim's (1977) research also shows that women see an ideal career as allowing personal growth, satisfaction, making a contribution

to others, and doing what they want to do. They add that men, on the other hand, indubitably want these things too; yet when they visualize a career they see it as a series of jobs, a progression of jobs, as a path leading upward with recognition and reward implied.

(2) Women discuss other issues related to their job and work which indicate that they dislike certain aspects of their jobs and work-reality. Some men also voiced some concerns (e.g., David is concerned with the widespread use of calculators), but their focuses are very different from that of women.

For example, most women discussed their feeling of discomfort while making decisions. Mary and Barbara mention this in regard to evaluating the faculty. Nancy says that she is tired of making too many decisions alone. Judith and Kathryn feel uncomfortable in making decisions in situations of conflict. Victoria says that making decisions in uncertain situations is one of the hardest things that she has to do.

One may recall here Ferguson's (1984) comments regarding the effect of women's "different voice" on their thoughts and behaviors. Ferguson (1984) argues that women's experience of themselves as continuous with others results in a great need for others, i.e., a dependency. It also leads them to avoid risk and conflict, and to be threatened by the open clashing of wills that an authentic, non bureaucratic politics requires.

Grant (1988) also argues that women seem to have greater ease in expressing their vulnerability, their lack of self-confidence, and their emotions.

Some women chairs reveal other problems too. Thus, Barbara expresses her frustration with her male faculty (in general); Judith thinks that she lacks the time to think about the future. Victoria says that all decisions are basically the faculty's and the dean's decisions and that she is not sure whether such a respect for authority is good or bad for all.

The nature of concerns that men have are very different from that of the women, which reflect more personal kinds of concerns.

(3) It was found that none of the women chairs had any previous experience as a chair; only Barbara had some direct experience in administration from her directing a research lab. Among the men chairs, three had previous experience as a chair; one had experience as an associate head. Others have had administrative experience.

Therefore, women chairs in this study had little or no administrative experience. This lack of experience affected their responses on the issue of any role-change. One may recall that all the women, except Mary, said that there had been some major changes in their roles. In contrast to this, all the men, except David, said that there had been only some gradual changes in their roles.

It is also found that in contrast to men, who had some well-thought plan/reason for taking this position, most of these women chairs did not have any such plan/reason.

Based on the above discussion, the issue of the nature and degree of compromise as involved in informants' construction of their work-role takes a new meaning and understanding:

1. Women, though self-creating their roles, are making more compromises. Their responses show that in their role as chairs they want to do certain activities (e.g., research) which they are unable to do according to their satisfaction due (according to them) to their lack of time. Furthermore, their view of life (e.g., caring in relationships) and certain needs (e.g., dependency, security) are not in consonance with the organizational world and its functioning. The latter is reflected in their feeling of discomfort in making decisions under certain circumstances.

Therefore they are compromising more, and the nature of compromise is related to some aspects of their "different voice."

2. By contrast, men in this study, perceive their roles as consistent with their job descriptions and feel much more comfortable and satisfied with their jobs. It is suggested that since all of them have had previous administrative experiences they have a much clearer understanding of these

233

expectations; moreover, these were pretty close to their own expectations. In this sense, it is suggested that the degree of compromise is not that much as compared to women.

The above analysis points to one important differences in the interpretive strategies that men and women use in their creation of a "sense of structure." This is explained below.

As mentioned before, ethnomethodologists argue that individuals' employ different interpretive strategies while creating their "sense of structure." As of now, they have identified six of such strategies or procedures: (1) reciprocity of perspectives, (2) "Et Cetera Assumptions," (3) the film of continuity, (4) normal forms, (5) talk itself is reflexive, and (6) descriptive vocabularies as indexical expressions.

The study shows that men and women have different interpretations of their work-role construction. This is influenced by the fact that both groups are using different interpretive strategies in their construction of realities. To be more specific, the analysis shows that women's caringness for others, their sensitivity to others' needs, and their own personal needs influences the way they make sense of reality. In contrast to these interpretive rules, the study shows that men's need to consider structural and/or institutional requirements (viz. program's goals) influence their construction of social realities. All these means that

gender-specific interpretive strategies exist and are valid.

Therefore, to the list of interpretive rules (as identified earlier) the following rule need to be included: interpretive strategies are gender specific. [It is important to note here that though the informants have varied background characteristics (see table A & table B), they do not affect the general findings among the two groups.]

PART 2: DIFFERENCES WITHIN EACH GROUP OF INFORMANTS

At the beginning it was acknowledged that the case that women have a "different voice" does not claim that all women share this "different voice." Rather, the claim asserts that more women than men speak in this "different voice." Thus it is important to see whether and how much one can find differences within the groups of women and men informants. This is discussed below.

Differences within the women informants

The followings are the common findings (common findings mean that more women than men informants share these findings) among the women respondents:

Regarding role-occupants' expectations from her role:

Emphasis on a "concern for people."

Regarding organizational expectations:

Referred to the students, dean, faculty and staff as important actors whose expectations are important for them to consider.

Emphasized the mostly "covert" nature of their expectations.

Women's description of the students' expectations relate mostly to more personal needs and men's mostly to their professional relationship with the students.

Regarding negotiation:

Attitude toward negotiation manifests their self-creating

or self-definition of their role.

Concern over lack of time to do professional/scholarly activities.

Importance of doing research.

Dislike of making decisions.

Not so much satisfied with their jobs.

Think that their role has changed.

Based on the above responses, some women informants are found to make some minor departures. For example, Nancy did not mention the staff while discussing "others' expectations." Victoria did not mention the staff and the students. However, she is also conscious to the possibility that she is living by and within the system and tradition, and at several points even mentions that she is not sure whether that is good or bad.

Among the women informants, only Mary seems to differ in several responses. While discussing "others' expectations" she mentions the president in addition to mentioning the common responses. She thinks that her role has remained pretty much the same. She likes her job very much. She does not have a very strong personal interest in research.

Thus among the women informants besides Mary, the departures from the common response seem to be very minor. Mary's case is somewhat different. On the one hand, she shows a strong commitment to a concern for people, emphasizes the

237

students' needs, and dislikes doing evaluation; on the other hand, she appears to be very much satisfied with her job.

An explanation of her responses would need another study to be conducted; however, based on her interview it can be said that feeling comfortable with her job may be due to any of the following reasons:

1. She has been able to make a healthy application of her personal views and "voice."

2. Her work-environment/situation may be different in some ways from that of the rest of the informants

Differences within the male informants

The common responses of the men are the following:

Regarding the role-occupants' expectations from his role:

Emphasis on a "concern for program or department."

Regarding organizational expectations:

References to the dean, faculty and president/vice-president as important actors whose expectations they need to consider.

Emphasis on the mostly "overt" nature of their expectations.

Regarding negotiation:

Their definitions of their jobs are mostly based on their job descriptions.

Concern over program development.

Satisfied with their job.

238

Based on the above responses some men are found to differ as expected.

For instance, Steve did not mention the president. Robert thinks that he is very much constrained by the university.

George mentions the students but sees their expectations mostly on a professional level. He also sees himself mostly as an educator, and is not interested in administration.

Richard mentions the student and staff as important actors in considering organizational expectations. He dislikes hierarchy and would like to see a more collegial work-environment in his department. He is also not sure whether he wants to remain in administration or will go back to full-time teaching.

Among the male informants, too, I do not see any major departure from the norms. The only one who appears to be quite different is Richard. In short, he sounds in several ways like a feminine voice. One possible reason may be that he is the youngest of the male chairs in this study (he is 41 years of age), and is experiencing the "changing phase of male development" which some authors have recently argued (e.g., Kimmel, et al. 1989; Connell, et al., 1989). Briefly, these authors argue that the effects of the Women's Liberation Movement are felt not only on women but also on men. Thus, some men, at this period, are becoming more and more conscious

of what is happening around them, they are reevaluating themselves, and are trying to express their feelings and sensitiveness. Though different in several ways from the other male chairs, Richard, like them, strongly sees his role as improving the program or department.

PART 3: DIFFERENCES ON OTHER ISSUES

Two issues not directly related to informants' work-role construction came up during the course of the discussion which gave further evidence to the existence of the "different voice."

One of the issues concerns the strategies that informants adopt in dealing with conflicting situations. The other issue focuses on strategies that they adopt in moving ahead with a new plan.

On the first issue (viz. strategy in dealing with conflict) it was found that women put strong emphasis on greater communication. Men, in contrast, emphasize rules or principles (e.g., voting, maintaining a balance). Gilligan (1982) and Harding's (1981) arguments give some explanation to such differences. Gilligan points out women's concern to include diverse needs in contrast to men's tendency to balance opposing claims. Harding (1981) also argues that men tend to draw moral judgements by applying abstract and universal notions of individual rights.

It was also found that women prefer to talk to the conflicting parties on a one- to- one basis, while men prefer to talk to the conflicting parties in a group. Harding (1983) discusses the values that women place on empathy and connection with particular others and their needs. In contrast, Harding says, men value the need to separate oneself

from the particular others and to take the role of the generalized others.

With regard to the second issue (strategies to move ahead with a plan), five of the six men emphasize the need to involve the faculty in the early and later stages of the development of the plan. In contrast, four women emphasize the need to talk to the faculty informally regarding the plan/idea; the other two women prefer to go to the dean with the plan. These reflect gender differences in the issue of power and politics that Flamming (1984) and Hartsock (1983) have argued. Both Flamming and Hartsock assert that women see the world in less political terms than men do. Women's need to go to the dean, i.e., someone up in the hierarchy, shows their need of feeling dependency as pointed out by Ferguson (1984).

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

This study addresses two interrelated issues: (1) whether the "different voice" finds its expression in women's construction of their work-roles in the organization, and (2) if so, in what ways. The ultimate or broader goals are to find out whether and how the "different voice" affects women's organizational behaviors.

The phrase "different voice" has been used to mean women's voice; "voice" here includes perceptions, thoughts, and attitudes regarding different realities and issues. The phrase also indicates that women's voice is different from men's. Several writers/scholars (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Harding, 1981; Ferguson, 1984; Schaef, 1981) have argued for and have documented the nature of this "different voice."

The study has assumed its importance due to two major facts (one recent and the other long-existent) of organizational life:

1. Every year more and more women are joining work-organizations, and at this period of our time no one can conceive the possibility of a reverse in such a trend.

2. It has been long recognized that work-organizations are structured according to rules geared toward men, not women (Kanter, 1977). Most organizations are created by men and are dominated by men in terms of their sheer majority numbers.

The results have been the development and endurance of a male-dominant environment within the organization based on men's values, interests, and world views.

Thus, for those who are conscious of these facts it is not only an intellectual curiosity but more importantly it is a necessity to study whether women have been able to express their "different voice" within the organization. The answer to this question, "yes" or "no," would have major implications not only for women, but also for men and the field of organizational behavior and theory. An understanding of organizations from a male point of view gives one only a partial understanding of that reality. These are the basic reasons for conducting this study.

The study takes an ethnomethodological approach toward understanding individuals' work-role construction. Six men and six women who are working as chairs of various academic departments are the informants. Two universities constitute the research sites. All interviews were taped-recorded and later on transcribed.

Briefly, the findings of the study show that the "different voice" does finds its expression in women's construction of their work-roles. Such an expression is found in several dimensions of their work-role construction. Thus, women chairs, in their role definition and in their role performance, expressed their "concern for people" more

244

compared to the men. Men chairs, on the other hand, mostly
showed their "concern for program." Women's concern for
people, includes hierarchical inferiors, expresses the
caring, sensitivity, and empathy to others' needs that several
writers and researchers (e.g., Gilligan, 1882; Schaef, 1981;
Ferguson, 1984; Woolf, 1929) have documented.   All   the
women chairs, except one, point to the dean, faculty, and
students as important actors whose expectations regarding the
chairs' role are important for them to consider. Most of them
also mention their staff's expectations. Men, on the other
hand, refer to the president/vice president, dean, and faculty
as important actors. Only two men point out the students'
expectations. On the one hand, such differences reflect
women's responsiveness to the needs of different groups of
people in their work environment; on the other hand, it
reflects the fact that men are more co-opted by the
institutional requirements about which several authors have
cautioned (e.g., Ferguson, 1984; Hummel, 1977).

Women informants all argued that they make sense of
expectations of "others" mostly by reading nonverbal or covert
clues, signs, and expressions. Men, on the other hand,
emphasized the overt nature of these expectations. These
findings are very much consistent with the documentation of
the literature of the "different voice." For example, Daly
(1978) and Friedan (1981) along with others, argue that male

245

knowledge is based on objectivity and reasoning, on what is obvious, whereas female knowledge is based on intuition.

Most women were found to create their roles, which go beyond their official job descriptions. Men were found to conform more closely to their official job descriptions. The study also reveals that more women were concerned about and emphasized their need to do research and other scholarly activities. This reflects the need for creativity that Schaef (1981) points out. Men chairs' discussions do not exhibit such a tendency. However, women informants also express their frustration and put stress upon their lack of time to focus on scholarly activities.

Most of these women also dislike certain aspects of their job or work-environment. Most of the women say that they feel uncomfortable when they have to decide between people or issues in conflict or write negative faculty evaluation.

Most of them are also thinking of changing their jobs. In general, it appears that men are more satisfied and adjusted to their jobs. Most of them have had previous experience of a chair and/or an administrative job, and their expectations seem to reflect organizational expectations.

On the basis of the above findings, in regard to the issue of negotiation, it is suggested that women are compromising more in their work-role construction, since they are not being able to do some of the things that they want to

do in that position (e.g., research). Furthermore, it is suggested that some aspects of their "different voice" are not in consonance with the reality of the work-environment, which causes some stresses and dissatisfaction among these women informants.

Some other findings between men and women, not related to their work-role construction, give more evidence of the existence of a "different voice." For example, women are found to emphasize one- to- one discussion during conflicts as compared to men's tendency to talk to the group as a whole.

Implications

As mentioned earlier, the issue of sex difference is a controversial one. On the one hand, there are writers/scholars who argue that women have a "different voice." The results of several research studies, on the other hand, show no significant gender differences or at best they show contradictory results. This issue is further complicated and convoluted by the fact that even among the feminists some of them have resisted admitting any differences between the genders. Huston (1988) gives one important explanation of this disagreement among the feminists. According to her, such a position of no difference exists among the feminists due to the "real danger that such differences will be interpreted as genetic and immutable, and as evidence of the inherent

inferiority of women" (p.8).

Contrary to such a position that women are like men, this study shows that women do have a "different voice." Furthermore, it shows that such a voice affects women's organizational behavior. The implications of such findings are several:

(1) <u>Implications for scholars/researchers who question the existence of a "different voice."</u>

These scholars/researchers (feminists or non-feminists) need to question and re-think seriously their belief and/or assumption that men and women are alike in all important respects. Any such belief will have far-reaching implications in their writings and research, simply because these beliefs/assumptions will be reflected in their scholarship.

(2) <u>Implications for the work-organization</u>

The study documents some important needs and concerns of the women in this study which are different from the men's. These needs and values can be summarized as follows: a. to do more research,

b. to pay importance to the need of the clients (students) of their organization,

c. to express concern for people.

These differ from the men's needs and values, which the study demonstrates are the following:

a. concern for the program,

248

b. importance of hierarchical authority.

The values that women have in terms of paying attention to clients' needs, i.e., in general a concern for people, is a virtue on its own right (at least, from this researcher's perspective). The more important questions are whether and how such values can have some impact on the long-enriched patriarchical form of organizations. There are no easy ways to make it happen.

Some authors argue that women who enter organizations that are patriarchal are outsiders simply due to their possession of a voice which is different from the patriarchal voice.

For example, Adrienne Rich (1977) has emphasized how women are outside the mainstream of our culture and how important it is to remember that one is outside. She is also fearful of women's losing their "outsiders" consciousness and actually being co-opted by the male establishment.

However, as argued by Schutz (1977), outsiders have certain vantage points too. As he explains, the outsider or stranger, on moving into a new group, challenges the members of that group by his/her very presence. Members of this new group are "in" and she/he is "out." The thinking of those in the "in-group" has taken on habitual patterns and become "thinking as usual" to the members of this group. The outsider, entering with a different set of assumptions and

beliefs, cannot accept this "thinking as usual" and thus calls into question all accepted norms that have been taken for granted by the group. Schutz thus points out the greater objectivity on the part of outsiders. He argues that they can, and must, ask "why." The outsiders have a vantage point that allows a clearer view of the system on the inside.

Thus it can be argued that as more women move into the upper hierarchy of organizations, they will become the change agents of today's organization. At this point, such a change is not visible, due to the fact that most of the upper hierarchical positions are still being occupied by men.

(3) <u>Implications for women working in organizations or planning to work in organizations</u>

The study shows that most of these women appear to be less satisfied with their jobs compared to their male counterparts. Also, they seem to feel more stressed in facing some important realities of organizational life. In the preface of their book, Florisha and Goldman (1981) write the following comment: "This is an exciting time to be a woman in the working world, but that is not to say it is an easy one. It is exciting because more women are working (working for money, that is) than ever before, and working at jobs with the demands and rewards once reserved for men. But it is a difficult time for just the same reason; if more women are moving into positions where they are new-comers simply because

250

they are women, then more women than ever are facing the stresses and uncertainties that such environments produce" (p.ix).

Besides the pressure of maintaining a family and a career, a major reason for such stress is facing the reality of a work-organization which is based on men's values and world views. Women in this study clearly express this side of the conflict. In this study, women informants are likely to feel lonely in their work-environment because of their sheer minority. This is a reasonable assumption on the part of the researcher considering the small number of women chairs in both these universities. For example, of the two universities (the research sites), one has only five women chairs and the other has four women chairs. Considering the fact that the former has around 78 departments and latter has around 55 departments, women who are working as chairs in these two universities are in a sheer minority. Unless the number of women chairs increases, most of these women will face enormous stress and anxiety in their job. If the number increases, they will have a support group or a common group to share and talk about their experiences. Only then we can imagine a future where women will feel more comfortable in the administrative world.

(4) Implications for men and those working in upper hierarchical positions within the organization

The fact that women in this study construct their role in a way that differs from men points out that there is another way to construct one's organizational role and that the way men construct their work-role is not the only way. The important revelation is that the way women are constructing their roles is more liberating in the sense that they are trying to apply their won thinking, needs, and expectations in such construction. Such an understanding can facilitate both men, and others who occupy upper hierarchical positions. In the case of men, understanding how women try to link their personal needs and expectations with the institutional requirements, can [at least] help them to try to get in touch with their own personal needs and wants. They can realize that these (one's personal needs and wants) may be in opposition to institutional requirements but that does not mean that they cannot create, change or modify existing organizational realities. The way women (in this study) construct their work-roles bears testimony to that.

For those who occupy upper hierarchical positions, and hence have the authority and power to shape organizational realities, can reflect back and think about the existing nature of organizations and other possible states. It is time they realize that how much the "organizational and/or

institutional thinking" is replacing individual's own thinking, and how much organizational needs and expectations are overriding employees' personal needs and expectations from the organization.

(5) Implications for ethnomethodolists

The study shows that men and women use different interpretive strategies in their creation of a "sense of structure." For example, women's caringness and sensitivity influence their "sense of a situation." In contrast to this, men's need to consider structural expectations influences the way they construct realities. Based on this, it is argued that ethnomethodologists have to realize that interpretive strategies are gender-specific.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings certain recommendations are offered at this point.

First of all, I strongly believe that women who are entering organizations should realize that the way the organization is structured or functioning is not the reality but is only one reality among other possibilities. Since they are the outsiders, they have a superior vantage point and hence the responsibility to create other possible realities in the organization. Instead of getting too frustrated with their job or work-environment, they need to understand that

all new situations that we encounter for the first time pose some uncertainties and stresses; that only a natural phenomenon. Therefore, it is important for them not to lose their outside vision and voice but to try to find ways and seek opportunities to maintain a healthy application of their visions and voices.

Secondly, both men and women have to realize these differences in their perspectives. Eric Erickson argument falls neatly here. "He points out that there are 360 ways to view an elephant, and every person standing in a circle around the animal sees only a small part of the whole, but each has 'the truth.' Yet a person on the north side can speak quite rationally about a 'long thing hanging down, swaying freely,' to a person on the south side, who also sees a 'long thing hanging down, swaying freely.' They do not know each is describing a very different part of the beast's anatomy, used for very different functions, with very different consequences to the observer. So it is in the organizational world" (Melia & Lyttle, 1986, p.37).

Controversy exists as to why men and women have different perceptions of issues, but this study shows that the fact remains that they do have voices which are different from each other. The issue is not whose voice is good, and whose is bad; the more important issue is that such different voices exist. If each can understand the other's perspective better,

254

then together they can explore new possibilities.

Third, researchers and theorists working within the field of organization behavior and theory need, at first, to find out women's views on different issues within the organization and then to incorporate those in their writings. The objectives/goals of the development of a literature in a field are to describe the field and to offer suggestions for the improvement of the field. No one can expect, at this time in history, to get a comprehensive understanding of the organizational world without looking into women's perception in addition to men's perception. As more women are entering organizations, they cannot be treated anymore as "invisibles." With the increase in their number, their impact in terms of new behaviors and problems will be felt in the work-place.

Finally, public administrators and/or policy makers need to think seriously about the potentialities that women bring with them into the organization and how they may enrich public administration. One of the important factors that distinguishes public administration from private administration is its obligation to promote the public interests. In a moral and basic sense, it must serve "a higher purpose" (Hart, 1984, p. 112). As argued by Mosher (1981), a central issue presented by contemporary public administration is assuring that public administrators represent the interests of the citizenry. Rosenbloom (1989)

255

explains, "although it is often difficult to say precisely what is public interest, there can be no dispute about the obligation of public administrators to consider it as a general guide for their actions. When they fail to do so, public administrators may rightly be criticized for placing personal or agency interests above those of the people as a whole" (p.8).

Such a concern is the focal emphasis of the Blacksburg Manifesto as articulated by Wamsley et al. (1987). In addition to this public interest perspective, authors of the Blacksburg Manifesto also point out the importance of communication in order to enter into a dialogue with the citizen.

Thus, in contrast to the traditional managerial focus of public administration, recent authors stress the values of representativeness, political responsiveness, public interest, accountability, equity, and more and open communication with the citizen in public administration.

It is important to realize that some of these values are very much in consonance with some aspect of the "different voice." For example, women chairs in this study show a greater "concern for people" compared to men chairs. Women also put more emphasis on communication and have a greater tendency to take into consideration different people's interests. All these are close to the values for which recent

authors in public administration are arguing.

Ironically, some do not realize these similarities. Simon (1987) in a recent article, discusses two relatively "neglected types of decision-making: `intuitive' decision-making and decision-making that involves interpersonal interaction" (p.57). Peters (Arizona Daily Star, 1988) argues that "management is not about administration. It is about emotion." As Rosener (1989) points out, "nowhere does either mention the fact that these are viewed as being female attributes" (p.63).

As more women are joining administration, it is important for public administrators and especially for policy-makers to realize the nature of their "different voice" and the role that it can play in public administration. They also need to think about the accompanying problems that the "different voice" may bring in the organization. In this study, for example, most women are found to be less satisfied with their role as a chair; some are planning to change their jobs too. Under such circumstances, policy-makers need to find ways to encourage women to join in administrative and policy-making positions, and also to retain them in those positions. Research in public administration has to be carried on which show this concern.

Naisbitt and Aburdene (1990) predicted that the 1990's would be the decade of women in leadership. Their prediction

is based on the increasing number of women in all professions. Their documentation (based on various statistical sources) shows that nearly one-third of computer scientists are women; more than half of all officers, managers, and professionals in the nation's largest commercial banks are women; 49.6% of accountants are women. They further point out that between 1983 and 1988 the number of women executives, administrators, and managers in manufacturing swelled from 403,000 to 647,000 thereby increasing women's share of the top manufacturing jobs from 20 to 26.3% (p.234).

In such a situation, the possibilities/opportunities and problems that the "different voice" offers within the organization, need to be seriously explored by researchers. This present study made one such exploration and it is hoped that new studies will be conducted that will shed more light on how the "different voice" functions within the organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, S. L. (1983). "Informal interaction patterns of Professional Women." In J. R. Gordon (ed.), **A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behavior** (pp. 287-290). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Allen, V. L., van de Vliert, E. (1984). **Role Transitions: Explorations and Explanations**. N.Y.: Plenum.

Ardener, Edwin. (1973). "Some outstanding problems in the analysis of events," Paper presented at the Association of Social Anthropologists' Decennial Conference. As quoted in Chris Kramarae, 1981, **Women & Men Speaking**, Rowley: Newburry House.

Baird, L. L. (1969) "A Study of the Role Relations of Graduate Students." <u>Journal of Educational Psychology</u>, Vol.60, pp.15-21.

Baird, John E., Jr. & Patricia, Bradley H. (1979)."Styles of Management & Communication: A Comparative Study of Men & Women," <u>Communication Monogram</u>, Vol.46, June, pp.101-110.

Bates, F. L., & Harvey, C. C. (1975). **The Structure of Social Systems**. N.Y.: Wiley.

Bem, S. L. (1981). "Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex-Typing." <u>Psychological Review</u>, Vol.88, pp.354-364.

Benson, Douglas & Hughes, John A. (1983). **The Perspective of Ethnomethodology**. N.Y.: Longman Inc.

Berger, Peter L. & Luckman, Thomas. (1967). **The Social Construction of Reality**. Garden City: Anchor.

Bernstein, Richard. (1978). **The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory**. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Biddle, B.J. (1986). "Recent Development in Role Theory," <u>American Review of Sociology</u>, Vol.12, pp.67-92.

Bittner, Egon. (1969). "The Police on Skid-Row: A Study of Peace-Keeping." <u>American Sociological Review</u>, Vol.32, pp.669-715.

Blum, Linda & Smith, Vicki.(1988). "Women's mobility in the corporation: A Critique of The Politics of Optimism,"

Sign: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp.528-538.

Brass, D. J. (1985). "Men's and Women's Networks: A Study of Informal interactions patterns and influence in an Organization." *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 28, pp.327-343.

Brenner, O.C., & Tomkiewicz, Joseph. (1979). "Job Orientation of Men and Females: Are Sex Differences Declining?" *Personnel Psychology*, Vol.4, pp.741-751.

Borgotta, E.F. & Stimson, J. (1963). "Sex Differences in Interaction Characteristics," *J of Social Psychology*, Vol.60, pp.89-100.

Brewer, M. B., Dull, V. & Lui, L. (1981). "Perceptions of the Elderly: Stereotypes as Prototypes." *Journal of Personnel Social Psychology*, Vol.41, pp.656-70.

Brief, A. P., and Aldag, R. J. (1976). "Correlates of Role Indices." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.61, pp.468-472.

Brown, Mary Helen. (1986). "Sense-making & Narrative Forms: Reality Construction in Organizations." In Lee Thayer (ed.), **Organization-Communication: Emerging Perspectives I** (pp.71-84), Alex Pub. Co.

Burrel, Gibson and Morgan, Gareth.(1982). **Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis.** Heinemann: Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Caplan, R. D. & Jones, K. W. (1975). "Effects of work load, role ambiguity, and type A personality on anxiety, depression, and heart rate." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.60, pp.713-719.

Castillejo, Irene Claremont de (1973). **Knowing Women: A Feminine Psychology.** New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Caudrea, P. A. (1975). "Investigation of Sex Differences across Job Levels." Doctoral Dissertation, Rice University, 1975. **Dissertation Abstracts International,** 1975, 36, 1957B.

Cheesmier, Leonard H. and Mills, Joh. (1989). "Gender-differences in Conflict resolution Styles of Managers: At Work and at Home. *Sex Roles*, Vol.20, Nos. 3/4, pp.149-

Chodorow, Nancy. (1978). **The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.** Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cicourel, Aaron V. (1970)."Basic and Normative Rules in the Negotiation of Status and Role." In H. Frietzel (ed.), **Recent Sociology**, No.2 (pp.4-45). N.Y.: McMillan.

Connell, B., Radican, N. & Martin, Pip. (1989). "The Changing Face of Masculinity." In Kimmel, M. et.al. **Men's Lives** (pp.578-585). N.Y.: McMillan Publishing Co.

Daly, M. (1978). **Gyn/ecology: The Meta-ethics of Radical Feminism.** Boston: Beacon.

Davidson, Roger H. (1969). **The Role of the Congressman.** N.Y.: Pegasis Publishers.

Denzin, K. Norman. (1970). "Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnomethodology." In J. D. Douglas (ed.) **Understanding Everyday Life.** (pp.261-286). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Denzin, N. K. (1983). "Interpretive Interactionism." In G. Morgan (ed). **Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research** (pp.129-146). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Donmoyer, Robert. (1990). "Generalizability and the Single Case Study." In Elliot W. Eisner and Alan Peshkin (eds.), **Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate** (pp.175-200). N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Farganis, Sondra (1986). **Social Reconstruction of the Feminine Character.** Rowman and Littlefield.

Ferguson, Kathy. (1984). **The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy.** Temple University Press.

Flamming, J. (1984). **Political Women: Current Roles in State and Local Government.** Beverly Hills: Sage.

Forisha, Barbara L. and Goldman, Barbara H. (1981). **Outsiders on the Inside.** Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

French, M. (1985). **Beyond Power: On Women, Men, and Moral.** N.Y.: Summit Books.

French, R. P. & Caplan, R. D. (1972). "Organizational Stress and Individual Strain." In A. J. Marrow (ed.), **The Failure of Success** (pp.30-66). N.Y.: AMACOM.

Fried, Bruce J. and Leat, Peggy. (1986). "Role Perceptions among Occupational Groups in an Ambulatory Care Setting." Human Relations, Vol.39, No.12, pp.1151-1174.

Friedan, Betty. (1981). **The Second Stage**, N.Y.: Summit Books.

Fry, Louis W. and Greenfield, Sue. (1980). "An Examination 6 Attitudinal Differences between Policewomen and Policemen." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol.65, Fall, pp.123-126.

Garfinkel, Harold. (1967). **Studies of Ethnomethodology.** Englewoods Cliffs, N.Y.: Prentice-Hall.

Geertz, C. (1973). "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In C. Geertz (ed.), **The Interpretation of Cultures** (pp.3-30), N.Y.: Basic Books.

Gilligan, Carol. (1982). **In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.** Harvard University Press.

Glaser, Barney G. & Strauss, Anselm L. (1976). **The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.** Chicago: Aldine.

Goode, W. J. (1983). "Why Men Resist." In A. S. Skonick and J. H. Skonick (eds.), **Family in Transition** (pp.201-218). Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Goodman, Ellen. (1979). **Turning Point.** Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Gordon, C., & Gordon, P. (1982). "Changing Roles, Goals, and Self-Conceptions: Process and results in a Program for Women's Employment." In Icke, W. & E. S. Knowles (eds.), **Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior** (pp. 243-83). N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.

Grant, Judith. (1987). "I feel therefore I am: A critique of female experience as the basis for a feminist epistemology." Women & Politics, Vol.7, No.3, Fall, pp.99-113.

Gross, N.; Mason, W.S.; & McEachern, A.W. (1958).

Exploration in Role Analysis: Studies in the School
Superintendency Role. N.Y.: Wiley.

Haas, J. E. (1964). **Role Conception and Group Consensus,**
Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research.

Harding, Esther M. (1970). **The Way of All Women.** New York:
Harper and Row.

Harding, Sandra. (1981). "Toward a strong program from
epistemology: Clues from Feminine Inquiry." Paper
presented at the American Political Science Association
meetings, N.Y. City, Sept.

Harding, Sandra. (1987). **Feminism and Methodology.** Indiana
University Press.

Harding, Sandra. (1983). "Is Gender a Variable in
Conceptions of Rationality?" In Carol C. Gould (ed.),
**Beyond Domination: New Perspectives on Women and
Philosophy** (pp.43-63). N.J.: Rowman & Allenheld.

Hare-Muslen, Rachel, T. and Marecek, Jeanne. (1988.). "The
Meaning of Differences: Gender Theory, Post Modernism,
and Psychology." <u>American Psychologist</u>, June, pp.455-464.

Harrigan, B. (1977). **Games mother never taught you.** N.Y.:
Warner Books.

Hart, David K. (1984). "The Virtous Citizen, the Honorable
Bureaucrat, and 'Public Administration'." <u>Public
Administration Review</u>, March, (special issue) p.112.

Hartsock, Nancy C. M. **(1983). Money, Sex and Power: Toward a
Feminist Historical Materialism.** New York: Longman.

Hearn, Jeff & Parkin, Wendy P. (1983). "Gender &
organization: A Selective Review & A Critique of a
Neglected Area." <u>Organization Studies</u>, 4/3: 219-242.

Heinan, H. S.; McGlauchin, D.; Legeros, C.; & Freeman, H.
(1975). "Developing the Women Manager." <u>Personnel
Journal</u>, Vol.54, pp. 282-286.

Heiss, J. (1981). "Social Roles." In M. Rosenberg and R. H.
Turner (ed.), **Social Psychological Perspectives,** N.Y.:
Basic.

Heiss, J.S. (1962). "Degree of Intimacy & Male-Female

Interaction." <u>Sociometry</u>, Vol. 25, pp.197-208.

Held, Virginia (1985). "Feminism and epistemology: Recent work on the connection between gender and knowledge." <u>Philosophy and Public Affairs</u>, Summer, Vol. 14, No.3, pp.296-307.

Hennig, Margaret and Jardim, Anne. (1976). **The Managerial Women, The Survival Manual for Women in Business.** N.Y.: Pocket Books.

House, R. J. and Rizzo, J. R. (1972). "Role Conflict and Ambiguity as Critical Variables in a Model of Organizational Behavior." <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Performance</u>, Vol. 7, pp. 467-505.

Hummel, Ralph, P. (1977). **Bureaucratic Experience.** N.Y.: St. Martin's Press.

Huston, Aletha C. (1988). "Gender, Socialization, and the Transmission of Culture." In Sharon S. Brehm (ed.), **Seeing Female: Social Roles and Personal Lives** (pp.7-19). Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Jacklin, Carol Nagy. (1989). "Female and Male: Issues of Gender." <u>American Psychologist</u>, Feb, Vol.44, No.2, pp.127-133.

Jourard, Sydney. (1958). "A Study of Self Disclosure." <u>Scientific American</u>, Vol.198, pp.77-82.

Janis, I. L. & Mann, L. (1977). **Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment.** N.Y. :Free.

Kahn, R.L.; Wolfe, D.M.; Quenn, R.P.; Snoek, J.; & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). **Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict & Ambiguity.** N.Y.: Wiley.

Kahn, William A. (1984). "The structure of exaltations." <u>American Behavioral Scientists</u>, Vol.27, No.6, July/Aug, pp.705-722.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). **Men & Women of the Corporation,** N.Y.: Basic Books.

Kanter, R. M. (1979, July/August). "Power Failures in Management Circuits." <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, pp.65-75.

Kerber, Linda K. (1986). "Viewpoint: On In A Different Voice: An interdisciplinary forum." Signs: J of Women in Culture & Society", Vol.11, No. 21, pp.301-311.

Kimmel, Michael, S. & Messner, Michael, A. (1989). **Men's Lives**. N.Y.: McMillan Publishing Co.

Kirkpatrick, Jeane. (1975). **Political Women**. N.Y.: Basic Books.

Kohlberg, l. (1966). "A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes." In E. E. Maccoby (ed.), **The Development of Sex Differences** (pp. 82-173). Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Kraft, Selma. (1983/84). "Cognitive functions and women's art", Women's Art Journal, No.4, Fall/Winter, pp.5-9.

Krielkamp, Thomas. (1984). "Psychological Closeness." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol.27, No.6, July/Aug, pp.771-784.

Kutner, N., & Brogan, D. R. (1981). "Problems of Colleagueship for Women entering the Medical profession." Sex Roles, Vol.7, pp.739-746.

Liddel, W. W. & Slocu, J. W. (1976). "The Effects of Individual-Role Compatibility upon Group Performance: An extension of Schutz's FIRO Theory." Academy of Management Journal, Vol.19, pp.413-426.

Lincoln, J. R., & Millar, J. (1979). "Work and Friendship ties in Organizations: A Comparative Analysis of Relational Networks." **Adminsitrative Science Quarterly**, Vol.24, pp. 181-199.

Lindsay-Hartz, J. (1980). **Two Studies of Guilt and Shame Experiences**. Doctoral Dissertation, Clark University, Worchester, M.A.

Linton, Ralph. (1936). **The Study of Man**. N.Y.: Appleton-Century.

Loden, Marilyn. (1985). **Feminine Leadership or How to Succeed in Business without being one of the boys**. N.Y.: Times Books.

Maccoby, E. E., and Brief, A. P., Schuler, R. S. (1981). **The Psychology of Sex Differences**. Stanford, CA: Stanford

University Press.

McCall, G.J. (1971). "Social Roles & Interaction." In **Society Today** (pp. 118-129). Del Mar, CA: CRM Books.

McDermott, Diane (1988). "The Art and Science of Contemporary Counselling Psychology: The Dilemma of a C a r i n g Relationship." In Sharon S. Brehm (ed.), **Seeing** **Female: Social Roles and Personal Lives** (pp.101-109). Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc.

McGee, Gail W., Ferguson, Carl E., and Seer, A. (1989). "Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity: Do the Scales Measure these two Constructs?". Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol.74, No.5, pp. 815-818.

McHugh, Peter. (1968). **Defining the Situation: The Organization of Meaning in Social Interaction.** Jardim, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

McMillan, Carol. (1982). **Reason, Women, and Nature: Some Philosophical Problems with Nature.** Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mead, George Herbert. (1934). **Mind, Self, & Society,** University of Chicago Press.

Melia, Jinx & Lyttle, Pauline. (1986). **Why Jenny Cannot Lead: Understanding the Male Dominated system.** Grand Junction, CO: Operational Politics.

Merril, B. Hentikka & Hentikka, Jaako. (1983). "How can language be sexist", in **Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science.** Edited by Sandra Harding and Merril B. Hentikka (pp.139-148). Dordrecht, Holland: Reiland.

Miles, R. H. (1976). "A Comparison of the Relative Impact of Role Perceptions of Ambiguity and Conflict by Role." Academy of Management Journal, Vol.19, No.25, pp.25-35.

Miller, Jean Baker. (1976). **Toward A New Psychology of Women,** Beacon Press/Boston.

Mischel, W. (1966). "A Social-Learning View of Sex Differences in Behavior." In E. E. Macobby (ed.), **The Development of Sex Differences** (pp.56-81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

266

Moreland, R. L. & Levine, J. M. (1982). "Socialization in Small Groups: Temporal changes in Individual-Group Relations." In L. Berkowitz (ed.), **Advances in Experimental Social Psychology**, Vol.15, pp.137-92. N.Y.: Academic.

Morris, M. B. (1977). **An Excursion into Creative Sociology**. N.Y.: Columbia University Press.

Mosher, Frederick. (1981). **Democracy and the Public Service**. 2nd ed. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Naisbitt, John and Aburdene, Patricia. (1990). **Ten New Directions For the 1990's: Megatrends 2000**. N.Y.: Wiliam Morrow and Company, Inc.

Parson, T. (1951). **The Social System**. Glencoe, Ill: Free.

Parson, T., & Shils, E. A. (1951). **Toward a general Theory 6 Action**. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Pfohl, Stephen J. (1975). "Social Role Analysis: The Ethnomethodological Critique." <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, Vol.59, No.3, pp.243-263.

Pollner, Melvin. (1974). "Sociological and Commonsense models of the Labelling process." In Roy Turner (ed.) **Ethnomethodology** (pp.27-40). Baltimore: Penguin.

Rice, Adrienne. (1979). "Privilege, Power, & Tokenism." <u>Ms Magazine</u>, Sept., pp.42-43.

Rivers, Caryl.(1983). Quoted in Rachel Flick, "The New Feminism & The World of Work," <u>The Public Interest</u>, 1983, No.71, Sring, p.37.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., and Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). "Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations." <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, Vol.15, pp. 150-163.

Rose, Hilary. (1985). "Science's Gender Gap." Review of Women's Books 2, pp.5-6.

Rosenbloom, David H. (1989). **Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector**. 2nd edition. N.Y.: Random House, Inc.

Rosener, Judy B., and Pearce, Catherine L. (1988-89). "Men and Women in Organizations: Are the Future Managers

exposed to the issues?". <u>The Organizational Behavior Teaching Review</u>, Vol. XIII, Issue 2, pp.55-67.

Rossi, Alice S. (1964). "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal." <u>Daedalus</u>, Vol.93, Spring, pp.607-652.

Ruddick, Sara. (1980). "Maternal Thinking," <u>Feminist Studies</u> Vol.6, No.2, pp.342-367.

Saint-German, Michelle A. (1989). "Does the Difference Makes a Difference? The Impact of Woomen on Public Policy in the Arizona Legislature." <u>Social Science Quarterly</u>, Vol.70, No.4, pp.956-968.

Schaef, Anne Wilson. (1981). **Women's Reality: An Emerging female system in the White Male Society**. Minneapolis, Winston.

Schlenker, Judith A. & Gutek, Barbara A. (1987). "Effects of role loss on work-related attitudes." <u>J of Applied Psychology</u>, Vol.72, No.2, pp.287-293.

Schofield, Janet W. (1990). "Increasing the Generalizability of Qualitative Research." In Elliot W. Eisner & Alan Peshkin (eds.). **Qualitative Inquiry in Education. The Continuing Debate** (pp.201-232). N.Y.: Teachers College.

Schutz, Alfred. (1967). **The Phenomenology of the Social World**. Trans. George Walsh and Frederick Lehnert. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Schutz, A. (1977). "The Stranger." In R. Sennet (ed.), **The Psychology of Society** (pp. 150-58). N.Y.: Vintage.

Seidel, John V., Kjolseth, Rolf, & Seymour, Elaine. (1988). **The Ethnograph. A User's Guide**, Version 3.0, March, Qualis Research Associates.

Simon, H. (1987). "Making Management Decisions: The Role of Intuition and Emotion." <u>Academy of Management Executive</u>, 1 (1), pp.57-63.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). **The Ethnographic Interview**. N.Y.: Holt, Renehart & Winston.

Stryker, S. (1980). **Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version**. Polo Atto, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Strub, Peter J., & Priest, T.B. (1976). "Two Patterns of

Establishing Trust: The Marijuana User." <u>Sociological Focus</u>, Vol.9, pp.399-411.

Summer, Timothy, P. and DeCoties, Thomas A. (1988). "An Investigation of Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction." <u>Sex Roles</u>, Vol.18, Nos.11/12, pp.679-689.

Tavris, Carol & Wade, Carol. (1984). **The Longest War: Sex Differences in Perspective.** Hartcourt Brace Jovanovick, Inc.

Taylor, Ronald, & Thompson, Mark. (1976). "Work-Value Systems of Young Workers." <u>Academy of Management J</u>,   Vol.19, pp.522-536.

Thompson, Joan Hulse. (1981). "Role Perceptions of Women in the Ninety-Fourth Congress, 1975-1976." <u>Political Science Quarterly</u>, Vol.95, No.1, Spring, pp.71-83.

Tosi, H. (1971). "Organization Stress as a moderator of the Relationship between Influence and Role Response." <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, Vol.14, pp.7-20.

Turner, R.H. (1979). "Strategy for Developing an integrated role theory," <u>Humboldt J. Soc. Rel.</u>, Vol.7, pp.123-39.

Turner, R. H. (1978). "The Role & the Person." <u>American J 6 Sociology</u>, Vol.84, pp.1-23.

Van Maanen, John. (1979). "Reclaiming Qualitative Methods for Organizational Research: A Preface." <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, Vol.24, No.4, Dec. pp.520-526.

Van Sell, M., Brief, A. P., Schuler, R. S. (1981). "Role conflict and Role ambiguity: Integration of the literature and directions for future research." <u>Human Relations</u>, Vol.34, pp.43-71.

Varea, P. E., Schaffer, G. S., and McCauley, C.D. (1983). "Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction revisited." <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, Vol.26, pp.348-353.

Wamsley, Gary L., Goodsell, Charles T., Rohr, John A., Stivers, C., Wolf, James F., and White, O. (1987). "The Public Administration and the Governance Process: Refocusing the American Dialogue." in Ralph Chandler (ed.), **A Centennial History of the American Administrative State** (pp.291-317). MacMillan Publishing Co.

Whiting, B. B., And Edwards, C. P. (1988). **Children of Different Worlds: The Formation of Social Behavior.** Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whitmont, Edward C. (1980). "Reassessing Feminity and Masculinity: A Critique of Some Traditional Assumptions." Quadrant, Vol.13, Fall, pp.109-122.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1990). "On Seeking and Rejecting--Validity in Qualitative Research." In Elliot W. Eisner and Alan Peshkin (eds.), **Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate** (pp.121-152). N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Woolf, V. (1929). **A Room of One's Own.** N.Y.: Hartcourt, Brace and Company.

Zimmerman, Don H. and Weider, Lawrence D. (1970). "Ethnomethodology and the Problem of Order: Comment on Denzin." In Jack D. Douglas, **Understanding Everyday Life** (pp.287-302). Chicago: Aldine publishing Inc.