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Abstract

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the leadership practices (Kouzes and Posner, 2002) of the department chairs as perceived by the faculty and the job satisfaction (Spector, 2007) of faculty members at a historically black university located in the State of Mississippi. The role of the gender and ethnicity of faculty members’ perceived leadership practices of department chairs and job satisfaction is explored. A total of 100 faculty responded to the study. An ANOVA test found that there is a significant difference in leadership practices of department chairs by faculty members between ethnicity: modeling the way (F = 242.529, p = .001), inspiring a shared vision (F = 289.658, p = .001), challenging the process (F = 386.177, p = .001), enabling others to act (F = 272.504, p = .001), and encouraging the heart (F = 339.685, p = .001). There is a significant difference in subscales of job satisfaction for faculty members between ethnicity: promotion (F = 12.953, p = .00), supervision (F = 1.819, p = .00), contingent rewards (F = 25.379, p = .00), operating procedures (F = 34.334, p = .00), co-workers (F = 34.406, p = .00), nature of work (F = 3.020, p = .054), and communication (F = 46.118, p = .00). There was not a significant difference in Leadership Practices of department chairs and Job Satisfaction of faculty members based on gender. The implications of the study resulted in gender differences and ethnicity having a statistical impact on the perceptions of leadership practices of department chairs and job satisfaction of faculty member. Future studies might expand the study to include more historically black university to gain a broader perception.
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Introduction

According to Betts, Betts, Chavez, and Urias’ (2009) study, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated 6,000 jobs in higher education administration will need to be filled annually due to the large percentage of baby-boom generation retiring. The growing demand for talented faculty member is projected to increase and the ability to retain and attract faculty members will become a major concern as time progress. Higher educational institutions depend greatly
on faculty members and maintaining quality faculty members is essential for all institutions. Daly and Dee’s (2006) study investigated faculty turnover at 15 randomly selected urban public universities in the United States. From a sample of 768 respondents, findings indicated that providing autonomy, building support, ensuring equity in rewards, and mutually negotiating increases job satisfaction of faculty members (Daly and Dee, 2006).

Seifert and Umbach’s (2007) study examined the effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on the dimensions of job satisfaction. The study had a sample size of 4,231 faculty members from 2 and 4 year public and not for profit institutions. The results revealed that Latino and Asian faculty members were less satisfied with compensation and opportunities for advancement. African American and Latino faculty members were less satisfied with equitable treatment.

Wrights’ (2009) study factors affecting African Americans faculty satisfaction at a historically black university and a predominantly white institution. The qualitative study utilized semi-structured interview process of open and closed ended questions from 6 African American faculty members at a Historical black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and 5 at a predominately white institution (PWI) in the southern regions of the United States. Wrights’ (2009) study concluded that faculty at HBCUs are satisfied by student interaction and are more satisfied than faculty at PWI. Faculty at HBCUs expressed dissatisfaction by less pay, teaching more classes and limited time for research (Wright, 2009). Faculty at PWI indicated dissatisfaction with the amount of research, work environment, micromanaged, non-honesty, limited diversity, and feeling negatively evaluated by students (Wrights, 2009).

These studies have postulated the importance of institutions creating an environment that promotes the development and collective contributions of all faculty members. The department chairs are the architect of these environments and it is essential that they lead faculty members to foster collective growth. Ethnicity has an impact on faculty members’ job satisfaction and should be considered when institutions invest resources towards training, conferences, and leadership development to ensure faculty members are well equip to achieve success (Denson and Park, 2009). Although there have been several studies in the area of faculty job satisfaction, there has been few focus on HBCUs with determining how gender and ethnic groups influence job satisfaction and the perception of leadership practices of department chairs (Faculty and Governance Issues, 2010).

Background

Faculty members at HBCUs comprise of more than fifty thousand individuals but only represent a small segment of the post-secondary teachers across the country (Faculty and Governance Issues, 2010). Previous literature discussed faculty governance, socialization, and diversity but provide little light on the historical and contextual description and experience of HBCU faculty (Faculty and Governance Issues, 2010). Historical black colleges and universities faculty employment has the proclivity to have a large group of African Americans compared to traditional white institution. According to Fields’ (2000) study, ’In 1995, the nation’s 26,835
Black faculty constituted 58 percent of all full-time faculty at four year HBCUs and 72 percent of full-time faculty at two-year HBCUs.”

In regards to faculty job satisfaction, Wright’s (2009) study postulated that faculty members’ job satisfaction at HBCUs is the result of three factors: the impact on students as a result of courses; freedom and flexibility of the job; and institutional context such as pay, workload, and lack of recognition. Rosser’s (2005) study explained that few studies have attempted to investigate change in faculty members’ perceptions over time and few have been conducted at historical black universities. Seifert and Umbach’s (2007) study revealed that job satisfaction is a key predictor of intention to remain or leave an academic position. Klein, Takeda-Tinker’s (2009) study investigated the impact of leadership on faculty members’ job satisfaction in the Wisconsin Technical College System. The results of the study indicated that a relationship exists between job satisfaction of full-time business faculty and leadership practices of their direct supervisor. The study also concluded that there was insufficient evidence regarding job satisfaction dependent upon gender, age, level of education, and years of service. This outcome indicates the importance of academic chairs’ influence on the productivity of faculty members. The leadership style and practices of academic chairs has the ability to motivate faculty members toward achieving institutional goals and establishing an environment that embraces shared governance (Codling and Yelder, 2004). This study fulfilled the gap in research regarding the perception of the HBCU faculty members’ perception of leadership practices of department chairs and job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework And Hypothesis

Bozeman and Gaughan’s (2011) study found different disciplines concentrate on different aspects of job satisfaction, economist (e.g. Freeman, 1978) focus on pay, pay equity, and market related issues; psychologists (e.g. Ryan and Deci, 2000) focus on both intrinsic (self-motivated) aspect of job satisfaction and extrinsic (externally defined rewards such as pay, promotion, and advancement); and sociologists (e.g. Tuch & Martin, 1991) tend to examine satisfaction difference by race, gender, and position in social structures. Studies have found that both intrinsic motivations and extrinsic factors related to pay and departmental climate (August & Waltman, 2004; Braxton, Luckey, & Hellanal, 2006; Farwather, 2005; Rosser, 2004). Bozeman and Gaughan’s (2011) study explained that college faculty members are highly motivated by a professional calling and extrinsic motivators are not as important to their job satisfaction.

Hagedorn’s (2000) study postulated a conceptual framework of faculty job satisfaction to explain, predict, or understand faculty job satisfaction. Hagedorn’s (2000) study explained that there are two constructs that affect job satisfaction: triggers and mediator. Triggers are significant life events that may be related or unrelated to the job (Hagedorn, 2000). Mediators are a variable or situation that influences the relationships between other variable or situations producing an interaction effect (Hagedorn, 2000). There are three types of mediators: motivators and hygienes, demographics, and environmental conditions. Motivators and hygienes include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement.
Demographics variables are ethnicity, institutional type, and academic discipline (Hagedorn, 2000). Environmental conditions include collegial relationships, student quality or relationships, administration, and institutional climate (Hagedorn, 2000). These mediators are explained in Table 1.

### Table 1: Conceptual Framework of Faculty Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivators and Hygienes</strong></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Number of publications and Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Measures indicating chairperson status and engagement in funded or creative endeavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>A derived measure comparing the actual proportions of time spent in research and teaching to the desired time spent in these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Number of committees served and chaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Derived measure calculated from time in rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Natural log of salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Dichotomous variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>male or female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Two dichotomous variables indicating if African American or Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional type</td>
<td>Carnegie designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic discipline</td>
<td>Categorized by Biglan type (hard/soft, pure/applied, life/nonlife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Conditions</strong></td>
<td>Collegial relationships</td>
<td>Item(s) measuring collegial relationships not available in the data set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student quality</td>
<td>Satisfaction with student quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or relationships

Administration Measure of satisfaction with administrative decisions
Institutional climate Measures of perceived improvement in or various aspects of the college

Research Questions And Hypothesis

Previous research has indicated that a relationship exists between job satisfaction of full-time business faculty and leadership practices of their direct supervisor (Klein, Takeda-Tinker’s, 2009). The existing evidence is dated largely on quantitative research in community colleges. The problem is that no study to date has determined what relationships exist between leadership practices of department chairs and job satisfaction of faculty members at a historically black university (Faculty and Governance Issues, 2010).

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a significant difference in the perception among faculty members for leadership practices of their department chairs and job satisfaction of faculty members based on gender and ethnic groups at a historically black university in the State of Mississippi. The study offers an exploration of how faculty members perceive leadership practices so institutions can effectively enhance leadership development for academic chairs.

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference between female and male faculty members’ perception of their department chairs’ predominant leadership practice?

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the perception between female and male faculty members for their department chairs’ predominant leadership practice.

Research Question 2: Are there significant differences in the perception among ethnic groups of faculty members for their department chairs’ predominant leadership practice (Compared Ethnicity Included: African American and Asian, African American and Whites, Whites and Asians)?

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perception among ethnic groups of faculty members’ perception of their department chairs’ predominant leadership practice.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in the perception of job satisfaction for female and male faculty members?

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the perception of job satisfaction for female and male faculty members.
Research Question 4: Are there significant differences in the perception of job satisfaction among ethnic groups of faculty members (Compared Ethnicity Included: African American and Asian, African American and Whites, Whites and Asians)?

Null Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perception of job satisfaction among ethnic groups of faculty members.

Methodology

The premise of the study was to determine which of the five leadership practices is the most perceived by faculty members for department chairs; the job satisfaction of faculty members; whether gender and race has an impact on the level of faculty job satisfaction; and the relationship between leadership practices of department chairs and the job satisfaction of faculty members at a historically black university. This chapter addressed the following areas: research questions, the targeted participants, the procedures for implementing the research process, the instrumentation, and the criteria for analysis of the data. Before data collection from human subjects, request for research involving human subjects was submitted to the Office of Research and Federal Relations at Jackson State University.

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative methodology to gain substantial information from participants to determine their perceptions of leadership practices of their department chairs and job satisfaction. A non-experimental research design is used to obtain perceptions of cross-sectional of faculty members at a historically black university. Fink’s (2003, p.32) explained that the aim of non-experimental research is to compare two or more groups without a manipulation of the situation or experience of the participants.

Two survey instruments are utilized for the study: Spector’s (2007) Job Satisfaction Survey and Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) (Observed) Leadership Practice Inventory. Demographic information is included with the survey to determine the impact of demographics may or may not have on job satisfaction.

Dependent variables are job satisfaction and leadership practices for this study. The Leadership Practices include five practices: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart.

The Job Satisfaction measures individual orientation based on nine facets of employee attitudes to determine the frequency of employee attitudes: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. Independent variables: Demographical variables of gender and ethnicity are used for this study.
Instrumentation

The study used two survey instruments, Spector’s (2007) Job Satisfaction Survey and Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) (Observed) Leadership Practices Inventory. To gain participation, an initial email invitation letters are emailed to respondents explaining the purpose of the study and the website link (Free Surveys Online) for the self-administrated questionnaire composed of Spector’s (2007) Job Satisfaction Survey and Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) (Observed) Leadership Practice Inventory, and four demographical questions.

The Spector’s (2007) Job Satisfaction Survey measures individual orientation based on nine facets of employee attitudes: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, communication comprised of 36 questions using a 6-point Likert-like scale. Respondents had an ordinal response options to rate the list of items from very positive to very negative. The reliability of this instrument was determined with coefficient alpha ranges for each of the nine categories (0.60 for coworkers to 0.91 for overall). The Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) Leadership Practices Inventory is based on five facets: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, encouraging the heart. The survey is comprised of 30 questions, and rates the frequency of a leadership behavior using a 10-point Likert-like scale. Respondents had an ordinal response options to rate the list of items from very positive to very negative. The reliability of this instrument was determined with the Cronbach’s Alpha with all scales above the .75 level.

Data Collection

The selection of participants for the study occurred during the academic year 2010-2011 from the population at a historically black university in the State of Mississippi. The study targets faculty from all academic disciplines to gain a broader interpretation of job satisfaction and perceived leadership at the university. The University’s faculty is composed of 528 individuals that work in varies departments (Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning, 2006). The faculty population by race include: 91 White, 366 Black, 71 others as indicated in Table 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Non-probability sampling method was used for this study to provide a representation of the targeted population. Convenience sampling was utilized for this study to offer the faculty members at the university an opportunity to respond to the survey. Fink (2003, p. 41) explained that convenience sampling is a group of individuals who are ready and available. Each individual in the faculty population had an equal chance of responding to the survey. There was no systematic pattern of selection of faculty members, only those listed by the Office of Institutional Research as faculty from the institution of study were afforded the opportunity to receive the survey web invitation via email. Five hundred and twenty-five faculty members received the web based survey which resulted in 116 respondents.
Figure 1. Faculty by Employment

Figure 2. Faculty by Gender
The following procedures implemented for this study included: permission was requested from Kouzes Posner International and Paul Spector for uses of survey instruments; permission from the historical black institution was requested to obtain approval from the Institution Review Board (IRB); faculty members’ email addresses were obtained of the Office of Institutional Research; data collection period occurred over four week during the Spring Semester 2011; participants were emailed invitation letters (Appendix A) attached with consent form (Appendix B) and website link to the survey (Free Surveys Online) (Appendix C); after two weeks, the population was emailed a reminder letter (Appendix D) to encourage participation; over a four
week data collection period, faculty members had the opportunity to respond to the survey or opt out of participation in the study; and respondents’ information was collected and analyzed without identifying information in the dataset.

**Confidentiality**

The participants were randomly assigned survey ID numbers and the contact information will never be traced to the information provided. The information from respondents is destroyed upon completion of the study. All data collected from participants will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s residence. In addition, the survey was designed to limit the request of personal information from respondents.

**Protection Of Human Subjects**

The participants received invitation letter via email with a consent form and web link to the survey. There was no deception because participants did not receive payment or awards for their involvement in the study. There was no information about the study withheld from participants or misleading information presented to participants. There was no coercion because the researcher does not serve as a supervisor to any of the participants and there was no intimidation or force to obtain compliance from participants. A participant had the option to request to be removed from the study at any time without penalty.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis is the result of the information obtained from the two instruments: The Leadership Practice Inventory (Observed) and Job Satisfaction Inventory. A statistical method was used to interpret the description, comparison, and differences between the respondents. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS-17) was used to analyze the data collected, specifically: means, standard deviations, independent t-test, and ANOVA test. A frequency count was used to determine the number of men and female respondents and the number of respondents by ethnicity. Frequency count was used to determine the mean of the respondents for each of the five leadership practices and overall job satisfaction and subscale of job satisfaction. Research questions one and three were analyzed by a t-test analysis for statistical significance. Research questions two and four were analyzed by an ANOVA test for statistical significance.

**Result**

**Response rate**

Four hundred and ninety-one faculty members received the invitation email containing the web link to the survey during the spring semester in April. A second invitation email was sent to increase the response rate after two weeks. After four weeks, there were 116 responses received. The number of usable surveys was 100 because of incomplete surveys submitted.
There were 54 males (54%) and 44 females (44%), 2 did not identify their gender (see Table 2). The majority of the respondents were African Americans (62%) and Whites (20%) (see Table 2). Full-time (97%) faculty members represented the largest participation in the study (see Table 2).

Table 2 Select Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collective response of participants was examined to determine the comparative population of the institution with those that participated in the study. The following figures 5, 6, 7, and 8 compare the population gender, employment status, ethnicity, and department chairs. The figures indicate that the sample population is a substantial representation of the faculty population.
Figure 5. Comparison of faculty population to the sample by gender.

Figure 6. Comparison of faculty population to the sample by employment status.
Research Question One

An independent t-test was used to determine the means, standard deviations and the statistical significance by gender. The test for significance was performed at a probability level of $p < 0.05$. The collective means indicated by female faculty members ranged from 26.15 for Enabling Others Act and 31.93 for Encouraging the Heart (Table 3). The collective means indicated by male faculty members ranged from 24.79 for Enabling Others Act and 29.99 for Inspiring a Shared Vision (Table 3). Means were compared using independent t-test for significance. The
significance was determined at 95% confidence level. The degrees of freedom vary for this research question due to omitting of response to some questions in the survey instrument by respondents. All leadership practices were found not statistically significant with Modeling the Way $t(93)=0.15, p > .05$; Inspiring the Vision $t(96)=0.22, p > .05$; Challenging the Process $t(95)=0.28, p > .05$; Enabling Others to Act $t(90)=0.50, p > .05$; and Encouraging the Heart $t(96)=0.55, p > .05$.

**Discussion Of Research Question One**

The findings indicated that there is sufficient evidence to support the null hypothesis based on the data gathered. All leadership practices were found not statistically significant, $p > .05$, for a sample size of 29 females and 71 males. Each of the five dependent variables of leadership practices indicated no significant difference for faculty members perception based on the independent variable of gender.

**Summary**

Research question one resulted no significant difference between gender for leadership practices of department chairs. Out of the five leadership practices exhibited by department chairs, none were identified as statistical significant between genders.

**Table 3 Respondents’ Ratings of Leadership Practices of Department Chairs by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females (29)</th>
<th>Males (71)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>28.50 3.18</td>
<td>27.03 3.94</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring a Shared Vision</td>
<td>30.00 2.99</td>
<td>29.99 3.27</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td>30.7 3.01</td>
<td>33.14 3.11</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>26.15 3.17</td>
<td>24.79 3.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>31.93 3.33</td>
<td>29.68 3.78</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question Two**

Table 4 shows the results from the leadership practices of department chairs by faculty members’ ethnicity. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if the data on ethical perspectives resulted in different perceptions of leadership practices. The test for significance was performed at a probability level of $p < 0.05$. The collective means indicated by African Americans faculty members ranged from 23.40 for Enabling Others to Act and 31.16 for Challenging the Process. The collective means indicated by Asian faculty members ranged from 10.00 for Challenging the Process. The collective means indicated by White faculty members ranged from 33.35 for Enabling Others to Act and 38.28 for Challenging the Process.
### Table 4 Analysis of Variance for Ethical Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPI Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4,543.525</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,271.762</td>
<td>242.529</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>852.394</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21.980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,395.919</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPI Inspire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4,820.408</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,410.204</td>
<td>289.658</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>757.200</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,577.608</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPI Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5,337.668</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,668.834</td>
<td>386.177</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>628.893</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,966.561</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPI Enable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3,798.361</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,899.181</td>
<td>272.504</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>634.212</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,432.573</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPI Encourage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA test results above showed a statistical difference among ethnic groups for the leadership practice of Modeling the Way (F = 242.529, p = .001), Inspiring a Shared Vision (F = 289.658, p = .001), Challenging the Process (F = 386.177, p = .001), Enabling Others to Act (F = 272.504, p = .001), and Encouraging the Heart (F = 339.685, p = .001). These results suggested that there was a difference in the ethical perceptions for the leadership practices and further analyses of the data included post hoc statistical procedures.

**Post Hoc Data Analysis**

Post-hoc tests were conducted using the Tukey HSD procedure for all leadership practices. Significant difference was found between the perception among ethnic groups of faculty members for their department chairs’ predominant leadership practice. The test identified a significant difference between the Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart showing a significant difference (p < .05) between ethnic groups.

**Discussion Of Research Question Two**

The independent variable, ethnicity, indicated statistical significant (p < .05) among the groups for the dependent variables Modeling the Way, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. The only dependent variable that was not found statistical significant (p > .07) was for Inspiring a Shared Vision between African Americans and Whites. The eta-squared confirmed a large size effect of 1.47 between African Americans and Asians and African Americans and Whites for Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. The findings indicated that there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and support the alternative hypothesis.

**Summary**

Research question two resulted in determining ethnicity has a significant impact on the perception of leadership practices of department chairs. The ethnic groups of this study included Asians, African Americans, Hispanic and Whites for the significant difference. The study presented findings that ethnicity has an impact on the perception of leadership of department chairs by faculty members.
Research Question Three

Spector’s Job Satisfaction Inventory was used to determine the job satisfaction of faculty members. The sum scores for each facet range from 4 to 24, 4 to 12 indicating for dissatisfied, 16 to 24 for satisfied, and 12 to 16 for ambivalent. The overall score for job satisfaction ranges from 36 to 216, 36 to 108 for dissatisfied, 144 to 216 for satisfied, and 108 to 144 for ambivalent.

Table 5 shows the frequency of job satisfaction of the sample population by gender. Descriptive statistics was used to show the mean point of value, standard deviation and independent t-test of significance. The test for significance was performed at a probability level of p< 0.05 for a sample size of 71 males and 29 females. The degrees of freedom vary for this research question due to omitting of response to some questions in the survey instrument by respondents. The overall job satisfaction for both male (137.54) and female (132.57) indicated ambivalent. Job satisfaction for males indicated the following: contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, and nature of work. Females indicated job satisfaction in the following: contingent rewards and nature of work. Overall job satisfaction was found not statistically significant with t(96)=19.19, p > .05. Job satisfaction subscales were found not statistically significant with pay with t(96)=−.86, p > .05; promotion with t(96)=−1.74, p > .05; supervision with t(96)=.94, p > .05; fringe benefits with t(96)=1.00, p > .05; contingent rewards with t(96)=1.47, p > .05; operating procedures with t(96)=.85, p > .05; co-worker with t(96)=1.06, p > .05; nature of work with t(96)=−1.22, p >.05; and communications with t(96)=−1.21, p > .05.

Table 5: Respondents’ Ratings of Job Satisfaction by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spector’s Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Males Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(71) Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Females (29) Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>137.54 .54</td>
<td></td>
<td>132.57 1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>14.4 1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.31 1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>12.89 1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.93 1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>14.63 1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.52 1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>13.68 1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.42 1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>16.37 1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.16 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>16.59 1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.34 1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>17.46 1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.57 1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>18.55 1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.18 1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13.13 1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.14 1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Of Research Question Three

The independent variable of gender did not produce a statistical significant difference for the dependent variables of job satisfaction. Therefore it is sufficient evidence to support the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between job satisfaction and gender of faculty.
members. The overall job satisfaction and subscales of job statistical between female and male faculty members was found not statistically significant, p > .05.

Research Question Four

Table 6 shows the results for job satisfaction of the sample population by ethnicity. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if the data on ethical perspectives resulted in different perceptions of job satisfaction for faculty members. The test for significance was performed at a probability level of p < 0.05. The overall job satisfaction indicated the following: African American (134.9), Asian (127.52), and White (145.23). African American and Asian job satisfaction is ambivalent. White indicated job satisfaction as satisfied.

Table 6: Analysis of Variance for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Overall Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2,639.523</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,319.761</td>
<td>1.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60,805.760</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>668.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63,445.282</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pay Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>13.306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.653</td>
<td>3.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>165.170</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.476</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promotion Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>49.579</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.790</td>
<td>12.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>174.152</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>223.732</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supervision Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.806</td>
<td>27.903</td>
<td>10.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>244.694</td>
<td>2.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>300.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fringe Benefits Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.002</td>
<td>4.001</td>
<td>1.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>200.162</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>208.164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contingent Rewards Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146.197</td>
<td>73.099</td>
<td>25.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>262.107</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>408.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Procedures Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144.946</td>
<td>72.473</td>
<td>34.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>192.083</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>337.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Co-workers Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.290</td>
<td>80.145</td>
<td>34.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>211.977</td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>372.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nature of Work Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA test results above showed a statistical difference among ethnic groups for and subscales of job satisfaction for promotion (F = 12.953, p = .001), supervision (F = 1.819, p = .001), contingent rewards (F = 25.379, p = .001), operating procedures (F = 34.334, p = .001), co-workers (F = 34.406, p = .001), nature of work (F = 3.020, p = .054), and communication (F = 46.118, p = .001). Also, the following were found not statistically significant among ethnic groups for jobs satisfaction overall (F = 1.975, p = .145), pay (F = 1.975, p = .145), and fringe benefits (F = 1.819, p = .168). These results suggested that there was a difference in the ethical perceptions for job satisfaction and further analyses of the data included post hoc statistical procedures.

Post Hoc Data Analysis

Post-hoc tests were conducted using the Tukey HSD procedure for those found with statistical difference. The test identified a significant difference among ethnic groups for promotion, supervision, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers nature of work and communication showing a significant difference (p < .05) between ethnic groups.

Discussion Of Research Question Four

The independent variable, ethnicity, indicated statistical significant (p < .05) among the groups for the dependent variable of overall job satisfaction. The dependent variable of job satisfaction subscales indicated the following:

- Communications indicated statistical significant (p < .05) between each ethnic group.
- Pay indicated statistical significant (p < .05) between African Americans and Asians and Whites and Asians.
• Contingent rewards and promotion indicated statistical significant (p < .05) between African Americans and Whites and Whites and Asians.
• Operating procedures and nature of work indicated statistical significant (p < .05) between Whites and Asians.

The eta-squared confirmed a large size effect of 1.43 between African Americans and Asians for overall job satisfaction and job satisfaction subscale pay. The findings indicated that there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and support the alternative hypothesis.

Summary

Research question four resulted in significant difference between ethnicity for job satisfaction of faculty members. Out of the nine facets of job satisfaction exhibited by faculty members, eight facets were identified as statistical significant difference for ethnicity.

Discussion

Historically Black Colleges And Universities

Historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) continuously suffer the same challenges that have endured since their creations. These institutions have molded history, created a social-economic population and have enabled a race of people to develop self-esteem, faith, and a mental contribution towards elevating society. With all those achievements, these institutions might have outlived their purpose from which they were created. Today’s challenges dictate educational institutions that are self-sufficient, are able to serve diverse student population, are engaged in innovative research and have the foresight to evolve towards an ever-changing world. These attributes have become the requirement for educational enterprises and states are expecting great contributions from HBCUs.

HBCUs have a long history of stretching resources and people to achieve educational goals of students. The depleting state appropriations have resulted in HBCUs faculty members absorbing greater responsibilities and expectations. Faculty members’ salaries at HBCUs have the proclivity of being lower than the national average. The reduced compensation indicates that faculty members are dedicated to the profession and serving students. While the environmental context of HBCUs consistently face challenges, the job satisfaction amongst faculty members is essential for the institution to be successful. The National Center for Education Statistics indicated that HBCUs are showing a decline in black faculty. “In 1997, there were 7,966 full time black faculty at HBCUs, but in 1999 this dropped to 7,887 (Boston, 2002).” The growing shortage of black faculty is also the result of few HBCUs offering Ph.D. programs and the decreasing number of African Americans pursuing higher educational careers. HBCUs have to provide greater incentives to maintain the presents of current faculty members against prevailing institutions.
Today, 100 HBCUs continue to thrive serving students and preparing future leadership positions regardless of the economic climate. HBCUs are the symbolic reference of the possibilities, of how opportunity can be a chance to achieve greatness. These institutions have continued to thrive regardless of economic deficiencies, state support, and federal recognition. According to Avery’s (2009) study, “HBCUs are responsible for 70 percent of all black doctors and dentists, 50 percent of all black engineers and public school teachers, and 35 percent of all black attorneys received their bachelor’s degrees at an HBCU.” The combined initial spending of all 100 HBCUs in their host communities totaled $6.6 billion (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2006). Regardless of this success, there is a continued problem of state appropriations and growing fight for student enrollment. Currently, HBCUs enroll 14% of the African Americans that attend college and struggle with low graduation rates. HBCUs have not been able to galvanize alumni to contribute significant resources back to the institution due to the economic disparities that exist in the African American community.

**Academic Leadership Of Higher Education**

Higher educational institutions are representative of unique cities that offer specialized services community members. Leadership is an essential component for determining direction of any organization, and for it to become a productive entity for all stakeholders. Academic leadership proposes some challenging opportunities for leaders to demonstrate resolve for its constituents and progress the organization to new heights. Higher education has evolved into a competitive environment of attracting the best students and obtaining national recognition. Historically, leadership training occurs from department heads and academic chairs considered to assume future leadership roles as deans of vice presidents. Unlike in corporate organization, they offer significant amount resources towards professional development or leadership training. Higher educational institutions have begun to realize that the growth of the organization greatly depends on leadership abilities of its employees. Codling and Yelder’s (2004) study revealed that universities have evolved into a corporate management style in the last twenty years. This change is the result of how state governments are reducing allotment to state educational institutions. States are increasingly expecting universities to absorb the majority of the operational expenditures and identify mechanism to decrease the dependence on state resources. Codling and Yelder’s (2004) study explained, “the growth of competition and market forces in higher education is fuelling change and the tug-of-war over the fundamental issues of institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and accountability.” The role of university administration encompasses both leadership and management prospects. Codling and Yelder’s (2004) study alluded the academic administrators have an integrated role of vision creation, fostering culture, research, teaching and providing direction with students and staffs. The multi-dimensional role can be tasking, and requires individuals that have the self-confidence to be all things expected.

Bisbee’s (2007) study suggested that higher educational institutions are beginning to how great challenges in identifying effective, competent, and visionary leaders to assume the task of leadership positions. The increased scrutiny of higher education has resulted in fewer individuals that are willing to take-on these positions. The new perspective of higher education
is to have multi-campus institutions, serve a diverse population, and produce quality programs (Bisbee, 2007; Gaither, 2002). As a result, there is a high turnover rate due to the stressful nature of these leadership positions (Bisbee, 2007). The high degree of responsibility, limited resources and power, and ambiguous role can make it difficult to handle leadership roles. There is also a unique culture that exists in higher education regarding the perceived beliefs of academic leaders. Leadership skills are perceived to be stronger for individuals that are external of the organization and who are older (Bisbee, 2007). This indicates that universities should reconsider how future positions are to filled and learn to utilize current employees to their maximum.

**Five Exemplary Practices Of Leadership**

Leadership development is a consistent process of growth as organizations seek to enhance employees’ performance and raise its productivity. Leadership is a personal process of growth and self-discovery that requires mechanisms of measurements. Kouzes and Posner (2003) posited after significant research to identify five principle components consistent among all the thousands of individuals studied: challenge the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. Jaklic, Stough, and Zagorsek’s (2006) study explained that the leadership practice inventory developed by Kouzes and Posner provided a consist method for accessing leadership performance at all levels. Chiok Foong Loke’s (2001) study extrapolated the following from the five distinct practices of Kouzes and Posner’s (2003) five leadership practices:

- Challenging the process; being committed to search out challenging opportunities to change, grow, innovate, and improve.
- Inspiring a shared vision: enlisting followers in a shared vision for an uplifting and ennobling future by appealing to their values, interests, hopes, and dreams.
- Enabling others to act: fostering collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building mutual trust through empowering followers by providing choice, developing competence, assigning critical tasks and giving visible support.
- Modeling the way: role modeling, which is consistent with shared values and achieves small wins for promoting progress and commitment.
- Encouraging the heart; providing individual recognition for success of projects and regularly celebrating accomplishments.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) created two instruments of the leadership practice inventory to measure the five leadership practices, self, and the observer. Both are composed of 30 statements, six that access each of the five leadership practices on a five point-Likert scale (Chiok Foong Loke, 2001). The leadership practice inventory has been distributed several types of organizations and have found it to be unrelated to demographic factors.
Job Satisfaction

Maintaining job satisfaction of faculty members is a growing concern for educational institutions due to the growing retirement of current faculty and the increasing demand of educational services. Retaining experiences faculty adds value to the educational system and enhances the quality of academic programs. Faculty members are highly likely to remain if the structural organization has collegial communication, equitable rewards, work autonomy, job security, and a role in the collective decision making process (Daly and Dee, 2006). Johnsrud and Rosser’s (2002) study found that faculty members do act on their discontent and leave an institution, but identifying the contributions of dissatisfaction benefits the institution. The recruiting of new faculty members is an additional expense to the institution and expectancy theory suggests that employees enter an organization with expected values (Daly and Dee, 2006). These values affect the function of the organization which might not coincide with the mission of the institution. The overall collective conscience of the faculty is guided by the department chair that embodies the ability to direct individuals toward shared decision-making. According to Johnsrud and Rosser (2002), “Despite the significance of faculty retention, there is little understanding of how demographic, structural, perceptual, and attitudinal variables interact to explain faculty intention to leave.”

Job satisfaction is an expansive interpretation of many factors based on intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions. Seifert and Umbach’s (2008) study illustrated that intrinsic dimension is the degree to which work is interesting and has self-direction. Extrinsic dimensions refer to items such as financial, job security, co-workers, and adequacy resources (Seifert and Umbach, 2008). These two dimensions are personal values that are different insignificance to each faculty member. The combination of delivering an adequate balance of intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions is the challenge for educational institutions. The challenge in increased when it comes to having a diverse faculty. Seifert and Umbach’s (2008) study concluded that female faculty members are less satisfied with dimension of their job than males; Latino and Asian Pacific Islanders faculty are less satisfied with compensation and opportunities for advancement; and females and minority faculty members have the proclivity to perceive less than equitable treatment.

Harash’s (2010) study examined the relationship between the perceive leadership styles of educational leaders and the job satisfaction of faculty members within community colleges. The results of the study found the following (Harash, 2010):

- Pay satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership and the subscale contingent reward of a transactional style.
- Promotion satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, contingent rewards satisfaction form the JSS, coworkers satisfaction, communication satisfaction, as well as overall satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership.
- Fringe benefits satisfaction had a significant positive correlation with contingent reward subscale and a significant negative correlation with management by exception-active.
• Operating conditions satisfaction had no significant positive correlations but had significant negative correlations with management by exception-passive, and laissez-faire subscales of transactional style.
• No significant differences were found between full-time and part-time community college faculty members with respect to job satisfaction.
• No significant differences were found between males and females.
• Significant differences were found based on education level. Faculty with a bachelor’s degree or less in education had significantly higher overall satisfaction than did faculty members with a doctoral degree.
• ANOVA comparisons for overall satisfaction and transformational leadership based on which college that faculty member taught in showed no differences for overall satisfaction or for transformational style preferences.

The results indicated the influence of leadership attributes on job satisfaction of faculty member. Although the student is limited to community colleges, it does offer insight towards faculty perceptions in higher educational institutions.

Gender Disparities Amongst Faculty Members

The demographical factors of gender have a significant influence on faculty members. Society projects certain roles and expectations on women which has an impact on their roles as a professional. The academic environment has historically been influence by male perspective that has resulted in difference in salary, rank and tenure among women faculty members. Today, women account for 40 percent of the faculty population nationwide (Conley, 2005). This large percent has not reduced equity issues of women faculty members. Academic career advancement of women is hindered by three factors: explored societal, professional-organizational and institutional barriers (Bain and Cummings, 2002; Conley, 2005). These factors transcends across academia because of the consistent culture that exist in higher education.

Research has found that there is a wage gap between faculty members for gender. The National Center for Education Statistics initiated a study in 1999 of 865 postsecondary institutions and a sample of 18,000 faculty members to determine the profile of faculty, professional backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes. The study revealed that men salaries were higher than women’s salaries for full-time faculty members and similar salary advantage for men in different ethnicity (Bradburn & Sikora, 2002). There is a gender advantage for men for higher faculty rank and are most likely to be employed in public doctoral institutions (Bradburn & Sikora, 2002).

Kowalewski’s (2005) study explored the leadership practices utilized by women serving in leadership roles at 56 dental schools. The leadership skills were identified using Kouzes & Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory. The study sought to determine what leadership skills are essential for women to obtain leadership roles in dental schools. Significant disparities have
been found among dental schools regarding gender. Kowalewski’s (2005) study discussed that enrollment in U.S. dental schools represent 42%; however, there is female under-representation in senior dental administrators. Professional associations like the American Dental Education Association have instituted programs to target opportunities for women in dental school.

A total of 235 responded to the study’s survey: 92 female respondents, and 143 male respondents. Ethnical demographics of respondents reported 88 percent Caucasian, 8 percent other, nine African American, seven Hispanic, one Native American, and four did not respond. A t-test determined the statistically significant difference in the mean and a chi-square analysis to determine significance. The results of the study include the following (Kowalewski, 2005):

- Associate Deans were found to be statistical significant for Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart
- Female Deans reported utilizing most frequently Encourage the Heart and least frequently Modeling the Way
- Male Deans reported utilizing most frequently Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart
- Modeling the way was the least utilized behavior reported by female and male Deans
- Female Associate Deans reported the most frequently utilized leadership behavior of Enabling Others to Act
- Female and Male Associate Deans reported the least frequently utilized leadership behavior of Inspiring a Shared Vision
- Female Chairs reported Inspiring a Vision as their most frequently utilized leadership behavior
- Male Chairs reported Enabling Others to Act as their most frequently leadership behavior
- Male Chairs reported least frequently utilizing the behavior Inspiring a Shared Vision
- Female Directors reported Inspiring a Shared Vision as their most frequently utilized leadership practice
- Male Directors reported most frequently utilizing the behavior of Enabling Others to Act
- Female and Male Directors reported least frequently utilizing the behavior Inspiring a Shared Vision

Corley and Sabharwal’s (2009) study investigated job satisfaction across gender and discipline from the sample population produced by the 2003 Survey of Doctorate Recipients from the National Science Foundation. The study (2009) explained that the projected growth of increased faculty retirement and demands of higher education will result in more women and minorities occupying faculty positions. Corley and Sabharwal’s (2009) study had a population
size of 223,424 grouped into four discipline categories: science, social science, engineering and health. The findings postulated the following:

- Male faculty members were more likely to be married across all disciplines
- Male faculty members had significantly more years of experience across all disciplines
- Male faculty members had higher salaries than female faculty across all disciplines
- Male faculty members were significantly more likely to be employed in a Carnegie Research I or II university in the fields of science, engineering, and health
- Female faculty members were more likely to be employed in these institutions within social science fields
- Male faculty members were more likely to work at a public university than women
- In the engineering fields, women were significantly more likely to focus their primary work activities on R&D
- Male faculty members had significant higher levels of overall job satisfaction across all disciplines
- Female faculty members in the health field were more satisfied, followed by science, social science, and engineering
- Males faculty members in social sciences, engineering, and health were equally satisfied
- Males faculty member in sciences were the least satisfied but still more satisfied than most females
- Tenured faculty members are more satisfied than untenured faculty with sciences, social sciences, and engineering while the reverse is true for faculty in the health fields

Corley and Sabharwal’s (2009) study concluded that in across all disciplines female faculty members expressed lower satisfaction compared to male faculty members. The study also indicated that job satisfaction is different across academic disciplines.

**Ethnicity Disparities Amongst Faculty Members**

The demographical factor of ethnicity has an influence upon faculty members at colleges and universities. The growing term is diversity in the workplace and how it is significant for organizational sustainability. Some faculty members of diverse heritage have found it challenging to achieve certain positions due to their ethnicity. Denson and Park’s study (2009) discussed that faculty members of color are less like to hold untenured positions. The premise of their study was to determine how diversity advocacy varies within subsets of faculty and to identify predictors of faculty attitudes regarding diversity. The term “Diversity Advocacy” is used to measure the attitudes on the value of diversity and how the institution should approach diversity (Denson & Park, 2009). The study used data collected by the Higher Education Research Institute as part of the triennial national survey of college and university conducted in 2004-05. The population sample resulted in 35,580 faculty members from 414 colleges and universities. The methodology of the study employed descriptive and multivariate analyses. The descriptive analyses explored demographic characteristics, academic rank, and institutional types. The multivariate analyses utilized a block entry regression analysis of background characteristics, academic discipline, institutional characteristics, work related
variables, and faculty values. The descriptive analyses revealed the following (Denson and Park’s, 2009):
- Black faculty are most like to score high on diversity advocacy
- Departments within the Engineering were least likely to score high on Diversity Advocacy
- English faculty most likely to score high
- Men were twice as likely to be low scores on Diversity Advocacy than women
- Lower category gaps between male and female faculty occurred in fields of Engineering, Business, and Math/Statistics

The multivariate analyses exposed the following (Denson and Park’s, 2009):
- Gender had a positive effect on diversity advocacy
- Blacks, Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Latino were all significantly more likely to be diversity advocates than white faculty
- Older faculty members were a significant predictor of Diversity Advocacy
- Faculty members in fields of Agriculture, Business, Engineering, Math/Sciences, and Physical Science scored significantly lower as diversity advocates
- Faculty members in fields of Education, Fine Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences was a significant positive predictor of Diversity Advocacy
- Doing academic work across multiple disciplines and incorporating more readings on race and gender in their classrooms were positive predictors of Diversity Advocacy
- Faculty members at four-year public institutions were significantly more likely to be Diversity Advocacy
- Faculty at institutions with higher percentages of students of color were less likely to score high on Diversity Advocacy

Denson and Park’s (2009) study concluded with three recommendations for colleges and universities to promote diversity among faculty: it is critical for universities to recruit and retain a diverse faculty; encourage STEM faculty to become more involved in campus diversity efforts; and promote civic values among faculty members. The significant founds of the study is for colleges and universities to be more intentional in promoting diversity among faculty members.

Jackson’s (2004) study investigated the difference of gender and race on the measure of teaching, research, and service productivity of 665 tenured engineering faculty members in 19 research intensive institutions. The compared groups using in this with regards to race were White Man, Blacks/Hispanics, Asian, and White Women. The assessment of teaching productivity was measured by the average number of hours spent per week on classroom activities. Significant difference was found that Asian spent higher number of hours per week than white men in office hours and more graduate advisees (Jackson, 2004). Overall, there was little difference in teaching productivity comparable to white men.

The assessment of research productivity was measured by the average number of publications, research activities, dollar value of grants, the number of supervising graduating master’s and doctoral students, and average number of hours spent on consulting. There was a significant
difference with Asian having higher engagement in research related activities than white men (Jackson, 2004). Overall, there was little difference in the research productivity of the compared group.

The assessment of service productivity was measured by recording respondents’ numbers of committees, master and doctoral committees, average number of hours to organizations, and hours of informal contact with students. The findings among the groups indicated little difference in service work. Statistical significant findings included white women larger service to organizations than white men and Asians high number of doctoral thesis committees than any other group (Jackson, 2004).

Jackson’s (2004) study concluded that there is an absence of significant difference between the productivity of white men and the compared group in the discipline of engineering for faculty members. The study does not account for non-quantitative factors that can determine performance but does provide insight that consideration for advancement should be an equitable process.

Berrian’s (2006) study examined the differences in job satisfaction between African-American and White faculty members employed at a predominantly White and predominantly Black four-year university. The study sample population was 170 faculty members that responded to the self-reported mailed survey addressing levels of job satisfaction, opportunities for promotion, salary, supervision, colleagues, procedures and rewards. The study employed a multivariate analysis of variance between the perceived departmental support and job satisfaction between two universities. Two universities were selected for the study: Tennessee State University (TSU) with 74 faculty members and Vanderbilt University with 96 faculty members that responded to the survey. Males accounted for 64.7% and females comprised of 35.3% of the population of the study. The ethnicity of the population was 56.5% White and 43.5% were African American. The finding of the study indicated the following (Berrian, 2006):

- Job satisfaction was significantly related to university type and race
- Departmental support and perceptions of fairness was higher for TSU than Vanderbilt
- Job satisfaction was higher for Vanderbilt than TSU
- The perceived departmental support, perceptions of fairness, and job satisfaction were higher for Caucasian faculty than for African-American faculty
- Departmental support, perceptions of fairness was found higher for African-Americans at TSU but lower at Vanderbilt
- Job satisfaction was higher for Caucasians at Vanderbilt but lower for African-Americans
- Job satisfaction was higher for African-Americans at TSU than for Caucasians at TSU

This study supports that African-American faculty members report having more job satisfaction at predominate Black university and a significant difference in job satisfaction based on institutions of employment.
Relating The Findings To Other Studies

The findings from this study provided contributions to the current research literature. Kowalewski’s (2005) study indicated that female chairs reported Inspiring a Vision as their most frequently utilized leadership behavior. The female respondents of this study identified Encourage the Heart as the most frequent behavior of department chairs followed by Inspiring a Shared Vision and Challenging the Process. Kowalewski’s (2005) study postulated that male chairs reported Enabling Others to Act as their most frequent leadership behavior. This study found males to identify Challenging the Process as the most frequent leadership practice behavior observed by for department chairs followed by Inspiring a Shared Vision and Encouraging the Heart. Although this study did not find a significant statistical difference base on gender, it does suggest that environmental conditions might produce different perceptions of leadership practices. The study did find statistical significant differences based on ethnic groups for leadership practices of department chairs. Jackson’s (2004) study concluded that there was a significant difference with Asian having higher engagement in research related activities. Denson and Park’s (2009) study explained that there is difference of gender and race on the measure of teaching, research, and service productivity. The perception based upon ethnic groups does have an effect on faculty members’ expectations.

This study can also contribute to the explanation of job satisfaction of faculty members. Klein and Takeda-Tinker’s (2009) study explained that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that job satisfaction relates to gender. Other studies have concluded that genders disparities might have an influence on faculty members’ perceptive due to salary, tenure and responsibility (Bain & Cummings, 2002; Bradburn and Sikora, 2002; Conley, 2005). The results from this study revealed no statistical significant different for job satisfaction based on gender. There were differences discovered based on ethnicities for job satisfaction. Berrian’s (2006) study identified three significant findings: Job satisfaction was significantly related to university type and race; the perceived departmental support, perceptions of fairness, and job satisfaction were higher for Caucasian faculty than for African-American faculty; and job satisfaction was higher for African-Americans at a HBCU than for a predominately Caucasian institution. This study found that there were statistical significant difference for job satisfaction base on ethnic groups but overall job satisfaction was not confirmed for African American faculty members at a historically black university, the result were ambivalent. Only those faculty members that identified themselves as White indicated overall job satisfaction.

Implications

The purpose of the study was to determine the faculty perceptions of the leadership practices of department chairs and faculty job satisfaction. Two survey instruments (Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practice Inventory and Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey) were used to address the four research question from the faculty members at a historical black university in the state of Mississippi. The following summaries will offer insight of leadership practices, job satisfaction, and demographics. The study utilized the demographics of gender and ethnicity. The
population of respondents resulted in one hundred faculty members, seventy-one are male and twenty-nine are female. They were ninety-seven full-time faculty members and three part-time faculty members.

**Implications For Leadership Practices**

These findings suggest that ethnicity has an impact on the following perceptions of leadership practices for faculty members: Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. There is definite a need for diversity leadership training of department chairs to learn how to be more effective in these leadership practices. These findings could be used to enhance new faculty orientation and continuous effectiveness training of department chairs.

**Implications For Job Satisfaction**

This study determined that the overall job satisfaction various based on ethnicity of faculty members. Those faculty members that identified themselves as Asian produced a large size effect for job satisfaction when compared to other ethnic groups. Also, the subscales of job satisfaction indicated significant difference in job satisfaction based on ethnicity. There are important changes for the university in regards to pay, promotion and operational procedures that could enhance the level of job satisfaction of faculty members.

**Recommendations For Future Research**

This study focused on gathering research from a historically black university in the State of Mississippi. Future studies might expand the study to include more historically black university to gain a broader perception. The large sample populations would provide greater understanding of the perceptions of both leadership practices and job satisfaction at historically black institutions.

Another possible study is to investigate by academic disciplines at several historically black universities. Previous studies have investigated the both perceptions of leadership practices and job satisfaction a community college in the discipline of business but not at a historically black institution. This possible study could provide additional information concern the perceptions of faculty member base upon academic discipline.

A consideration for another study could be a longitude study of leadership practices and job satisfaction of faculty members over time at a historically black institution. The study could investigate new faculty members and those that have been employed with the institution for several years to determine if there is a difference in perception. This study could offer insight regarding how the organization’s culture might influence the perception of faculty members.
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