

# ACHIEVING CONGRUENT ACTIONS AND INTENTIONS: An Empirical Assessment of Faculty Work in a Regional Public University

Mary Zey-Ferrell and Delbert Ervin

.....

Two explanations of congruency of ideal (intent) and actual (action/behavior) work of faculty are examined—reward expectations and referent others. Based on interviews with 5 college deans and 32 chairpersons, a survey of 503 faculty (69% return rate), and institutional data, it was found that referent others' goals have a greater influence than reward expectations on the congruency of work actions and intentions of faculty. Peers, chairpersons, and deans affect, in differing ways, the congruency of actions and intentions of faculty. Overwhelmingly, peers have the strongest effect, followed by chairpersons and deans. Of the three reward expectations variables (perception that work leads to tenure, promotion to associate professor, and merit salary increases), only the perception that work leads to tenure affects congruency of faculty work actions and intentions.

.....

Faculty have goals or self-expectations about their work. These expectations influence the behavioral choices faculty make among task contents. If faculty are unable to achieve congruent self-expectations and actions (behavior), they experience job stress (Festinger, 1957; Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter, 1958). Gmelch, Loveich, and Wilke (1984) found that the single major source of stress for faculty in a sample of 80 institutions was being unable to reach high self-expectations. Fifty-three percent of the faculty in their national sample experienced incongruency of actual and ideal self-expectations as their most serious source of work stress. As a result of this job stress, faculty may distort inputs or outcomes; act on others in the organization to change the organization; actively change their own work, the organization, or their outcomes; change their referent other; or leave the organization (Hirschman, 1970). Several studies suggest that individuals

Mary Zey-Ferrell, Department of Sociology, Texas A&M University; Delbert Ervin, Illinois State University.

perform better in self-role-congruent situations because they experience less emotional tension and cognitive strain (Borgatta, 1961; Smelser, 1961; Bunker, 1967). Incongruency between self-goals and role behavior causes psychological conflict (Biddle and Thomas, 1966; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Sarbin and Allen, 1969).

Faculty are highly autonomous (Parsons, 1956; Kornhauser, 1962), self-actualizing (Gross, 1968), and highly responsive to their professional goals (Anderson, 1963; Clark, 1963). Thus they, more than other professionals, experience conflict due to self-role incongruency. They often feel that the administration of the university should assist them in achieving their goals by providing a setting in which they can perform their work to reach their self-expectations.

What causes faculty to achieve congruent self-expectations (intentions) and actual (behavior/actions) work? Two major influences are posited and examined as complementary explanations. These two explanations are based on extrinsic reward expectations and referent others' goals. These two sets of predictor variables originate from different sources. Reward expectations are generated by the faculty member. Thus the assumption at the basis of this model is that the faculty member is viewed as a purposive and rational human involved in work roles in order to bring about desired consequence of tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases. On the other hand, referent others' goals are generated by others in the organization in which the faculty member works. These others have control over the faculty member's work. The dean, chairperson, and peers hold expectations for the faculty member's behavior. Thus the faculty member is viewed as constrained by referent others in the organization. The rational proactive view defines faculty members as generating their actions out of their own preferences and values, to the extent that they desire to achieve the rewards of the university. The reactive view defines the faculty member as constrained by the preference and values of others in the organization (Van de Ven and Astley, 1981, p. 428; Pfeffer, 1982, p. 5).

The purpose of this study is to assess reward expectations and referent others' goals as predictors of congruency of ideal and actual work behavior. These two models will be explored to discover which of the reward expectations variables (perception that work results in tenure, in promotion, and in merit salary increases) and which of the referent other variables (departmental peers, chairpersons, or deans) has the strongest effect on faculty ideal and actual work congruency. Given that some variables from each model influence congruency of ideal and actual work, we will examine a combined effects model.

## REWARD EXPECTATIONS MODEL

According to expectancy theory, the likelihood that an individual will put

effort into work is dependent upon two components: (1) the value placed on rewards for performance of work roles, and (2) the perception that future rewards are dependent on performance of work. The first component is well documented. Faculty value not only recognition (Hagstrom, 1965; Gaston, 1978) but also the extrinsic rewards of salary, promotion, and tenure (Mitchell and Biglan, 1971). The pressures of economic scarcity and tight job markets increase the value of these rewards. Thus we assume that faculty value the extrinsic rewards of salary, promotion, and tenure. The second component of expectancy theory is the individual's perception that rewards depend on work behavior, that is, the perceived contingency between behavior and obtaining rewards (Vroom, 1964; Lawler and Porter, 1967; Graen, 1969). Perception that work results in rewards intervenes between ideal and actual work. It is anticipated that when faculty ideals for their work are congruent with their expectations that their work results in rewards, then their ideal and actual work will be congruent.

Some faculty are expected to value rewards more than others. Those faculty without tenure, promotion, and large salary increases are more likely to be involved in work which they feel will result in the achievement of these rewards. By controlling for each occupational status variable (i.e., type of appointment, length of employment, tenure, rank, and salary increases), we can assess the effects of job statuses on the relationships between perception that work results in rewards and congruency of ideal and actual work. Thus the faculty member's position in the organizational structure is expected to affect congruency of faculty ideal and actual work.

## GOALS OF REFERENT OTHERS

Expectancy theory is a dominant model for research on motivation in work, but the evidence for the validity of the theory is mixed. House and Wahba (1972) and Korman (1976) have made suggestions for improvement of this model. Of major interest is a criticism made by Korman (1976) that one of the reasons for the lower than desired predictive ability of expectancy models is their failure to account for group norms in predicting work behavior. One type of group norm is the goals set by administrators and colleagues in the university. These deans, chairpersons, and departmental peers serve as referent others for the faculty member. Goals of referent others play a major role in the work choices of faculty (Feldman, 1984).

The occupant of any given role is interdependent in role performance with others in the organization. These others constitute that person's role-set (Merton, 1957). Because of this interdependency these others come to have role expectations for the actor's appropriate behavior. In universities, peers, chairpersons, and deans communicate role expectations to the faculty member and these expectations come to constitute role constraints (Par-

sons, 1956; Abrahamson, 1967; Hill and French, 1967; Dykes, 1968). According to Kahn et al. (1964), Pfeffer and Salancik (1975), and other role theorists (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958; Korman, 1971; Merton, 1957), organizations are systems of mutual social constraints in which the activities of any occupant are determined by the demands and expectations of others in his or her role-set. Several studies examined the effects of peers and superordinates on the self-reported behavior of university employees and found work behavior affected by the expectations of role-set members (DeVries, 1975; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1975; and Miles, 1977). In decentralized organizations such as universities, departmental peers and departmental chairpersons have more influence (though not legitimate authority) than deans with regard to the day-to-day work of faculty members. Most universities are administratively organized into departmental units. These departmental units are often autonomous and given responsibilities for curricular, pedagogical, and personnel decisions. Common norms and standards about research, scholarship, and teaching are control mechanisms. For faculty members, departmental units become the primary center of commitment in the university. "The consequence for the faculty member is one of turning inward, learning the rules of the departmental game, and then structuring his or her professional life in accordance with these rules" (Aiken, 1981). Commitment to the work valued by the university is a necessity for faculty who wish to be rewarded. The department is the arena in which peers review and make decisions about how individual faculty members will be rewarded with tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases.

We expect departmental peers to have the strongest influence on faculty ideal and actual role congruency (Parsons, 1956; Gouldner, 1957, 1958; Clark, 1963; Cottrell and Sheldon, 1966). Referent others, whom we expect to have the second strongest influence on faculty members, are chairpersons, who, in many cases, represent not only collegial relationships with the faculty members, but also represent the formal organization in which they are employed. Chairpersons convey to faculty members the formalized expectations for acceptable role behavior of departmental members. Caplow and McGee (1958), Dykes (1968), and others suggest that faculty confer with their departmental chairpersons (heads) about administrative decisions as well as career decisions. Chairpersons have unique abilities to extract compliance not only through referent power but also through coercion, reward, and competency-based power (French and Raven, 1959; Bacharach and Lawler, 1980).

Deans are a decidedly different kind of colleague in that the power relationship between the college dean and college faculty is more likely to be based on authority as opposed to influence. Although this power is of a different nature, the dean is a major authority position and can extract

compliance (Kahn et al., 1964; Miles, 1977). The social distance between the reciprocal roles of the dean and their faculty is great, crossing departmental boundaries. The power relationships are weaker, unidimensional, and sporadic. The college dean has less direct influence on the behavior of faculty, and, therefore, is not expected to affect faculty work as much as departmental peers and the departmental chairperson.

## RATIONALE AND METHODS

The expectation that work will result in rewards and the goals of referent others are of importance to the development of faculty work congruency. This analysis first determines to what extent these influences are congruent or incongruent with faculty self-expectations (ideal) and then determines whether actual work follows the ideals held by faculty members or conforms to the predictors of reward expectations and referent others' goals. If actual work follows the dictates of the predictor, then as the predictor moves away from the ideal, the faculty member is compelled by these predictors to be involved in work which is inconsistent with his or her self-expectations (ideals). Two questions will be addressed. (1) Which of the two types of predictor variables best explains why faculty are able or unable to attain their work self-expectations (ideals)? (2) Within each of the models, which of the reward expectancy variables and which of the referent other variables explains why faculty do or do not attain their work self-expectations (ideals)?

In order to answer these questions we compute the odds (ratio) of congruent to incongruent ideal and actual work. The odds range from 0 to  $\infty$ . The higher (closer to  $\infty$ ) the odds, the more congruent the ideal and the actual. Odds are also computed for each of the independent variables, that is, the congruent and incongruent frequencies of the ideal workstyle and each of (1) the expectations that the work results in rewards and (2) goals of referent other variables. When the ideal is congruent with a given predictor and the predictor is congruent with the actual, faculty members will realize their ideal self-expectations. The effect of the predictor will be positive. On the other hand, if both the predictor and the actual work deviate from the ideal, the greater the common deviation from the ideal, the greater the negative effect of the predictor on actual work. Faculty members will not realize their ideals.

## Hypotheses

### *Hypothesis I: Assessing the Reward Expectations*

In comparing the reward expectations variables while controlling for oc-

cupational statuses, the job security variable of perception that work leads to tenure is expected to have the greatest effect on the congruency of ideal and actual work. That is, as perception that work leads to tenure increases in congruency with ideal work, the odds increase that ideal work will be congruent with actual work. Conversely, as perception that work leads to tenure decreases in congruency with ideal work, the odds decrease that actual work will be congruent with ideal. Expectations that work leads to promotion and merit salary increase are also expected to affect positively the relationship between ideal and actual work.

### *Hypothesis II: Assessing the Goals of Referent Others*

In comparing the goals of referent other variables, the greater the proximity and power of others with regard to the faculty member, the greater the effect of others on the congruency of ideal and actual work. Therefore, peers' work and peers' perceptions of the appropriate work for the department are expected to have the greatest effects on the congruency/incongruency of faculty ideal and actual work, with the chairperson's perception of the work appropriate for the department having a lesser effect, and the dean's perception of the work appropriate for the college having the least effect. Congruency of faculty ideal work and others' goals and action is expected to increase the odds that the faculty member's ideal and actual work will be congruent. Conversely, as the others' perceptions and actions decrease in congruency with the faculty member's ideal, the odds decrease that the faculty member's actual work will be congruent with his or her ideal.

### **Faculty Workstyles**

The three major roles of faculty as defined by Harmon (1965) and analyzed by Zuckerman and Merton (1971) are teaching, research, and service. Dornbush and Scott (1975, p. 103) analyzed roles of one hundred university professors and defined them into the three categories of teaching, research, and service. As Long and McGinnis (1981) pointed out, most academicians spend some time in each of these roles.

Personal and professional goals are expressed through varying degrees of commitment to and time invested in these three roles. Some faculty devote all their energies to teaching while their research is intended to satisfy only minimal requirements of academic responsibility. Other faculty may consider teaching a secondary commitment which must not be allowed to interfere with their research work. Service is perceived by some as peripheral drudge work while others view it as centrally important to their careers. Varying degrees of commitment to teaching, research, and service result in a

wide array of role orientations (workstyles). This diversity is depicted in Table 1.

Eight distinct workstyles are identified by amplifying and diminishing each of the three work roles. Roles that are diminished are in lower case letters. This systematic division does not mean that lower case roles imply inadequate performance or that capitalized roles imply work performed with distinction. It simply means that faculty emphasize certain roles through value preferences and time priorities in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The eight categories are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. They constitute a theoretical universe of diverse academic workstyles found in departments.

This typology is the principal scheme used to operationalize variables in faculty questionnaires, administrative interviews, and the discussion of empirical findings. The workstyles served as choices for operationalizing the actual and ideal components of the dependent variables, goals of referent others, and faculty perceptions of rewarded work.

### Setting

The data for this analysis were collected in a large midwestern regional public university of nearly 20,000 students. Like many regional public universities, this institution made the transition from a state teachers' college to a comprehensive university in the 1960s. But the transformation, coming late in the national growth of higher education, has been ambiguous. The mission and goals of the university, as defined in the Master Plan of the Board of Higher Education, have changed several times during the past two decades. Early goals to become a major university have been scaled down, though hardly abandoned. The university presently emphasizes teaching, yet holds to claims of research and service. These goals and the realities of a limited and declining budget are in contradiction. Many faculty, especially those hired in the late 1960s and early 1970s, are caught in the cross pressures between socialized expectation for creative research and quality teaching, and finding the necessary support for these interests in a system with diminishing resources. Unstable and ill-defined missions and goals, unevenly developed programs and departments, decentralized and divergent standards of faculty evaluation, and declining support for research and quality education have contributed to role ambiguity, confusion, and conflict for many faculty.

### Data Collecting and Sampling

Data for this analysis were collected from four organizational sources by several methods: all five academic deans and thirty-two chairpersons were

**TABLE 1. Academic Workstyles and the Tasks (Roles) of Teaching, Research, and Service**

Eight distinct workstyles are constructed by amplifying or diminishing each of the three key roles of teaching, research, and service.

Workstyles	Work Roles Amplified or Diminished	Description
(TrS)	TEACHING-research-service	Teaching is prime commitment; research and service are of less importance. (Types Trs, tRS, and trS are instances of <i>single</i> role emphasis.)
(tRS)	teaching-RESEARCH-service	Research is prime commitment; teaching and service are of less importance.
(trS)	teaching-research-SERVICE	Research is a prime commitment; teaching and research are less important.
(TRs)	TEACHING-RESEARCH-service	Both teaching and research are prime commitment and have equal importance; service is of less importance. (Types TRs, TrS, and tRS are instances of <i>dual</i> role emphasis.)
(TrS)	TEACHING-research-SERVICE	Both teaching and service are prime commitment and have equal importance; research is of less importance.
(tRS)	teaching-RESEARCH-SERVICE	Both research and service are prime commitment and have equal importance; teaching is of less importance. (Type TRS is an instance of <i>triple</i> role emphasis.)
(TRS)	TEACHING-RESEARCH-SERVICE	Extensive commitment in all three areas. (Type trs is an instance of <i>triple</i> role deemphasis.)
(trs)	teaching-research-service	Minimal commitment in all three areas.



interviewed, faculty members were surveyed by questionnaire, and institutional data files were accessed. In the summer of 1980, the college deans and chairpersons were interviewed to attain their perceptions of the appropriate workstyles for their colleges and departments, respectively. Operational definitions are found in Appendix A.

In the fall of 1980 a two-page questionnaire was mailed through the intracampus mail to all faculty who were more than 50% FTE (full-time equivalent) during the previous spring semester. This survey of faculty yielded a 69% return rate ( $N = 503$ ). Faculty members were asked about their ideal workstyles, their actual workstyles,<sup>1</sup> the workstyles encouraged by their chairpersons, the workstyles appropriate for their departments, the workstyles rewarded by exceptional merit pay increases, the workstyles rewarded by tenure, the workstyles rewarded by rank, and the number of hours spent weekly in the three faculty roles of teaching, research, and service (see Zey-Ferrell and Baker, 1984, for preliminary description of some of these findings). Also in the fall of 1980, institutional data on the personal and occupational characteristics of the faculty who participated in the survey were gathered from the university files. Among these data were tenure status, rank, and salary increases over the past four years. Operational definitions are found in Appendix A.

These institutional data plus data on other personal characteristics such as age, sex, race, marital status, ethnicity, and departmental affiliation were used to establish that the faculty sample is representative of the university population on all characteristics except proportion of temporary faculty. All part-time faculty hold temporary appointments and faculty holding appointments of 50% or less FTE were eliminated from the sample. Thus temporary faculty are underrepresented in the sample.

### Analysis Technique

Our objective is to determine the effects of discrete independent variables on a dichotomous dependent variable: congruency versus incongruency of ideal and actual workstyles. The problem is ideally suited for log-linear analysis as developed by Goodman (1970, 1971, 1972, 1979) and explained by Davis (1974), Knoke and Burke (1980), Reynolds (1977), and Fienberg (1977). As is ordinarily the case when one of the variables is taken as dependent on the others, we have fitted the marginal table for the independent variables in each model. Having reduced the number of potential models by designating a dependent variable, we fitted all relevant models to the data. The models presented in Table 2 are those with a satisfactory fit. The most parsimonious<sup>2</sup> log-linear models within each theoretical model are indicated. The collapsed models were derived from the full models according to the methods discussed by Allison (1980).

TABLE 2. Log-Linear Constraints Models

Model	$G^2$	$df$	$P$	
A. Goals of referent others models				
{ECDFPQ} {ID} {IP}	61.02	61	.475	
{ECDFPQ} {IC} {ID} {IP}	53.25	60	>.5	<i>a</i>
{ECDFPQ} {IDP}	60.92	60	.443	
{ECDFPQ} {ICP} {ID}	53.15	59	>.5	
{ECDFPQ} {IDP} {IC}	53.13	59	>.5	
Collapsed models				
{CDP} {ID}{IP}	8.93	5	.112	
{CDP} {IC}{ID}{IP}	1.09	4	>.5	<i>a</i>
B. Reward expectations models				
{MTA} {IT}	9.94	6	.127	<i>a</i>
C. Controlled for tenure, rank merit salary increase, type of appointment, length of employment (collapsed)				
{TL} {TL} {IT}	1.45	1	>.5	<i>a</i>
D. Combined model				
{CDPT} {IP} {ID} {IC} {IT}	15.94	11	.114	<i>a</i>

*Legend:* The model parameters represent the dichotomy, incongruency/congruency between the faculty ideal workstyle and the following:

Dependent variable

I Faculty actual workstyle

Goals of referent others variables:

E Faculty's perception of workstyle encouraged by chairperson

C Chairperson's perception of appropriate workstyle for department

D Dean's perception of appropriate workstyle for college

F Faculty member's perception of appropriate workstyle for department

P Peers' actual workstyle

Q Peers' perception of appropriate workstyle for department

Reward expectations variables:

M Perception of workstyle leading to merit salary increase

T Perception of workstyle leading to tenure

A Perception of workstyle leading to promotion

Occupational status variables:

R Academic rank (instructor, asst. prof., assoc., professor)

S Tenure status (untenued/tenured)

O Type of appointment (temporary/tenure tract)

B Merit salary increase ( $\leq 8\%$ , 8.01-11.99%,  $\geq 12\%$ )

(Note: 8% represents the average increase)

L Length of employment

**TABLE 1. (Continued)**


---

*Note:* Our exploration of the effect of occupational status variables consisted of fitting the marginal table for all occupational variables {RSOBL} and each reward structure variable. We concluded that the model {TRSOBL} {IL} {IT} was the preferred model. We present above the collapsed version {TL} {IL} {IT}.

<sup>a</sup>The most parsimonious models.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Reward Expectations Model

Of the three reward variables (perception that workstyle results in tenure, promotion, and merit salary increase), only perception that workstyle results in tenure (T in Tables 2–5), was associated with congruency of ideal and actual workstyle of faculty. See Table 3 for these findings. As the ideal moves into congruency with perception that workstyle results in tenure, the ideal becomes incongruent with the actual. The odds ratio is .41. Faculty do not realize either the workstyle they think results in tenure or their ideal, which in this case are one and the same. In partialling out the effects, it was found that the majority of these faculty members ideally expected to be teacher-researchers (TRs) and thought this same workstyle would result in tenure. Overwhelmingly, these faculty are actually teachers (Trs). Smaller portions of the faculty who ideally expected to be teacher-researchers were teacher-service (TrS) and teacher-researcher-service (TRS) in workstyle.<sup>3</sup> Thus faculty who have taken on more teaching obligations due to pressures for efficiency do so with the perception that they will not be granted tenure in this university for the work which they are compelled to do. The interaction effects of these independent variables do not add significantly to the main effects model.

It was anticipated that current occupational statuses of faculty members would affect the relationship between the reward expectation variables and congruency of ideal and actual workstyle. Specifically, it was expected that tenure status (S in Tables 2–5) would have a major effect on the relationship between the independent and dependent variable. Although tenure status does have a significant effect, length of employment (L in Tables 2–5) is a superior predictor. The odds ratio is 2.30. Tenure status and length of time in the university are highly intercorrelated. As a result of examining several categorizations<sup>4</sup> of the variable length of employment within the university, it was found that faculty who are in their thirteenth year of employment or less exhibited incongruent ideal and actual workstyles. Upon further examination, it was found that the subsample of incongruent faculty consisted disproportionately of those who expected to be teacher-researchers (TRs)

**TABLE 3. Fitted Frequencies for the Reward Expectations Model with Occupational Statuses Controlled**

		{LT} {IT} {IL} <sup>a</sup>		
		I		
L	T	Congruent	Incongruent	Odds
14+	Con	9.80	12.20	.80
14+	Inc	73.20	37.80	1.94
0-13	Con	23.20	66.80	.35
0-13	Inc	127.80	152.20	.84

Odds ratios:  $T_{con}/T_{inc} = .41$ ;  $L_{14+}/L_{0-13} = 2.30$ .

<sup>a</sup>See Table 2 for definitions of variables.

and teacher-researcher-service (TRS) and were actually teachers (Trs) and teacher-service (TrS).

#### Goals of Referent Others Model

In examining the referent other model using log-linear analysis, we find that of the six variables, three affect the congruency ratio of ideal and actual workstyles: (1) peer's actual workstyles as self-reported (P in Tables 2-5); (2) chairperson's perception of the appropriate workstyle for the department (C in Tables 2-5); and (3) dean's perception of the appropriate workstyle for the college (D in Tables 2-5). See Table 4 for these findings.

By far, the peers referent variable has the greatest effect of any of the referent other variables on the congruency/incongruency of the ideal and actual workstyle of faculty. The effect of peers is such that congruency of ideal workstyle with peers' actual workstyle increases the odds that the faculty member's actual is congruent with the ideal. That is, as the ideal moves into congruency with the peers' actual workstyle, the incongruency of the ideal and actual decreases. The odds ratio is 4.72; that is, the odds increase 4.72 times as we move from incongruency to congruency of the independent variable. This relationship and its direction are consistent with our hypothesis. Stated another way, faculty are 4.72 times more congruent with their ideal when their peers' workstyles are congruent with the faculty member's ideal.

Chairperson's perception of appropriate workstyle for their department has the second greatest effect. Surprisingly, as the faculty ideal moves into congruency with the workstyles the chairperson perceives as appropriate for the department, the ideal workstyle moves out of incongruency with the actual workstyle of the faculty. That is, as the independent variable moves into congruency, the odds increase that the dependent variable is incongru-

**TABLE 4. Fitted Frequencies for the Goals of Referent Others Model**  
**{CDP} {IC} {IP}<sup>a</sup>**

P	C	D	I		Odds
			Congruent	Incongruent	
Con	Con	Con	30.91	33.10	.93
Con	Con	Inc	8.19	2.80	2.93
Con	Inc	Con	29.89	17.11	1.75
Con	Inc	Inc	60.01	10.99	5.46
Inc	Con	Con	19.51	97.49	.20
Inc	Con	Inc	10.39	16.61	.63
Inc	Inc	Con	14.70	39.30	.37
Inc	Inc	Inc	60.40	51.60	1.17

Odds ratios:  $P_{Inc}/P_{Con} = 4.72$ ;  $C_{Inc}/C_{Con} = .53$ ;  $D_{Inc}/D_{Con} = .33$ .

<sup>a</sup>See Table 2 for definitions of variables.

ent. The odds ratio is .53. This finding does not support the direction of our hypothesis. The actual workstyles of faculty are .53 times more incongruent with their ideal when their chairperson's perceptions of the appropriate work for their department is congruent with their ideal.

The effect of chairpersons can be explained as follows: The chairperson is supporting the workstyle which faculty members would ideally like to attain, but the faculty members have some factor blocking this attainment. By partialling out the effects in this subsample, we find that major portions of these faculty expect to be teacher-researchers (TRs) but are actually teachers (Trs), teacher-service (TrS), and teacher-researcher-service (TRS). Some of these faculty spend more of their time teaching than they would ideally like. Others spend more time in teaching and service work than they would ideally like. The interview data overwhelmingly demonstrate that faculty feel they have been forced to spend more time in teaching, minor administrative activities, and other service.

The effect of the dean's perception of the appropriate workstyle for the college is essentially the same, though slightly weaker than the effect of the chairperson's perception. That is, as the ideal moves into congruency with the workstyle which the dean perceives is appropriate for the college, the odds increase that the faculty member will realize a workstyle which is incongruent with his or her ideal. The odds ratio is .33. The actual workstyles of faculty are .33 times more incongruent with their dean's perception of the appropriate work for the college than their workstyles are congruent with their ideals.

The effect of dean's perception is explained in the same way as the effect of chairperson's perception. The deans are supporting the workstyle which

faculty members would ideally like to attain, but again faculty members have other factors blocking this attainment. By partialling out the effects in this subsample, we found the same patterns as above. The faculty ideal was largely teacher-researcher (TRs), but the faculty members were involved largely in teaching (Trs) with smaller portions in teacher-service (TrS) and teacher-researcher-service (TRS). Again, although faculty would like to be involved in research and writing, they are unable to do this work they feel is important due to heavy teaching loads and administrative work.

In addition to defining the goals of referent other variables which affect the congruency/incongruency ratio, we also defined the strength of these effects. It was found that departmental peers have the greatest effect on faculty members, and chairpersons have the second greatest effect, followed by deans. This substantiates the hypothesis that the department is the faculty work unit and that peers who work in this unit, followed by chairpersons, have the greatest effect on faculty ideal and work behavior congruency. Interaction between the independent variables did not improve the main effects model.

### Combined Effects Model

The combined effects model is unusually clean and consistent with the findings from the earlier referent others' goals and reward models. All four of the constraint variables defined as significant by the earlier models stay in the combined effects model. No other variable or interaction effect contributed significantly to the main effects model. See Table 5 for these findings. The four variables which make up the combined effects model in the order of decreasing magnitude of their effects are: (1) peers' actual workstyles (P), (2) perception that workstyle leads to tenure (T), (3) chairperson's goal of appropriate workstyle for the department (C), and (4) dean's goal of the appropriate workstyle for the college (D). The odds ratios are comparable to those for each of the same four variables in models I and II, and the directions are the same. That is, congruency of peers' actual workstyle and faculty member's ideal increases the odds of congruency of faculty members' ideal and actual, while for each of the other three variables (congruency of the faculty members' ideal workstyles with perception that workstyle leads to tenure, chairperson's goal of the appropriate workstyle for the department, and dean's goal of the appropriate workstyle for the college), the odds increase that the faculty member's actual workstyle is incongruent with his or her ideal workstyle.

### CONCLUSIONS

After determining that over 55% of the faculty did not evidence congru-

**TABLE 5. Fitted Values for the Combined Model**  
 {TCDP} {IT} {IC} {ID} {IP}<sup>a</sup>

T	P	C	D	I		Odds
				Congruent	Incongruent	
Con	Con	Con	Con	7.30	11.70	.62
Con	Con	Con	Inc	.66	.34	1.94
Con	Con	Inc	Con	1.58	1.42	1.11
Con	Con	Inc	Inc	2.32	.68	3.41
Con	Inc	Con	Con	4.59	32.41	.14
Con	Inc	Con	Inc	2.43	5.57	.43
Con	Inc	Inc	Con	3.22	12.78	.25
Con	Inc	Inc	Inc	10.91	14.09	.77
Inc	Con	Con	Con	23.01	21.99	1.05
Inc	Con	Con	Inc	7.63	2.37	3.22
Inc	Con	Inc	Con	28.63	15.37	1.86
Inc	Con	Inc	Inc	57.88	10.12	5.72
Inc	Inc	Con	Con	15.37	64.63	.24
Inc	Inc	Con	Inc	8.02	10.98	.73
Inc	Inc	Inc	Con	11.30	26.70	.42
Inc	Inc	Inc	Inc	49.16	37.84	1.30

Odds ratios:  $P_{\text{Con}}/P_{\text{Inc}} = 4.38$ ;  $D_{\text{Con}}/D_{\text{Inc}} = .32$ ;  $C_{\text{Con}}/C_{\text{Inc}} = .56$ ;  $T_{\text{Con}}/T_{\text{Inc}} = .60$ .

<sup>a</sup>See Table 2 for definitions of variables.

ent ideal and actual workstyles, our major purpose was to assess two models and a combined effects model for explaining congruent/incongruent ideal and actual workstyles. It was found that the goals of referent others had the greatest effects on the congruency of faculty actual and ideal workstyles. Thus resocialization and feedback from others in the organization have greater effects on workstyle congruency and incongruency of faculty than do reward expectations. In this way faculty are similar to other professionals in client-serving organizations (Hage, 1974, 1980).

Among the goals of referent other variables, peers', chairperson's, and dean's congruency with faculty ideal affect the congruency of faculty ideal and actual workstyles. Overwhelmingly, peers are most important in determining faculty workstyles. This finding is consistent with the writings of Parsons (1956), Gouldner (1957, 1958), Clark (1963), and Cottrell and Sheldon (1966). Our results support both the findings of Miles (1977) and Thompson (1960) that those who are located in greater proximity have greater influence and also the thesis of Parsons (1956), Clark (1963), and Aiken (1981) that those with the greatest power over the outcomes of work activities of faculty have the greatest effect. Departmental faculty colleagues have power over the strategic decisions which influence the allocation of resources, the implementation of organizational rewards, and the

leveling of negative sanctions against members who do not conform in their professional work behavior. Consequently, faculty are more likely to realize their ideal workstyle when their peers are involved in the same workstyle which they hold as their ideal.

It is important to note that peers' normative values of the workstyle they *perceive* is appropriate for their department is not related to the congruency faculty ideal and actual workstyles; rather department peers' *actual* workstyles had an effect on the ratio of congruent to incongruent ideal and actual workstyles. This demonstrates that faculty are influenced by what their peers do rather than the values or normative expectations their peers hold (Deutscher, 1973). Faculty perceive that they will be judged and formally evaluated on the same set of standards that their departmental peers are judged. If their peers can be tenured and promoted with little or no research or publishing, they are likely to have a congruent ideal and actual workstyle which places little emphasis on research and publishing. On the other hand, if their peers are highly involved in such activities, they are more likely to perceive they too must be researchers and must publish.

Chairpersons' goals for their department have significant effects on the congruency of faculty ideal and actual workstyles. Chairpersons are the negotiators of faculty work, a process in which faculty exchange their work for physical and human resources necessary to them in producing their work, gaining recognition, and obtaining organizational rewards. Chairpersons can ultimately affect the productivity of their faculty by assigning to faculty work which does not correspond with faculty ideals. Some of the faculty who hold incongruent ideal and actual workstyles feel their chairpersons effectively inhibit their ability to attain their ideal workstyle through assigning committee work, academic governance activities, advising, or extra courses which overload them and hamper their achievement in areas of high quality teaching and research. Thus the effect of the chairperson's influence is that of increasing incongruency between faculty ideal and actual workstyles. This occurs as a result of chairpersons holding one goal of the appropriate workstyle of the faculty, which is congruent with the ideal workstyle of many faculty members, but then asking faculty to take on the maintenance work of the department which prevents faculty members from spending time in the roles in which they both feel the faculty member should be involved. As the number of administrators, support staff, and technical/clerical personnel who perform work related to the maintenance goals of the university decreases due to economic scarcity, it is anticipated that the proportion of faculty with incongruent ideal and actual workstyles will increase. Economic scarcity increases the need for efficiency, which translates for faculty into a larger number of courses and increases in class



size. Time for these activities competes with time for research and quality teaching.

The dean's goals of the appropriate workstyle for their college, when congruent with faculty members' ideal workstyle, has an effect similar to that of chairperson. Due to the dean's greater structural distance from faculty members and limited direct influence on work activities of faculty, this relationship is significant but not as strong as that of peers or chairpersons.

In the interviews, faculty mentioned that some deans and chairpersons are contradictory in their actions and their verbal standards for faculty work. In the daily operation of departments and colleges, chairpersons and deans continually ask faculty to be "good citizens" and take on increasing portions of the university's maintenance activities; but during the evaluation period, the definition of what is appropriate for faculty in these work units is based on the quality and quantity of their teaching and research. Thus faculty often perceive that chairpersons and deans give verbal support for the work that they hold as ideal, but they cannot supply the necessary resource of time for the labor-intense activities of high quality research and teaching.

We found some support for Warren's thesis (1969) that professionals are influenced by the expectations of formal rewards and sanctions. Congruency of faculty ideal and actual workstyles was not affected by faculty perception that the workstyle would result in promotion to associate professor or by perception that the workstyle would result in a merit pay increase. Job security, the ultimate formal sanction, was the only reward expectation variable which had an effect on congruency/incongruency of ideal and actual workstyles.

The two models for explaining congruency of ideal and actual workstyles of faculty are complementary explanations. Although the reward expectancy model originates from within the faculty member as a result of the formal sanctions of the university, and the goals of referent others originate within the organization, both variables are heavily influenced by the economic scarcity of the environment within the university and thus create not only uncertainty but contradictions for the faculty who work in the university. Given the overwhelming incongruency of ideal and actual workstyles of faculty and the lack of support for faculty ideals among administrators, it is not surprising that many competent faculty have left the university to take positions in other universities or economic sectors. Hirschman (1970) labels this *exit* behavior. Others have stayed in the system but have voiced their opposition by a unionization. This Hirschman labels *voice*. Those who remain are not in large numbers loyal, as Hirschman would have us believe.

Some certainly are loyal, but many are trapped by the lack of demand for their specializations and competencies in the present job market.

*Acknowledgments.* The senior author (M.Z.-F.) gratefully acknowledges the programming assistance of Barbara Thomas; the continued support of John Sharpham through the Faculty and Instructional Development Center; Charles A. White, in conjunction with the University Indirect Cost Funds and the 1981-82 Faculty Research Grant, No. 01-720-2010; and Edward Streeter, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Special gratitude is expressed to Paul Baker for his assistance in interviewing chairpersons and deans. The senior author also gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Marjorie Coppock, Alex McIntosh, and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful suggestions.

## NOTES

1. Actual workstyle is self-reported. To validate that self-reported actual workstyle is consistent with actual behavior, we ran correlations between reported workstyle and self-reported time spent in each of the major roles of teaching, research, and service. We found high correlations (from .79 to .86) between reported dominant role and service spent in these roles.
2. The parsimonious model acceptable in absolute terms is superior to simpler models, and cannot be significantly improved upon by more complex models.
3. Tables containing the proportions of the sample choosing each of the independent and dependent variable response categories can be obtained by writing the senior author.
4. The length of employment with the university was categorized in 3- and 4-year intervals to determine the effects of greater refinement of categories. The dichotomous division of 13 years or less and 14 years or more contributed more to the model than either of the other two categorizations.

## REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, M. (1967). *The Professional in the Organization*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Aiken, M. (1981). Crossing the boundaries and building the bridges: linking sociology to the social sciences. *The Sociological Quarterly* 22: 447-452.
- Allison, P. D. (1980). Analyzing collapsed contingency tables. *American Sociological Review* 48: 123-130.
- Anderson, G. L. (1963). The organizational character of American colleges and universities. In Lunsford, *The Study of Academic Administration*, pp. 1-19.
- Bacharach, S. B., and Lawler, E. J. (1980). *Power and Politics in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Biddle, B. J. and Thomas, E. J. (1966). *Role Theory: Concepts and Research*. New York: Wiley.
- Borgatta, E. F. (1961). Role-playing specification, personality and performance. *Sociometry* 24: 218-233.

- Bunker, G. (1967). Self-role congruence and status congruence as interacting variables in dyadic behavior. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Campbell, John P., and Pritchard, R. D. (1976). Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, pp. 63-130. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publ. Co.
- Caplow, T., and McGee, R. T. (1958). *The Academic Marketplace*. New York: Basic Books.
- Clark, B. R. (1963). Faculty organization and authority. In Lunsford, *The Study of Academic Administration*, pp. 37-51.
- Cottrell, L. S., Jr. and Sheldon, E. B. (1966). Relationship expectations. In H. M. Vollmer and D. L. Mills (eds.), *Professionalization*, pp. 228-236. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Davis, J. A. (1974). Hierarchical models for significance tests in multivariate contingency tables: an exegesis Goodman's recent papers. In H. L. Costner (ed.), *Sociological Methodology 1973-1974*, pp. 189-231. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deutscher, I. (1973). *What We Say/What We Do: Sentiments and Acts*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
- DeVries, D. L. (1975). The relationship of role expectations to faculty behavior. *Research in Higher Education* 3: 11-29.
- Dornbush, S. M., and Scott, W. R., with the assistance of B. C. Bushing and J. D. Laing (1975). *Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dykes, A. R. (1968). *Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Feldman, D. C. (1984). The development and enforcement of group norm. *Academy of Management Review* 9: 47-53.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., and Schachter, S. (1958). When prophecy fails. In E. E. Macoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, pp. 156-163. New York: Henry Holt.
- Fienberg, S. E. (1977). *The Analysis of Cross Classified Data*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- French, J. R., and Raven, B. (1959). *The Bases of Social Power*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research.
- Gaston, J. (1978). *Reward Systems in British and American Science*. New York: Wiley.
- Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., and Wilke, P. K. (1984). Sources of stress in academe: a national perspective. *Research in Higher Education* 20(4): 477-490.
- Goodman, L. A. (1970). The multivariate analysis of qualitative data: interactions among multiple classifications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 65: 226-256.
- Goodman, L. A. (1971). The analysis of multi-dimensional contingency tables: stepwise procedures and direct estimation methods for building models for multiple classifications. *Technometrics* 13: 33-61.

- Goodman, L. A. (1972). A general model for the analysis of surveys. *American Journal of Sociology* 77: 1035-1086.
- Goodman, L. A. (1979). A brief guide to the causal analysis of data from surveys. *American Journal of Sociology* 84: 1078-1095.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles—I. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 281-306.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles—II. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 444-480.
- Graen, G. (1969). Instrumentality theory of work motivation: some experimental results and suggested modifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph* 53: 1-25.
- Gross, E. (1968). Universities as organizations: a research approach. *American Sociological Review* 33: 518-544.
- Gross, N. C., Mason, W. S., and McEachern, A. W. (1975). *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency*. New York: Wiley.
- Hage, J. (1974). *Communication and Organization Control: Cybernetics in Health and Welfare Settings*. New York: Wiley.
- Hage, J. (1980). *Theories of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hagstrom, W. O. (1965). *The Scientific Community*. New York: Basic Books.
- Harmon, L. R. (1965). *Profiles of Ph.D.s in the Sciences*. Washington: National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.
- Hill, W. and French, W. (1967). Perceptions of the power of departmental chairmen by professors. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 11: 548-574.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and the State*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- House, R. J., and Wahba, N. A. (1972). Expectancy theory in industrial and organizational psychology. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meetings, Honolulu.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., and Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Katz, D. A., and Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Knoke, D., and Burke, P. J. (1980). *Log-Linear Models*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Korman, A. K. (1971). Expectancies as determinants of performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 55: 218-222.
- Korman, A. K. (1976). Hypothesis of work behavior revisited as an extension. *Academy of Management Review* 1: 50-63.
- Kornhauser, W. (1962). *Scientists in Industry*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Lawler, E. E. III (1973). *Motivation in Work Organizations*. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.
- Lawler, E. E., III, and Porter L. (1967). Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 2: 122-142.

- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 3: 157-189.
- Locke, E. A., Cartledge, N., and Kneer, C. S. (1970). Studies of the relationship between satisfaction, goal-setting, and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 5: 135-158.
- Long, J. S., and McGinnis, R. (1981). The effects of the mentor on academic career: working paper. Washington State University.
- Lundsford, T. F., ed. (1963). *The Study of Academic Administration*. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.
- Merton, R. (1957). The role-set: problems in sociological theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, VIII: 1-23.
- Miles, R. H. (1977). Role-set configuration as a predictor of role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Sociometry* 40: 21-34.
- Mitchell, T. R., and Biglan, A. (1971). Instrumentality theories: current uses in psychology. *Psychological Bulletin* 76: 432-454.
- Parsons, T. (1956). Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations, II. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1: 225-239.
- Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and Organization Theory*. Boston: Pitman.
- Pfeffer, J., and Salancik, G. R. (1975). Determinants of supervisory behavior: a role-set analysis. *Human Relations* 28: 139-154.
- Pfeffer, J. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Reynolds, H. T. (1977). *Analysis of Nominal Data*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Sarbin, T. R., and Allen, V. L. (1969). Role theory. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, pp. 488-567. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Smelser, W. T. (1961). Dominance as a factor in achievement and perception in cooperative problem solving interactions. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 62: 535-542.
- Van de Ven, A. H., and Astley, W. G. Mapping the field to create a dynamic perspective on organization design and behavior. In A. H. Van de Ven and W. F. Joyce (eds.), *Perspectives on Organization Design and Behavior*, pp. 427-468. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Vroom, V. H. (1965). *Motivation in Management*. New York: American Foundation for Management Research.
- Warren, D. I. (1969). The effects of power bases and peer groups on conformity in formal organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 14: 544-557.
- Zey-Ferrell, M., and Baker, P. J. (1984). Faculty work in a regional public university: an empirical assessment of goal consensus and congruency of actions and intentions. *Research in Higher Education* 20(4): 399-426.
- Zuckerman, H., and Merton, R. K. (1971). Patterns of evaluation in science: Institutionalization, structure and functions of the referee system. *Minerva* 9: 66-100.

## APPENDIX: OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

### Components of the Dependent Variable

*Ideal Workstyle.* The faculty member was asked to choose the workstyle in which he or she would ideally like to spend time – the workstyle believed to best express his or her own professional identity. Each of the respondents chose one of the eight workstyles from the typology.

*Actual Workstyle.* The faculty member was asked to choose the workstyle which represented how he or she actually spends work time. Each respondent chose one of the eight workstyles from the typology.

The congruency and incongruency of actual and ideal are the two categories of the dependent variable. The dependent variable is designated I.

### Components of the Independent Variables

#### *Reward Expectancy Variables*

##### **Occupational Status Variables**

1. Type of appointment (O). A dichotomous variable: continuing appointment (regular employment) or a temporary appointment.
2. Length of employment with the university (L). This variable does not include years worked at other institutions of higher education and is, therefore, an indicator of the effects of time spent in the organizational context being analyzed. A dichotomous variable: 1 to 13 years or 14 years and over.
3. Tenure status (S). A dichotomous variable: tenured or not tenured.
4. Rank (R). A discrete categorical variable: full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor or less.
5. Merit salary increases (B). A trichotomous variable: those receiving less than the average 8% raise for the past three years, those receiving 8–12%, and those receiving 12% or more (which is substantially more than the average raise).

##### **Designation of Workstyles Which Result in Reward Variables**

1. Tenure (T). Faculty members were asked to designate the workstyle which would most likely result in tenure in their department.
2. Promotion (A). Faculty members were asked to designate the workstyle which would most likely result in promotion to associate professor in their department.
3. Merit salary increase (M). Faculty members were asked to designate the workstyle which would most likely result in merit salary increase in their department.

##### **Social Context Variables**

1. Peers' perception of appropriate workstyle for the dependent (Q). The faculty member was asked to designate the workstyle most fitting and appropriate to the

needs of his or her department (discipline). That is, which workstyle was most appropriate for the academic mission and goals for his or her department (discipline)? These perceptions were aggregated by department excluding the perception of the respondent. The workstyle which received the plurality of support was designated as peers' perception of the appropriate workstyle for the department for that respondent.

2. Peers' Actual Workstyle (P). This variable was constructed by aggregating, on a departmental basis, the actual workstyle (role behavior) of faculty, excluding that of the respondent, thus yielding a measure of departmental peers' actual workstyle. The workstyle which received the plurality of support was designated as peers' actual workstyle for that respondent. In no department was there a consensus or a near consensus of peers' perception on this variable.

3. Chairperson's Perception of Appropriate Workstyle for Department (C). Chairpersons were asked to designate the workstyle which was most appropriate to meet the academic mission and goals of the department. Clarification was added by stressing that the question was normative and not empirical. Each chairperson chose from the eight workstyles in the typology.

4. Faculty Member's Perception of Workstyle Encouraged by Chairperson (E). Respondents were asked to designate the workstyle which their departmental chairpersons promoted or encouraged for them. Each respondent chose one workstyle from the typology.

5. Dean's Perception of Appropriate Workstyle for the College (D). Deans were asked to designate the workstyle which was most fitting and appropriate to the needs of their college, that is, the workstyle which was most appropriate to meet the academic missions and goals of the college. Clarification was added by stressing that the questions was normative and not empirical. Each dean chose from the eight workstyles in the typology.

6. Faculty Member's Perception of Appropriate Workstyle for the Department (F). Faculty members were asked to designate the workstyle which was most fitting and appropriate to the needs of their department, that is, the workstyle which was most appropriate to meet the academic mission and goals of the department. Each faculty member chose from the eight workstyles in the typology.

Congruency and incongruency of the ideal faculty workstyle with each of the social context variables and each of the reward expectation variables, respectively, are the two categories of the independent variable.