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ABSTRACT

READINESS AND ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE VALIDITY OF THE READINESS SCALES IN HERSEY AND BLANCHARD'S SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

Xiaoping Wang

The purpose of the study was to investigate the construct validity of the two instruments measuring readiness in Situational Leadership: the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Form and Staff Member Rating Form—developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977). The study examined the relationships between readiness and achievement motivation, and between readiness and faculty education and work experience. The study also explored the concurrent validity of the two instruments measuring McClelland's (1961) achievement motivation: The Achievement Orientation Scale and The NachNaff Scale.

The respondents were 66 department chairs and 156 faculty from 12 comprehensive institutions in the South. Data on faculty readiness were collected with the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Form and Staff Member Rating Form. Data on achievement motivation were collected using the Achievement Orientation Scale and the NachNaff Scale. A faculty demographic questionnaire was used to collect data on faculty education and work experience: amount of education, length of teaching experience, publications and presentations, public service, and rank.

The results of the study provided only partial support for the construct validity of the Readiness Scales. Faculty work experience was significantly correlated with faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching ($r = .16$, $p < .05$), research ($r = .29$, $p < .001$), and service ($r = .23$, $p < .23$). Significant differences were found in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching ($F[2, 143] = 5.08$, $p < .01$) and for service ($F[2, 139] = 4.33$, $p < .05$) among full, associate, and assistant professors. Significant differences were also found in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching ($t = 2.59$, $p < .01$) and research ($t = 2.79$, $p < .01$) between faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree. However, the study did not find any relationship between readiness and achievement motivation.

From the results of this study, there was no evidence for the concurrent validity for the Readiness Scale—Manager
Rating Form and the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Form. There were no statistically significant correlations between faculty self-ratings and department chairs' ratings of faculty readiness. Additionally, no evidence was found for the concurrent validity of the two instruments of the Achievement Orientation Scale and the NachNaff Scale. In fact, the two instruments had a significant negative correlation ($r = -.24, p < .001$).
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Effective leadership is one of the most essential elements of success in organizations. The identification of the factors that contribute to leader effectiveness, however, has long been an intriguing problem. Although initial studies on leadership effectiveness concentrated on traits or characteristics of leaders (Stogdill, 1957), later studies emphasized leader behaviors (Hemphill & Coons, 1950; Halpin, 1966). The behavioral studies have identified various dimensions of leadership behavior that are centered around two basic dimensions: organization-oriented behavior and individual-oriented behavior (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). Among all these studies, the Ohio State studies have been the most widely recognized. Two distinct dimensions of leader behavior were identified in the Ohio State studies: initiating structure and consideration (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). These studies showed effective leader behavior tended to be associated with high performance in both dimensions (Halpin, 1959).

Ever since the late 1960s, another stream of leadership studies has focused on the contingency or situation: the most effective leadership styles are associated with the situation (Fiedler, 1967). Situational Leadership, a theory developed by Hersey and Blanchard in the late 1960s and
early 1970s, has become one of the most popular leadership models in recent years. It has been used in management training in all kinds of organizational settings (Hersey, Angelini, & Carakushansky, 1982). The major premise of the model is that there is no one best leadership style for all situations; rather, leader effectiveness is maximized by appropriately matching the leadership style with the maturity level (later, it was also called readiness level) of the followers.

In Situational Leadership, two dimensions of leader behavior style are identified: task behavior and relationship behavior. Task behavior refers to the extent to which leaders are likely to spell out the duties and responsibilities of the group members (followers). Relationship behavior is associated with the extent to which leaders endeavor to maintain a two-way or multi-way communication (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 172). Four leadership styles are distinguished in Situational Leadership which are combinations of the two dimensions. Style 1 (S1) is high on task-behavior and low on relationship behavior; Style 2 (S2) is high on both behaviors; Style 3 (S3) is high on relationship behavior and low on task behavior; and Style 4 (S4) is low on both behaviors.

The situational variable in Situational Leadership is employee maturity related to a specific task. The concept
has also been referred to lately as employee readiness (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). The two terms, readiness and maturity, will be used interchangeably in this study.

According to Hersey and Blanchard, readiness refers to "the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task" (1988, p. 174). The two dimensions composing employee readiness are willingness and ability related to a specific task. These two dimensions have also been referred to as psychological readiness (or psychological maturity) and job readiness (or job maturity). In this study, these terms are used interchangeably to refer to the two readiness dimensions.

Willingness, or psychological readiness, refers to the followers' willingness to take responsibility for directing their own behavior in completing a specific task. "It is the extent to which an individual has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 175). Hersey and Blanchard argue (1988, p. 184) that willingness is affected by achievement motivation as it is defined by McClelland (1961). According to McClelland, people with strong or high need for achievement would seek out situations in which they could get achievement satisfaction. They set challenging but attainable achievement standards for themselves and do not rely on extrinsic incentives. They also try harder and more successfully to reach the standards they set for
themselves (McClelland, 1961). This need for achievement (n Ach), according to Hersey and Blanchard, influences the willingness dimension of employee readiness (1988). Accordingly, it can be assumed that a person who has a low level of achievement motivation would be expected to have a low level of willingness; a person with a high level of achievement motivation, on the other hand, would be expected to have a high level of willingness.

Ability, or job readiness, is related to the ability and competence to perform certain tasks in a particular area. "Ability is the knowledge, experience, and skill an individual or group brings to a particular task or activity" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 175). Ability is determined by knowledge and skills, which are affected and determined by education and/or working experience (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Different combinations of the two dimensions of willingness and ability constitute the continuum of follower readiness in Situational Leadership. The continuum contains the following four levels of readiness:

R1. Low ability and low willingness
R2. Low ability and high willingness
R3. High ability and low willingness
R4. High ability and high willingness

According to Situational Leadership, leader effectiveness is generated when the leader correctly
assesses the follower's readiness level and applies the leadership style appropriate for that readiness level. Leader effectiveness will be maximized when S1 matches with R1, S2 with R2, S3 with R3, and S4 with R4.

To measure follower readiness, two scales were developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977): the Readiness Scales—the Manager Rating Scale and the Staff Member Rating Scale. Both instruments have been popularly used in research studies on Situational Leadership.

The instruments have been reported to have high reliabilities: test-retest reliabilities of .84 on the ability scale and .88 on the willingness scale (Hersey, Blanchard, & Hambleton, 1978). However, questions have been raised concerning the validity of the instruments, especially when the instruments were used in educational settings (Beck, 1978; Clark, 1981; Clothier, 1984).

In the present study, the construct validity of the two instruments measuring readiness in Situational Leadership was investigated by examining the relationships between readiness and achievement motivation, and between readiness and the variables of education and work experience. The concurrent validity of the NachNaff scale (NachNaff) (Lindgren, 1976) and the Achievement Orientation scale (AO) (Ray, 1975), used to measure achievement motivation, was also addressed.
Statement of the Problem

The concept of employee readiness is crucial in Situational Leadership because it is the only situational component in the theory that dictates which leadership style should be used in a given situation for maximizing leader effectiveness. It is essential, therefore, that leaders accurately assess the follower's readiness level so an appropriate leadership style is applied in a particular situation. For the purpose of helping both leaders and their followers make valid judgments about follower readiness and facilitating research using Situational Leadership, two instruments were developed to measure the construct of employee readiness: Manager Rating Scale, and Staff Member Rating Scale (Hambleton, Blanchard, & Hersey, 1977). Each of these Likert-type instruments consists of two subscales— one measuring ability and the other measuring willingness.

Although the two instruments have been popularly used in Situational Leadership research and other leadership studies, the validity of the two instruments remains questionable (Beck, 1978; Clark, 1981; Clothier, 1984). Even though previous research has shown a clear need for testing and revising the Situational Leadership instruments (Beck, 1978; Clothier, 1984), few studies have rigorously examined the validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness. The problem triggering the present
study is that sufficient evidence concerning the validity of
the Situational Leadership instruments developed by
Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey is not available.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to investigate and examine the construct validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness in Situational Leadership: the Readiness Scales—the Manager Rating Scale and the Staff Member Rating Scale—developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977). Construct validity is concerned with the extent to which a particular measure relates to other measures consistent with theoretically derived hypotheses concerning the concepts (Zeller & Carmines, 1980). It is regarded as the most comprehensive form of test validity primarily because it focuses on the role of theory in test construction. Thus, construct validation is important for every type of psychological test (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In this study, the construct validity of the two instruments of readiness was explored by empirically examining the hypothetical relationship between employee readiness and achievement motivation, and the relationship between employee readiness and education and work experience.

The concurrent validity of the two instruments, the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff) and the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO), used to measure achievement motivation, was also
investigated in this study to provide information on the accuracy of the measuring of achievement motivation.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Analysis of the data collected in the study was conducted to answer the following research questions by testing the hypotheses pertinent to each of the research questions:

**Research Question 1.** Is there a relationship between task-relevant employee psychological readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

**Ho1.** There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated psychological readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

**Ho2.** There is no significant relationship between faculty's psychological readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty's achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

**Research Question 2.** Is there a relationship between employee task-relevant job readiness defined by Hersey and
Blanchard and educational and work experience related to the specific research, service, and instructional tasks?

Ho3. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated job readiness concerning each of the three tasks and faculty's educational experience.

Ho4. There is no significant difference in faculty's job readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty's educational experience.

Ho5. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated job readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty's work experience.

Ho6. There is no significant relationship between faculty's job readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks perceived by the department chair and faculty's work experience.

Ho7. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated job readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty rank.

Ho8. There is no significant difference in faculty's job readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks perceived by the department chair and faculty rank.
Research Question 3. Is there a relationship between overall employee task-relevant readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

Ho9. There is no significant relationship between overall faculty's self-rated readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

Ho10. There is no significant relationship between overall faculty's readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks perceived by the department chair and faculty's achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

Research Question 4. Is there a relationship between overall employee task-relevant readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and employee's educational and work experience?

Ho11. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated overall readiness concerning each of the three tasks and faculty's educational experience.

Ho12. There is no significant difference in faculty's overall readiness perceived by their department
chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty's educational experience.

Ho13. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated overall readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty's work experience.

Ho14. There is no significant difference in faculty's readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks perceived by the department chair and faculty's work experience.

Ho15. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated overall readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty rank.

Ho16. There is no significant relationship between faculty's overall readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks rated by the department chair and faculty rank.

Research Question 5. Is there a relationship between employees' self-perceptions of their level of task-relevant readiness and their employer's perception of it?

Ho17. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated psychological readiness and their department chair's rating of it concerning each of the three specific tasks.

Ho18. There is no significant relationship between
faculty's self-rated job readiness and their department chair's rating of it concerning each of the three specific tasks.

Ho19. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated overall readiness and their department chair's rating of it concerning each of the three specific tasks.

Research Question 6. What is the concurrent validity of the two instruments used in the study measuring achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

Ho20. There is no correlation between the two instruments: the AO and NachNaff scales used in this study to measure achievement motivation defined by McClelland.

Definition of Terms

Employee readiness. Employee readiness was defined as the combination of the two dimensions of employee willingness and ability to take responsibility for directing the employee's own behavior in completing a task. These two dimensions are also referred to as psychological readiness and job readiness. Both dimensions relate to specific tasks in a given situation. In this study, employee readiness was operationalized as levels of faculty's willingness and ability to do a specific task measured by the Readiness
Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale the developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977).

Achievement motivation. Achievement motivation was defined as the capacity to set high but obtainable goals, the concern for personal achievement rather than the rewards of success, and the desire for task-relevant feedback. In this study, achievement motivation was measured separately by the NachNaff Scale (Lindgren, 1976) and the Achievement Orientation Scale (Ray, 1975).

Education Experience. Education experience refers to the faculty's formal school and training experience. In this study, education experience was operationalized as the number of years of school education and training the faculty had received.

Work experience. Work experience refers to experience gained on one's own or on the job. In this study, work experience was confined to faculty's experience concerning the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Work experience was operationalized in this study as the total number of years of teaching, the total number of professional publications and presentations made within a three year period, and the total number of hours devoted to serving on committees during a three year period.

Significance of the Study

Situational Leadership has been widely accepted and
tested in various organizational settings. The validity of the most popularly used scales measuring the situational variable of employee readiness in Situational Leadership, however, has been questioned. This study is significant to the research of Situational Leadership and to the field of leadership in its provision of data about the construct validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness. It also contributes to an understanding of the concept of employee readiness in two ways: first, by exploring the relationship between the concept of achievement motivation and employee readiness; and, second, by exploring the relationship between education and work experience and employee readiness. By specifying the relationship between willingness and achievement motivation, and the relationship between task-relevant ability and faculty's educational and teaching experience, this research will provide academic administrators with guidance in making diagnostic decisions about faculty readiness. The findings regarding the concurrent validity of the two instruments measuring achievement motivation would provide further information about the validation of the instruments. Finally, the research will provide directions for further research efforts in the field.

Limitations

1. This study was limited by the research design,
which was an ex post facto study. The findings of the research should, therefore, be treated as correlational and not as causal in nature.

2. The study population was limited to the faculty and the department chairs employed by 92 universities and colleges in the 12 Southern states that are classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I by Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (see Appendix A).

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the two achievement motivation instruments used in this study were reliable and valid.

2. In this study, the randomly selected department chairs were requested to randomly choose three faculty from the departments. It was assumed that the sampling procedure was followed.

Organization of the Study

The study is composed of five chapters. Chapter I contains the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses, definitions of the terms, significance of the study, limitations, and assumptions.

Chapter II is a review of the related literature pertaining to development of leadership, research done on Situational Leadership Theory and McClelland's achievement motivation, and problems concerning the instruments
measuring readiness in Situational Leadership Theory.

Chapter III describes the research design of the study, the research population and sampling procedures, data collection, instrumentation, and techniques of data analysis utilized in the study.

Chapter IV describes the analytical procedures and techniques of the data collected in the study and shows tables displaying the results of the analysis.

Chapter V presents the findings pertaining to the research questions and hypotheses and discussions and interpretations of the findings. Recommendations and suggestions are made for further research.
CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

In this chapter, a review of the related literature on leadership and achievement motivation will provide the rationale for the present study in four sections. The first section will be an introduction that includes the purpose of the study. The second section will provide a historical overview of the evolution of leadership studies during the past few decades. The third section will discuss the relationship between the concept of readiness and the concept of achievement motivation. The focus of the fourth section will be on specific issues raised from research studies on the two readiness scales developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977).

Introduction
This study was designed to investigate the construct validity of the two readiness scales developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977) to measure employee readiness in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership. Although the instruments have been widely used in the field of leadership research, there is a lack of evidence relevant to the validity of the two instruments. The construct validity of the readiness instruments was explored in this study by examining the theoretically-derived hypothesized
relationships between the concept of readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard in Situational Leadership and the concept of achievement motivation defined by McClelland, and the relationship between the concept of readiness and education and work experience. The concurrent validity of the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO) (Ray, 1975) and the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff) (Lindgren, 1976), which were used to measure achievement motivation in the study, was also determined to ensure reliable estimates of achievement motivation.

**Historical Overview of the Leadership Studies**

Leadership studies during the last century can be categorized into three distinct approaches: 1) trait, 2) behavioral style, and 3) contingency or situational.

**Trait Approach**

For half of the twentieth century, the trait approach remained the most common way to study leadership. Researchers assumed that there were certain traits or characteristics that essentially made one a leader. It was, therefore, believed that leaders were born, not made. This trait approach typically attempted to isolate and identify distinct psychological traits that set potential leaders apart from nonleaders (Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976; Stogdill, 1948).
Efforts to identify the traits that endow leaders with unique qualities that differentiated them from their followers, however, generated few consistent and meaningful results; actually no set of traits of effective leaders was identified (Jennings, 1961).

Both Stogdill's and Mann's extensive reviews of the trait literature generated similar conclusions about these studies (Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959). Stogdill, after reviewing 120 trait studies between 1904-1947, concluded:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits,...the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. (1981, p. 64)

Thus, those early leadership studies failed to support the basic premise of the trait approach that a person must possess some particular set of traits in order to become a leader. Hoy and Miskel described the situation as follows:

In brief, the early searches for personality traits to distinguish leaders from followers were remarkably unsuccessful. Leaders with one set of traits are successful in one situation but not in others. Moreover, leaders with different combinations of traits can be successful in the same or similar situations. (1987, p. 272)
Behavioral Style Approach

At the same time the trait approach to the study of leadership was being questioned, another, distinctly behavioral, approach evolved during the 1940s and 1950s. Studies on the important aspects of leadership behavior generated numerous dimensions of leadership behavior, all of which were centered around two basic distinct dimensions that are often labelled as "organization-oriented" and "individual-oriented". A partial list of such leadership dimensions would include Barnard's effectiveness and efficiency of cooperative action (1938); Argyris's formal behavior and individual behavior (1957); Bass's effectiveness and interaction effectiveness (1960); Cartwright and Zander's goal achievement and group maintenance (1953); Getzels and Guba's nomothetic and idiographic perspectives (1957); and Halpin's production orientation and employee orientation (1956).

Perhaps the most important and widely recognized of the behavioral style studies were conducted by the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University. There, leadership was considered to be the behavior of an individual to direct a group to achieve a certain goal. Two basic dimensions of leadership behavior were identified: initiating structure and consideration (Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Halpin, 1959). These two dimensions were defined by Halpin (1959). Initiating structure referred to "the
leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure" (p. 4). Consideration included leader behavior "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff" (p. 4).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed to study and collect data about the behavior of leaders in terms of the two dimensions. These two dimensions were determined to be separate and distinct from each other, rather than opposite ends of the same continuum (Halpin, 1966; Stogdill, 1963). Leader behaviors could thus be described as a combination of the two dimensions. Four quadrants were formed to show different combinations of both initiating structure and consideration (see Figure 1).

The Ohio State leadership model has been the most widely accepted model and has been used in numerous leadership studies. Some of the major findings of the Ohio State University LBDQ studies were described by Halpin as follows:

1. Leadership behavior had two fundamental dimensions: initiating structure and consideration as measured by the LBDQ.

2. Leaders tended to be effective when they were high
on both dimensions.

3. Superiors tended to emphasize initiating structure, whereas subordinates were more concerned with consideration.

4. There tended to be positive correlations between the style of high consideration and high initiating structure and the group's satisfaction, procedural clarity and favorable changes in group attitude.

5. Different institutional settings tended to foster different leadership styles. (1966, p. 97-98)
In his review of the studies on consideration and initiating structure, however, Korman (1966) found little evidence that LBDQ scores were predictive of later effectiveness of the leader or satisfaction among the leader's subordinates. The Ohio State studies were summarized by Porter, Lawler, and Hackman as follows:

Reviews fail to reveal any substantial consistent effects associated with given behavioral styles of leaders nor any consistent trend for one or another style to be particularly effective in terms of individual or group performance—although there do seem to be some tendencies for employee morale to be positively associated with a considerate, employee-oriented style. (1975, p. 424)

Another leadership model, Managerial Grid, developed by Blake and Mouton (1964), has been widely used in organization and management development programs. This model had two dimensions which corresponded with those developed by the Ohio State studies. They were the concern for production and the concern for people (Blake & Mouton, 1985). Concern for production referred to the extent to which the leader was concerned for successful accomplishment of the organizational task, while concern for people referred to the leader's concern for establishing sound and warm interpersonal relationship (Blake & Mouton, 1985). Combinations of the two dimensions are shown in the grid,
and five basic leadership styles are generated (see Figure 2).

From the data collected, Blake and Mouton (1985) concluded that the most effective leader behavior and the best style of leadership was the 9-9 or team management style in all situations since it was based on maximum concern for people and production. Yet, their conclusion was contradicted by the findings of some other research studies. Some studies on the Managerial Grid reported that

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
& 9 & 8 \\
\hline
1 & 1-1 & (Impoverished) \\
5 & 5-5 & (Middle Road) \\
9 & 9-9 & (Team) \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
& 9 & 8 \\
\hline
1 & 1-1 & (Task) \\
5 & 5-5 & \\
9 & 9-9 & \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
& (Low) & (High) \\
\hline
1 & 1-1 & \\
5 & 5-5 & \\
9 & 9-9 & \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c}
& (Low) & (High) \\
\hline
0 & 1-1 & \\
4 & 5-5 & \\
8 & 9-9 & \\
\end{array} \]

**Figure 2.** The Model of the Managerial Grid
the predominant style was 5-5 (Gilmore, 1984; Boenisch, 1983; Adelman, 1980); other studies found the predominant style to be 1-9 (Richardson, 1980; Anthony, 1984). Besides, due to the uneven approaches to research instrumentation, reliable conclusions cannot be drawn about the model (Caskey, 1988).

Contingency Approach

The questions concerning the existence of the best leadership style gave rise to the third major approach of leadership study: the contingency, or situational, approach. Researchers advocating the contingency approach to leadership study believed that effective leadership was a function of both leader behavior and other situational variables (Fiedler, 1967; House, 1973; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Effectiveness of leadership was seen as dependent upon the match between the leader's behavior and the situation. To these researchers, there could be no one best style of leadership; rather, there was a most effective leadership style for a particular situation. One of the contingency models was developed by Fiedler (1967). In his Contingency model, leadership style was defined as a personality characteristic. It referred to the underlying need structure of a leader which was exhibited in the leader's behaviors (Fiedler, 1967). The least preferred co-worker (LPC) scale was developed by Fiedler to identify
leadership styles. The LPC was a semantic differential or forced-choice scale that consisted of sixteen bipolar adjectives, each being scored on an eight-point scale. The respondent was requested to choose a person with whom he or she had the most difficulty working, and to describe the person on the scale (Fiedler, 1967). The LPC identified two leadership styles: relationship-oriented and task-oriented. A person who scored high on the LPC was considered to be relationship-oriented, whereas a person who scored low on the LPC was described as task-oriented. A relationship-oriented leader was motivated by obtaining satisfaction from successful interpersonal interactions. A task-oriented leader derived satisfaction from successful task accomplishment (Fiedler, 1967).

Three major situational variables were identified in the contingency model. These were leader-member relationship, task structure, and position power. Leader-member relationship referred to the extent to which the group personally liked and accepted the leader. Task structure was associated with the extent to which the task was clearly defined, verified, and structured. Position power referred to the extent to which the formal position granted the leader power to demand the subordinates' compliance with directives (Fiedler, 1967). These three situational variables functioned to determine the favorableness of a given situation, that is "the degree to
which the situation enables the leader to exert his influence over his group" (Fiedler, 1967, p. 13).

Eight possible situations, derived by combining the three situational variables, were arranged along a continuum of favorableness. The most favorable situation was one characterized by good leader-member relationship, high position power, and high task structure. The least favorable situation had poor leader-member relationship, low position power, and low task structure (Fiedler, 1967).

Fiedler reached the following conclusion concerning the effectiveness of leadership styles and different situations:

In terms of promoting group performance, our data show that the task-oriented type of leadership style is more effective in group situations which are either very favorable for the leader or which are very unfavorable for the leader. The relationship-oriented leadership style is more effective in situations which are intermediate in favorableness. (1967, p. 13)

Researchers of Fiedler's Contingency model have generated some supportive findings. All three meta-analyses of the studies on the model by Strube and Garcia (1981); Peters, Hartke, and Pohlmann (1985); and Crehan (1985) provided supportive results of the model. Yet, researchers using Fiedler's contingency model also encountered difficulties that were caused by the methodological problems inherent in the model. Since 1962, only two studies have
met the criteria set by Fiedler and have rigorously tested the model (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). They are the study of Chemers and Skrypeck (1972) and the study of Vecchio (1977). While Chemers and Skrypeck's study generated some support for the model, Vecchio failed to support the theory.

Another contingency theory was developed by House and was known as Path-Goal Theory (1973). The theory was developed based on the research by Evans (1970) who studied the relationship between the behavior of leaders and subordinates' expectations that their efforts resulted in desired rewards. According to House's theory, leader effectiveness manifested through the relationship between a leader's behavior and a subordinate's expectations. Based on the Ohio State model, four different types of leader behavior were distinguished: directive, achievement-oriented, supportive, and participative leadership (House & Mitchell, 1974). Directive Leadership referred to behavior associated with providing clarifications of roles and expectations of the group and specific directions for subordinates to follow in completing the tasks. Achievement-Oriented Leadership referred to the behavior characterized by setting challenging goals, seeking performance improvements, and showing a high degree of confidence that subordinates would attain high standards. Supportive Leadership referred to behavior described as considerate, showing concern for the needs of the
subordinates, and creating a friendly climate in the work group. Participative Leadership referred to behavior characterized by consultation with subordinates and using subordinate ideas in the decision-making process (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Leaders, according to the Path-Goal Theory, could vary these leadership behaviors in different situations to generate leader effectiveness. The two situational variables identified in the theory were: 1) personal characteristics of subordinates including subordinates' personal needs, abilities, and personality traits; and 2) environmental factors such as task structure, group size, and degree of formalization. Leader effectiveness was manifested in terms of the improvement of subordinates' job satisfaction, motivation, and acceptance of the leader. According to the Path-Goal Model, leaders were effective if their leadership behavior matched the situation.Directive leadership was most appropriate when used in situations where the subordinates were authoritarianism-oriented, and where reduction of role ambiguity was important to improve subordinate' motivation. Supportive leadership was effective when the job was seen as boring, stressful, and frustrating. Achievement leadership had its most positive effects when subordinates had unstructured and nonrepetitive jobs and when achievable goals needed to be established. Participative leadership was effective in situations when
the subordinate's tasks were not highly structured, or when subordinates were achievement-motivated (House & Mitchell, 1974).

The last contingency leadership theory to be reviewed here, which is also the focus of this study, is Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership. Hersey and Blanchard started their work in the late 1960s, and the model first appeared in 1969, known as the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Like other contingency theories, the major theme of Situational Leadership was that there was no one best leadership style. Instead, any style might be effective or ineffective depending upon the situation. Effective leaders must be flexible and able to adapt their styles of behavior to the needs of the situation. According to Situational Leadership, the appropriate matching of the leadership style with the readiness level of the group or individual generated leadership effectiveness (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

**Basic leader behavior styles.** With the major thrust on the observed behavior of the leader, Hersey and Blanchard (1988) defined the leadership style as the behavior pattern that an individual exhibited when attempting to influence the activities of others as perceived by those others. Parallel to the concepts of initiating structure and consideration of the Ohio State studies, two dimensions of
leadership behavior were identified: task behavior and relationship behavior. The two terms were defined by Hersey and Blanchard as follows:

Task behavior is defined as the extent to which the leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities of an individual or group. These behaviors include telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who is to do it. Relationship behavior is defined as the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi-way communication. The behaviors include listening, facilitating, and supportive behaviors. (1988, p. 172)

By placing the two dimensions on two cross-partitioned axes, Hersey and Blanchard differentiate four basic leadership styles: high task and low relationship, or Telling; high task and high relationship, or Selling; high relationship and low task, or Participating; and low relationship and low task, or Delegating (see Figure 3).

Hersey and Blanchard's research was greatly influenced by Reddin's 3-D Management Style Theory which was the first theory to identify a third dimension of leader effectiveness depending upon the work situation (1971). Hersey and Blanchard also recognized and added this effective dimension to their two dimensional model. They integrated the concepts of leader style with situational demands of a specific environment. Thus, "when the style of a leader is
appropriate to a given situation, it is termed effective; when the style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed ineffective" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p.117). This third dimension was the environment since "it is the interaction of the basic style with the environment that results in a degree of effectiveness or ineffectiveness of
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leadership" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 97). Therefore, any of the leadership styles could be effective or ineffective depending upon the particular situation.

**Readiness: the situation variable.** Although they recognized several important variables of situation, such as the leader's followers, superiors, peers, organization, job demands, and time, Hersey and Blanchard singled out the followers as the most important and vital variable in any situation, "not only because individually they accept or reject the leader, but because as a group they actually determine whatever personal power they may have" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, p. 29). Situational Leadership placed the emphasis on the followers, and the model was based upon an interaction among the leader's task behavior, relationship behavior, and the task-relevant readiness of the followers.

The situational variable in Situational Leadership, therefore, was employee readiness related to a specific task. Readiness, according to Hersey and Blanchard, referred to "the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task" (1988, p. 174). The concept of readiness contained two major dimensions: ability and willingness of the group or individual to take responsibility for directing their own behavior in completing a specific task. These two dimensions were also called job readiness and psychological
readiness, respectively. Willingness referred to the followers' willingness to take responsibility for directing their own behavior in completing a specific task. "It is the extent to which an individual has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 175). It was argued by them that willingness was affected by achievement motivation as it was defined by McClelland (1961). Hersey and Blanchard made the following remarks when examining the components of readiness:

According to David C. McClelland's research, achievement-motivated people have certain characteristics in common, including the capacity to set high but obtainable goals, the concern for personal achievement rather than the rewards of success, and the desire for task-relevant feedback (how well am I doing?) rather than for attitudinal feedback (how well do you like me?). Of these characteristics we are most interested, in terms of task-relevant readiness, in the capacity to set high but attainable goals....we have argued ...that achievement motivation affects willingness. (1988, p. 183-184)

Accordingly, it could be assumed that a person who had a low level of achievement motivation would be expected to have a low level of willingness; a person with a high level of achievement motivation would be expected to have a high
level of willingness.

Ability, or job readiness, was related to the ability and competence to perform certain tasks in a particular area. "Ability is the knowledge, experience, and skill an individual or group brings to a particular task or activity" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 175). Ability was determined by knowledge and skills, which in turn, according to Hersey and Blanchard, were affected and determined by education and/or working experience (1988).

Different combinations of the two dimensions of willingness and ability constituted the continuum of follower readiness from low to high. The continuum contained the following four levels of readiness (see Figure 4).

Individuals who were at a high level of readiness had the technical knowledge, ability, and experience to accomplish the given task. They were also willing and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able and</td>
<td>Able but</td>
<td>Unable but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing or</td>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>Willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>or Confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Readiness Levels.
highly motivated to take the responsibility, had the capacity to set high but attainable goals, showed self-confidence and commitment to the job, and had concern for personal achievement and self-respect (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Readiness in Situational Leadership was not a general concept; instead, it must always be considered in relation to a specific task. In any situation, individuals would be ready to some degree to assume responsibility to accomplish a specific task or object (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Leader effectiveness. According to the situational leadership model, effective leadership was dependent upon appropriately matching leader behavior with the level of readiness of the people that the leader was attempting to influence. The relationship between task-relevant readiness levels and the appropriate leadership styles was depicted by a bell-shaped curve (see Figure 5).

As shown in Figure 5, there were four leadership styles, each a combination of task and relationship behavior. There were four levels of readiness of the followers from low to high. The style of the leader changed with the readiness level of the follower and the appropriate matching was a curvilinear relationship. According to the model, the appropriate matching of the leader style and the readiness level of the group could be guided by the following guiding principles (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988):
Figure 5. Situational Leadership.
Low readiness level, or R1, required the Telling Style, or S1, leader style. The group or the individual who was both unable and unwilling to assume the responsibility for a specific task was defined to have a low readiness level (R1). A directive task-oriented or telling style was needed to provide the group with clear, specific directions and close supervision to maximize leader effectiveness.

The low to moderate readiness level, or R2, required the Selling Style, or S2. The group or individual who was unable but willing to assume the responsibility for a specific task was at a low to moderate readiness level (R2). A selling style characterized by high-task and high-relationship behavior was needed to provide the group with both directive behavior and supportive behavior to reinforce its willingness in order to promote leader effectiveness.

The moderate to high readiness level, or R3, required the Participating Style, or S3. The group or the individual who was able but unwilling to assume the responsibility for a specific task was at the moderate to high readiness level (R3). A participating style characterized by high relationship and low task behavior was the most appropriate with the group at this level. The leader shared decision-making with the group, assumed a role of facilitating and communicating, and created an environment which was supportive but nondirective.
The high readiness level, or R4, required the Delegating Style, or S4. The group or the individual who was both able and willing to assume the responsibility for a specific task was at a high level of readiness (R4). A delegating style characterized by low task and low relationship behavior had the highest probability of being effective with the group.

The situational leadership model was dynamic; leadership styles changed along with the readiness levels of the followers. Each level of readiness needed a different leadership style to generate effective leadership. There was no single best style for all situations. "Rather, the task-relevant maturity (readiness) levels of individuals or groups in a given situation tend to determine which leadership styles are likely to achieve the highest results" (Hersey, Angelini, & Carakushansky, 1982, p. 217).

The key to using Situational Leadership is to diagnose accurately the readiness level of the followers, and then to match the leadership style accordingly. Besides, leaders need the skills and flexibility that will enable them to adjust their styles when the readiness level of the followers changes over time along the readiness continuum (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). As the readiness level of the group is improving along the continuum from low to high, the leader should continuously reduce his or her task behavior, diminish the amount of supervision, and increase positive
reinforcement and socioemotional support, thus changing the style of high task behavior to the styles of high relationship behavior. When the group reaches the high level of readiness, both task and relationship behavior should be decreased to allow group autonomy (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). This dynamic feature requires leaders to enlarge their range of skills and leadership styles and attain the necessary flexibility of style changing. Finally, the situational leadership model implies that leaders should and can change the environment by helping the group mature. This occurs only when the leaders adjust their leadership behavior through the four styles along the prescriptive curve as indicated by the model (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Readiness and Achievement Motivation

Situational Leadership embraces the construct of employee readiness, or maturity, in the model as a decisive factor for appropriate applications of leadership styles to generate effective leadership. As Hersey and Blanchard (1982; 1988) have emphasized, such a construct has a clear connotation distinct from a concept of being mature in a general or global sense. Employee readiness is always task-relevant. The construct of readiness is composed of two elements which are interrelated: willingness and ability. A change in one element will affect the other and thus the
overall readiness level (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). As is postulated in Situational Leadership, achievement motivation defined by McClelland is a most important factor that affects the level of an individual's willingness and self-motivation to accomplish a given task (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). Individuals who are achievement-motivated tend to be high in readiness: they set high but attainable goals, and provide large amounts of self-motivation (Leadership Studies, 1986).

Achievement motivation, according to McClelland et al. (1953, 1961), referred to a person's internal psychological force to achieve. It was defined as the positive or negative affect aroused in situations that involved competition with a standard of excellence where performance in such situations could be evaluated as successful or unsuccessful (McClelland, et al., 1953). Such a construct of achievement motive and a general theory of achievement motivation were developed by McClelland and his associates in the late 1940s and early 1950s (McClelland, et al., 1953). Many studies were conducted in the United States and abroad to develop the construct of the achievement motive. McClelland and his associates used a research instrument called the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), a projective measure of need for achievement (n Ach) (McClelland, et al., 1953; McClelland, 1961). The TAT score was derived by collecting and content analyzing subjects' written stories
in reaction to four pictures designed to elicit achievement themes. The subjects were shown the picture for 20 seconds and asked to write answers to the following four questions:

1. What is happening? Who are the persons?
2. What has led up to this situation? That is, what has happened in the past?
3. What is being thought? What is wanted? By whom?
4. What will happen? What will be done? (McClelland, et al., 1953, p. 98)

In McClelland's studies of college students (1953), the TAT was given under three different conditions with regard to the absence or presence of arousal of achievement motivation: relaxed, neutral, and achievement-oriented. In all three situations, paper and pencil tests were given to the subjects followed by administration of TAT. In each different situation, a different degree of arousal of achievement motivation was introduced. In the relaxed and neutral conditions, there was no intentional introduction of achievement cues. Under the achievement-oriented condition, the experimenter made a deliberate attempt to introduce achievement related cues in the form of special instructions to heighten the motivation of the subjects. The three conditions provided three points on an n Ach intensity continuum (McClelland, et. al., 1953).

The stories were scored according to a content-analysis system created by McClelland and his associates.
Frequencies of the various achievement-related imaginative categories in the Relaxed, Neutral, and Achievement-oriented conditions were counted in order to establish which categories shift in response to an increase in achievement motivation produced by manipulation of relevant cues (McClelland, et al., 1953). Individuals were identified as high achievers or low achievers depending on the frequency of references to achievement. An individual "whose thought processes contained many of these references to achievement under normal circumstance is presumed to be generally highly motivated for achievement" (McClelland, et al., 1953, p. 146).

This construct of achievement motive was validated through early studies using TAT and quantitative techniques (McClelland, et al., 1953).

The origins of achievement motivation were described to be associated with child-rearing practices and personality development (McClelland, et al., 1953). McClelland et al. concluded:

If a family does not set high standards of excellence, or if it does not permit the child to compete or strive to meet them on his own, then he could not be expected to have had the affective experiences connected with meeting or failing to meet achievement standards which cumulatively produce an achievement motive. (1953, p. 275-276)
In McClelland's later studies of individuals in entrepreneurial occupations, two other motivational variables related to personality were also identified: need for affiliation and need for power (McClelland, 1961). Need for affiliation (n Aff) was defined as the "concern in one or more characters over establishing maintaining or restoring a positive affective relationship with another person. This relation is most adequately described as friendship" (McClelland, 1961, p. 160). Need for power (n Pwr) was defined as "a concern with control of the means of influencing a person" (McClelland, 1961, p.167). According to McClelland, individuals who had high needs for affiliation or power, would be expected to have a relatively low need for achievement (McClelland, 1961).

Based on the findings of his studies, McClelland developed a profile of high achievers (1961). Four behavioral characteristics about individuals with a high need to achieve were identified: 1) willingness to take moderate and calculated risks as a function of skill; 2) reliance on intrinsic satisfaction in getting a job done and achieving self-established standards; 3) desire for feedback on job performance; and 4) concern with getting job done rather than developing interpersonal relationships (McClelland, 1961).

McClelland's achievement motivation theory is one of the motivation theories that have been recognized and
accepted (Fineman, 1977). It is this concept of achievement motivation that has been regarded as a most important factor affecting employee readiness in Situational Leadership. It is claimed to be directly related to employee readiness (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). An assessment of individual's achievement motivation would provide a correlated assessment of his/her readiness level since the two constructs are postulated to be correlated (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Issues Concerning the Readiness Scales

The situational leadership model has been widely accepted and used in leadership training, especially in the business sector. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), over 1,000,000 individuals were trained to use Situational Leadership with more than 400 of the Fortune 500 companies supporting training in the Situational Leadership Model. Although not too many empirical studies using the model have been published, there are a substantial number of unpublished studies using the model. Most are dissertations and papers presented at professional meetings. Some evidence for the validity of Situational Leadership has been reported in scholarly journals. Hambleton and Gumpert (1982) used the Leadership Behavior Analysis and Readiness Scales (Hambleton, Blanchard & Hersey, 1977) to study managers, subordinates, and superiors in a company. Leadership effectiveness was assessed by identifying
matches/nonmatches between leadership styles and readiness levels and the assessments of the followers' job performance. Twenty-nine percent of the cases were identified as matched in the study. The study reported that the matches received higher mean evaluations, thus providing some evidence supporting the validity of Situational Leadership.

Hersey, Angelini, and Carakushansky (1982) conducted an experimental study of the teacher's role in training 60 executives. The experiment groups showed statistically higher levels of performance in learning than did the control groups. The authors believed that Situational Leadership might be applied to any learning situation to produce a positive influence on learning environments.

Vecchio (1987) used a survey technique to examine teachers' job performance, teachers' job satisfaction, and teachers' satisfaction with leader/member relationships based on matches between principal leadership styles and teacher readiness levels. Among other instruments, LBDQ-XII and Readiness scales (Hambleton, Blanchard, & Hersey, 1977) were used in the study to measure leadership styles and readiness levels. The results provided some support for Situational Leadership, and the tests used in the study showed that the theory was partially accurate in its prescriptions. Situational Leadership was more strongly supported at lower maturity levels than at the high levels.
Perhaps the largest number of empirical studies of Situational Leadership are unpublished dissertations. The results of these studies are mixed. Several confirmed the theory. Boucher (1980) surveyed university intramural and recreational sports directors and their staff members. Match/nonmatch groups in terms of leadership styles and readiness levels were formed. Results indicated a significant difference between the two groups in the perceived leadership effectiveness in the direction predicted by Situational Leadership. Thomas (1983) conducted an experimental test of Situational Leadership in several school districts. Teachers' readiness levels and principals' leadership styles were assessed and data were then analyzed to test the hypotheses dealing with matches and nonmatches between the two variables. The results were reported to be supportive to the validity of Situational Leadership in that a proper match of readiness level and leadership style enhanced the satisfaction of the followers.

Other studies reported partial or no support for Situational Leadership. These included the studies conducted by McKay (1984), Clark (1981), Beck (1978) and Clothier (1984). McKay (1984) explored Situational Leadership by studying principal leadership styles and faculty readiness levels in an elementary school. The matches between leadership styles and readiness levels were hypothesized to lead to more mainstreaming of mildly
mentally handicapped and hearing disabled students. The research hypothesis was supported only with matches between low-task/low-relationship and above average readiness levels of faculty. Results concerning other matches were not consistent with the model.

Clark (1981) also studied school principal leadership styles and teacher readiness levels and investigated the match/nonmatch concept of Situational Leadership. The results were mixed in that some matches generated high perceived leader effectiveness while others did not.

Another study of the principal and teacher dyad was conducted by Beck (1978). Beck used teacher performance and satisfaction as the measure of the principal's leader effectiveness. The results of the study did not support Situational Leadership since the matches between leadership styles and readiness levels did not result in higher teacher performance and satisfaction than the nonmatches.

Clothier (1984) investigated whether leadership effectiveness was enhanced when higher educational administrators leadership styles matched faculty readiness levels. The intervening variables such as faculty rank and teaching experience in determining faculty readiness were also examined. The results showed no differences in leadership effectiveness for different degrees of matching between leadership style and readiness levels. No evidence was found that faculty's teaching experience or rank
mediated faculty readiness.

Although the empirical studies that examined Situational Leadership have not resulted in any conclusive findings, its extensive examination in the popular business literature and its use in training programs indicate its face validity and popularity. In these training programs and empirical studies of Situational Leadership, the Readiness Scales--Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale--have been frequently used to measure readiness in Situational Leadership (Clark, 1984; Beck, 1978; Vecchio, 1987). The two instruments were developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey in 1977.

In developing the Manager Rating Form, maturity was defined as a two-dimensional construct. (The term used when the instruments were first developed was maturity. Recently, it has been changed to readiness.) The two dimensions of the construct, as postulated by the situational leadership model, were ability and willingness, or job maturity and psychological maturity. A pool of 30 items was produced as potential indicators of each of the two dimensions. These items were later edited and revised by a group of managers and the authors themselves. Twenty items were selected as most relevant for measuring each of the dimensions. These items were then used to develop two sub-rating scales with two end points indicating total absence and presence of the variable, respectively. Six other points are included
between the two end points to indicate the degree of the existence of the variable. This instrument was tested as the first version of the manager rating form in four pilot studies (Hambleton, Blanchard, & Hersey, 1977). Item analysis and factor analysis were conducted on the studies and the results of these pilot studies were summarized by Hersey, Blanchard and Hambleton as follows:

1. We were able to select the most appropriate scales (seven in all) from the initial pool of scales to measure each dimension.

2. We determined that leader ratings on as few as five scales measuring each dimension were sufficient to produce acceptable score reliability.

3. We improved the readability and clarity of instrument directions and score interpretation. (1977, p. 226)

The instrument was pre-tested and post-tested using 51 managers. The reliabilities were .88 and .84 for job maturity and psychological maturity, respectively (Hersey, Blanchard, & Hambleton, 1977).

When using the instrument, the managers are asked to choose the five most job-relevant items from the seven items provided in each of the subscales of ability and willingness and rate the maturity of the employee on each of the tasks or objectives that have been selected. A job-maturity score
and psychological maturity score for each task are obtained by summing the total of the five job-maturity ratings and psychological-maturity ratings, respectively, with the highest possible score for each subscale 40, and the lowest 5.

An interpretation matrix has been developed by the authors to determine both the employee's over-all maturity level as perceived by the manager and the most appropriate leadership style.

The Manager Rating Scale was later slightly revised to develop the other readiness instrument: Self-Rating Form. Both of the scales were modified to include only five items and the name of the instruments was changed to Readiness Scale: Manager Rating Scale and Readiness Scale: Staff Member Rating Scale (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

The two readiness scales have been used frequently in both training programs and empirical research studies indicating substantial face validity. Yet, the instruments have not been statistically validated and little evidence is available concerning the instruments' construct validity. One of the most cited problems with the instruments is that the instruments are not discriminative enough to identify the four levels of readiness, especially in educational settings. For instance, Beck (1978) found that the scale skewed scores toward the higher readiness levels. Beck concluded:
These data suggest the need to modify the Maturity Scale. This could be done by changing the scoring matrix, the instructions, and/or the rating scales. These data also suggest the possibility that the results of this study were due to inaccurate measurement of task-relevant maturity. (1978, p. 103)

Vetter (1985) reached the same conclusion: the scales failed to discriminate the readiness levels of the subjects.

Clothier (1984) raised some more issues about the instruments. In an application of the situational leadership model to higher educational settings, Clothier used another version of the readiness scales and found no relationship between the subjects' work and educational experience and their readiness levels related to the specific tasks. After exploring several explanations, Clothier suggested that the evidence added further indication of inaccuracy of the data gathered using the readiness instruments. Again, Clothier recommended that the instruments needed testing and modification.

Another problem identified through the literature review was that there has been little test and examination of the construct validity of the two readiness scales. Some researchers questioned the validity of the concept of readiness. Some of the criticisms included: 1) that the readiness construct was conceptually ambiguous and disjointed because it failed to indicate clearly how the two
elements, willingness and ability, influence the overall readiness level (Graeff, 1983); and 2) that the framework failed to incorporate and distinguish different degrees of ability and willingness; they were either present or not present along the maturity continuum (Graeff, 1983; Nichols, 1985). In spite of these questions, few studies have explored the construct validity of the Readiness Scales in Situational Leadership.

The literature review revealed the problematic situations concerning the two readiness scales. It suggested that the two instruments of readiness need rigorous testing of their construct validity before any further studies should be conducted using the readiness instruments.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the related literature on the development of leadership studies and the evolution of Situational Leadership developed by Hersey and Blanchard. It revealed the problematic situation concerning the validity of the two popularly used readiness scales on the Situational Leadership Model: Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale. The need to examine the validity of the two instruments is evident. Such an examination of the two instruments would make it possible to provide directions to researchers and
practitioners for using and modifying the readiness scales.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

This chapter will present the description of the research design, the population and sampling, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.

Research Design

The study was designed to investigate and examine the construct validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness in Situational Leadership: Readiness Scale—the Manager Rating Scale and Readiness Scale—Staff Member Rating Scale (Hambleton, Blanchard & Hersey, 1977). The study consisted of a field test of the hypothetical relationship between the readiness concept in Situational Leadership measured by the readiness scales and the concept of achievement motivation measured by the NachNaff scale and the AO scale, respectively, and the relationship between readiness and education and/or work experience. The concurrent validity of the two instruments measuring achievement motivation developed by Lindgren (1976) and Ray (1975) was also determined. Data were collected from selected faculty and department chairs at colleges and universities in the South that are classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I. The following variables were measured in the study: faculty task-relevant
readiness level, and faculty achievement motivation. Information on faculty demographic characteristics was also collected.

Population and Sample

The research population of the study consisted of department chairs and faculty of 92 higher educational institutions in the 12 Southern states that are classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The random cluster sampling procedure was employed in the study, and all the department chairs were included as subjects after one institution from each of the 12 states was randomly selected.

A list of the names of the department chairs from the 12 universities and colleges was obtained from the most recent catalogs of these institutions (see Appendix A). Each department chair randomly selected three faculty from his/her department, one from each academic rank (assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor). The stratification of the faculty sample was intended to produce a sample representative of each academic rank of professor, associate professor and assistant professor so that the testing of the relationship between faculty readiness level and the rank was facilitated. When no faculty member was available at a particular rank, the department chair
selected the faculty member(s) from the other rank(s).

Instrumentation

Five instruments were used in the study to gather data needed to measure the variables and answer the research questions posed in this study. They were the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale, the NachNaff Scale and the Achievement Orientation Scale used to measure faculty's achievement motivation, and the questionnaire used to solicit faculty demographic characteristics (see Appendices B-D).

Instruments Measuring Readiness

The two instruments used in this study to measure faculty readiness level were the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale—developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977). (Permission was obtained from The Leadership Studies Inc. for the researcher to reproduce part of the readiness scales and to use the scales in the research. The two scales are not included in the appendices. If the reader desires to have more information about the scales, please either contact this author or The Leadership Studies Inc. at the address of Leadership Studies, 230 Third Avenue, Escondido, CA 92025.) The two instruments were designed to measure an individual's task-relevant readiness level on the two
dimensions: psychological readiness and job readiness. Each instrument was composed of two, 10-item subscales measuring psychological and job readiness, respectively, on an eight-point scale.

Psychological readiness refers to the followers' willingness to take responsibility for directing their own behavior in completing a specific task. Job readiness is related to the ability and competence of the follower to perform certain tasks in a particular area.

In this study, the Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale was completed by the department chairs on the faculty's readiness and the Staff Member Rating Scale was completed by the faculty on their own readiness. According to the Situational Leadership model, the readiness level of the follower should be assessed on specific tasks that the follower is being asked to complete. The general areas of faculty responsibilities identified in this study were teaching, research, and service. In order to satisfy the criterion of being specific, the task of teaching was defined as teaching a particular course related to the faculty member's educational background. The task of research was completion of a research project. The task of service was specified as serving on a departmental committee. Since the faculty selected for this study were across disciplines and programs at different levels (undergraduate, graduate, and doctorate), pilot interviews
of department chairs on a small scale had been conducted before these tasks were selected to ascertain that the tasks were applicable, in general, to the subjects.

A job readiness score and a psychological score for each specific task from each form were obtained by summing the total of the five job readiness ratings and the willingness ratings, respectively. After these scores were calculated, they were added to determine the faculty's overall readiness score.

The test-retest reliabilities of the ability scale and willingness scale were reported to be .88 and .84, respectively (Hersey, Blanchard, & Hambleton, 1978).

**Instruments Measuring Achievement Motivation**

The two instruments used in this study to measure achievement motivation were the NachNaff Scale (Lindgren, 1976) and the Achievement Orientation Scale (Ray, 1975). The NachNaff scale was an adjective checklist which consisted of 30 pairs of forced-choice items. The subjects were required to choose between self-descriptions characterized by achievement motivation and those characterized by affiliation. The scale was scored in the direction of the need for achievement and the possible highest score for the need for achievement motivation was 30.

The split-half reliability and test-retest reliability
of the scale were reported to be .80 and .88, respectively (Lindgren, 1976). The results of validation studies of the scale were reported to be generally consistent with McClelland's n Ach theory (Lindgren, Moritsch, Thulin, & Mich, 1986). Some of the results included the positive correlation between students' n Ach and their academic performance (Lindgren, et al., 1976; Wiltse, Kruppa, & Lindgren, 1979; Sid & Lindgren, 1982) and correlations for business majors were higher than those for students in other fields (Sid & Lindgren, 1981).

The Achievement Orientation (AO) Scale was a questionnaire composed of 28 items that measured n Ach. The subjects were asked to respond to each of the 28 questions with either a "Yes" with a value of 3, or "No" with a value 1, or "?" with a value of 2. The highest possible score of n Ach was 84 and the lowest was 28.

The reliability of the AO scale was reported to be .81 (Ray, 1980). Findings about the validity of the scale were positive correlations of college students' n Ach with the followings: .35 with peer-rated need for achievement; .57 with self-rated need of achievement; .27 with peer-rated actual achievement; .31 with occupational status; and Manual/non-Manual occupation (Ray, 1980).

In this study, faculty's achievement motivation was assessed by using both the NachNaff and AO scale scores of faculty.
Demographic Survey

A faculty demographic questionnaire was constructed by the author. It was used to collect information needed in answering Research Questions 2 and 4 and in testing the hypotheses pertinent to the research questions.

Data Collection

In this study, each person was asked to complete the following instruments:

1. The Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale--finished by the department chairs for each faculty selected from the department.

2. A demographic questionnaire; Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale; NachNaff Scale; and AO Scale completed by faculty.

The procedure used to collect data for the study is described as follows.

Each department chair was contacted and sent a package containing: 1) both versions of the cover letter for the department chair and the faculty, 2) all the foregoing instruments for the department chair and faculty to complete, and 3) self-addressed envelopes for the department chair and faculty. The department chair was requested to choose a random stratified sample of three faculty members from the department and distributed the appropriate instruments to the faculty members chosen for
the study. Both the department chair and the faculty were requested to complete the instruments specified in the cover letter and asked to send the completed instruments back to the researcher separately within 20 days using the enclosed self-addressed envelopes.

Subjects who did not return the materials by the requested date were sent a second package containing a cover letter and the instruments and were asked to return it within 10 days. The department chairs were sent a third package if only partial response from the department was returned after the first two mailings. Those who did not respond or could not be contacted after these efforts were treated as non-responding subjects.

**Data Analysis**

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested by computing Pearson product-moment correlations between faculty's psychological readiness level (both self-rated and department chair-rated) concerning each of the three specific tasks and achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales separately.

In testing Hypotheses 5 and 6, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between the faculty's job readiness level (both self-rated and department chair-rated) concerning each of the three tasks and length of teaching, number of publications and presentations, and number of
In testing Hypotheses 3 and 4, t-tests were conducted to test for differences in faculty job readiness (both self-rated and department chair-rated) concerning each of the three specific tasks among faculty at different education levels.

In testing Hypotheses 7 and 8, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to test for differences in the faculty's job readiness (both self-rated and department-chair rated) concerning each of the three specific tasks among faculty at different ranks.

Hypotheses 9 and 10 were tested by computing Pearson product-moment correlations between overall faculty readiness levels (both self-rated and department head rated) concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales separately.

In testing Hypotheses 13 and 14, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between the faculty's overall readiness levels (both self-rated and department chair-rated) concerning each of the three tasks and length of teaching, number of publications and presentations, and number of hours of committee services.

In testing Hypotheses 11 and 12, t-tests were conducted to test for differences in faculty overall readiness (both self-rated and department chair-rated) concerning each of
the three specific tasks among faculty at different education levels.

In testing Hypotheses 15 and 16, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to test the differences in the faculty's overall readiness (both self-rated and rated by department chairs) concerning each of the three specific tasks among faculty at different ranks.

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to test Hypotheses 17, 18, and 19 between faculty self-perceptions of the psychological readiness level and the department chair's ratings of the faculty's psychological readiness level concerning each of the three specific tasks; between the faculty self-rated job readiness level and the department chair's rating of the faculty job readiness level concerning each of the three specific tasks; and between the faculty self-rated overall readiness level and the department chair's rating of the faculty overall readiness level concerning each of the three tasks.

Hypothesis 20 was tested by computing Pearson product-moment correlation between the scores of faculty achievement motivation obtained from the NachNaff scale and the scores obtained from the Achievement Motivation scale.

All the above correlation coefficients obtained were tested at a significance level: $\alpha = .05$ by using the statistical techniques appropriate to the category of the data using one-tailed tests.
CHAPTER IV

Results of the Study

This chapter will present the findings and results related to the six research questions posed in the study and the hypotheses associated with each of the research questions. The data used in the analyses were collected from the Readiness Scales portion of the faculty and the department chairs' rating forms; the Achievement Orientation Scale and the NachNaff Scale that measured achievement motivation; and a faculty demographic questionnaire. In testing the null hypotheses in this study, the level of significance used was α = .05.

Characteristics of Respondents

The possible maximum number of subjects in the study was 884 (221 department chairs and 663 faculty members from each of the three ranks: full, associate, and assistant professors). Because the researcher did not know if every faculty rank was represented in each department, the actual sample size of faculty in this study was unknown.

Usable data were returned by 222 (25%) although responses were received from 340 (38%) of the possible total of 884. Thirty-four professional ranks (3.9%) were reported by chairs to be either vacant or unused. Twenty-one department chairs (9.5%) declined to participate for various...
reasons (see Table 1). One frequently cited reason was that the subject was too busy to participate in the study; another was that the department was too small to have adequate number of faculty at the three requested ranks for the study.

Table 1  
Summary of Response Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total Responding</th>
<th>Position Not Avail.</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Usable Data Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers are the possible maximum of the faculty members at each rank and of the total of the subjects.

Chairs and faculty from department in all 12 states were represented in the responses (see Table 2). Responses were also representative of both genders (62.8% of males and 36.5% of females). Faculty demographic data showed that the average years of teaching at the present positions for male full professors (M =16.02) and assistant professors (M = 7.00) were fewer than those for female full professors (19.67) and female assistant professors (M = 7.94).
### Table 2
**Summary of Positions Held by Respondents by State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opposite was true for associate professors ($M = 11.12$ for males, and $M = 10.75$ for females). In total years of teaching experience, however, the average for male faculty was higher than female faculty at all ranks. Also of note is the relatively small quantity of publications and presentations in the last three years by faculty of both
genders at all ranks. For instance, the average number of books published was .29, .06, and .30 for male full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively; the average was .50, .06, and .09 for female full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively. Similarly, the average of presentations at state conferences was 1.40, .85, and .91 for male full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively. For female full, associate, and assistant professors, the average was 2.50, 2.13, and .80, respectively. Such results were not unexpected since the subjects were faculty from institutions classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I by the Carnegie Foundation. These higher educational institutions, in general, emphasize teaching over research. Such an emphasis was certainly reflected in the data collected for this study (see Table 3).

Out of 156 faculty, 123 held doctorates, 3 specialist degrees, and 28 master's degrees. Only one of the 48 full professors held a master's degree, and 47 doctorates. Forty-three associate professors had doctorates, and 6 master's degrees. For assistant professors, 33 had doctorates, 3 specialist degrees, and 21 master's degrees.

Findings for Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1. What is the relationship between task-
Table 3
Summary of Work Experience for Teaching, Research, and Service of Faculty Respondents by Rank and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Present Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98 12.26 8.27</td>
<td>42 16.02 7.27</td>
<td>33 11.12 7.83</td>
<td>23 7.00 7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 9.96 7.53</td>
<td>6 19.67 4.03</td>
<td>16 10.75 7.29</td>
<td>35 7.94 6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98 18.15 8.32</td>
<td>42 23.40 6.25</td>
<td>33 16.76 6.93</td>
<td>23 10.57 6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 12.51 7.64</td>
<td>6 23.17 4.17</td>
<td>16 14.13 6.61</td>
<td>35 9.94 6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98 .21 .60</td>
<td>42 .29 .60</td>
<td>33 .06 .24</td>
<td>23 .30 .86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 .12 .47</td>
<td>6 .50 1.22</td>
<td>16 .06 .25</td>
<td>35 .09 .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98 .49 1.67</td>
<td>42 .57 1.31</td>
<td>33 .67 2.46</td>
<td>23 .09 .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 .32 1.05</td>
<td>6 1.17 2.86</td>
<td>16 .18 .54</td>
<td>35 .22 .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98 2.54 3.63</td>
<td>42 3.21 4.15</td>
<td>33 2.09 3.15</td>
<td>23 1.96 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 1.79 2.94</td>
<td>6 2.00 2.28</td>
<td>16 3.00 4.24</td>
<td>35 1.20 2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)
Summary of Work Experience for Teaching, Research, and Service of Faculty Respondents by Rank and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>227.59</td>
<td>297.10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>171.66</td>
<td>211.69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relevant employee psychological readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

$H_{01}$. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated psychological readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and their achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

Six Pearson $r$ correlations were computed to determine the relationship between faculty self-rated scores of psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service and scores of the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively (see Table 4).

Of the six tests computed between the scores on the self-rated psychological readiness for faculty tasks and achievement motivation, the correlation for faculty psychological readiness for research and achievement motivation measured by NachNaff was the only one statistically significant ($r = 0.35, p < .001$). The null hypothesis was rejected for the subscale of research readiness and NachNaff, but was retained for the others.

$H_{02}$. There is no significant relationship between faculty psychological readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of three specific tasks and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales,
respectively.

Table 4
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated Psychological Readiness And Achievement Motivation Measured by the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO) and the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Readiness And Achievement Motivation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.

Six Pearson r correlation tests were conducted to determine if there were statistically significant correlations between the scores of faculty psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service as perceived by the department chairs and the scores of faculty achievement motivation (see Table 5).

None of the correlations for chair-rated faculty psychological readiness and faculty achievement motivation...
were statistically significant; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. Department chairs' perceptions of faculty task-relevant psychological readiness were not significantly related with faculty's achievement motivation.

Table 5
Correlations for Chair-Rated Faculty Psychological Readiness and Achievement Motivation Measured by the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO) and the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Readiness And Achievement Motivation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2. What is the relationship between employee task-relevant job readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and education and work experience related to the specific research, service, and instructional tasks?

H03. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated job readiness concerning each of the
three specific tasks and their educational experience.

Faculty educational experience consisted of data on the highest degree that the person possessed at the time the study was conducted. Since only two subjects had a specialist degree, this group of faculty was excluded in the testing. Only those respondents holding a doctorate or a master's degree were compared. Three $t$-tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, or service between faculty with a doctorate and faculty with a master's (see Table 6).

Table 6
$t$-tests for Difference in Faculty Self-Rated Job Readiness Scores by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Readiness And Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .01$, one tailed test.
There was a statistically significant difference between faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree for teaching ($t = 2.59$, $df = 141, p < .01$) and for research ($t = 2.79$, $df = 139, p < .01$). In both cases of teaching and research, the mean scores for the faculty members with a doctorate (38.17 and 33.61) were higher than those for the faculty with a master's degree (37.01 and 30.14). Faculty with a doctorate rated themselves higher on job readiness for teaching and research than those with a master's degree. The null hypothesis was rejected for faculty job readiness for teaching and research and their educational experience. However, the null hypothesis was retained for faculty job readiness for service and their educational experience.

$H_04$. There is no significant difference in faculty's job readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty educational experience.

As with $H_03$, three $t$-tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in the department chair's perceptions of faculty job readiness for teaching, research, and service between faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree (see Table 7).

There was a statistically significant difference in job readiness for research between faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree as perceived by the department
Table 7  
**t-tests for Difference in Chair-Rated Faculty Job Readiness Scores by Educational Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Readiness And Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.39</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, one tailed test.*

chairs ($t = 2.02$, $df = 108$, $p < .05$). The null hypothesis was rejected for difference in chair-rated faculty job readiness for research between faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree. However, the null hypothesis was retained for differences in faculty chair-rated job readiness for teaching and service between the faculty with a doctorate and those with a master's degree.

Ho5. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated job readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks.
Data collected for work experience included the total number of years of teaching for the teaching task; the total number of publications of books, chapters and articles as well as presentations at national, regional, and state conferences during the last three years for the research task; and the total number of hours of public service at the departmental, school, and university levels during the last three years for the service task. Three Pearson $r$ correlation tests were conducted to determine the relationship between faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service and their work experience related to the tasks.

The null hypothesis was rejected since the correlations between faculty job readiness for teaching ($n = 146, r = .16, p < .05$), research ($n = 143, r = .29, p < .001$), and service ($n = 136, r = .23, p < .01$) and faculty work experience were statistically significant.

Ho6. There is no significant relationship between faculty's job readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and their work experience.

Three Pearson $r$ correlation tests were conducted to determine the relationship between faculty job readiness for teaching, research, and service perceived by the department chairs and faculty work experience. No correlations for
teaching (n = 114, \( \bar{X} = .16 \)), research (n = 112, \( \bar{X} = .18 \)),
and service (n = 108, \( \bar{X} = .13 \)) were statistically
significant, and the null hypothesis was retained.

Ho7. There is no significant difference in faculty's
self-rated job readiness concerning each of the
three specific tasks and faculty rank.

Three ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there
was any statistically significant difference in faculty
self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service
among three ranks of full, associate, and assistant
professors (see Table 8).

Table 8
Analysis of Variance of Faculty Self-Rated Job Readiness
Scores by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Readiness For Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>5.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Readiness For Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>55.70</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Readiness For Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>4.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
There were statistically significant differences in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching ($F [2, 143] = 5.08, p < .01$) and service ($F [2,139] = 4.33, p < .05$) among the groups of full, associate, and assistant professors. The null hypothesis was rejected for job readiness for teaching and service and rank but retained for research and rank. Student Newman-Keuls tests were conducted to determine which group(s) was statistically different from the others. The results indicated that, in the case of job readiness for teaching, assistant professors ($M = 37.28$) were statistically different from full professors ($M = 38.39$) and associate professors ($M = 38.32$). Similar results were found in the case of job readiness for service. Assistant professors ($M = 33.60$) were statistically different from full professors ($M = 35.90$) and associate professors ($M = 36.00$). In both cases of teaching and service, assistant professors rated themselves lower on job readiness than did full or associate professors.

$H_08$. There is no significant difference in faculty's job readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty rank.

Three ANOVA tests were conducted to see if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty job readiness perceived by the department chairs for teaching, research, and service among the three groups of full,
associate, and assistant professors (see Table 9).

Table 9
Analysis of Variance of Chair-Rated Faculty Job Readiness Scores by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness For Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>48.32</td>
<td>3.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness For Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness For Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The difference in faculty job readiness for teaching perceived by the department chairs and rank was statistically significant ($F [2, 111] = 3.80, p < .05$). The null hypothesis was rejected for faculty job readiness for teaching and rank but retained for research and service and rank. A Student Newman-Keuls test was conducted to see which group was statistically different, and the result showed that assistant professors ($M = 35.5$) were statistically different from full professors ($M = 37.4$) and
associate professors ($M = 37.4$). This indicated that the department chairs rated assistant professors lower than they did the full and associate professors on job readiness for teaching.

**Research Question 3.** What is the relationship between overall employee task-relevant readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

$H_0$. There is no significant relationship between overall faculty's self-rated readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

Six Pearson $r$ correlation tests were conducted to determine the relationship between faculty self-rated readiness for teaching, research, and service and achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively (see Table 10).

The correlation between the scores of faculty self-rated overall readiness for research and the scores of achievement motivation measured by NachNaff was statistically significant ($r = .28, p < .001$). This indicated a low positive relationship between faculty overall readiness for research and achievement motivation measured by NachNaff. The null hypothesis was rejected for faculty self-rated overall readiness for research and
Table 10
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated Overall Readiness and Achievement Motivation Measured by the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO) and the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness and Achievement Motivation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.

NachNaff but retained for the rest of the readiness subscales for teaching and service and the AO and NachNaff scales.

All the readiness subscales for teaching, research, and service and the scores of the AO scale were negatively correlated although none of the correlations were statistically significant. Such results implied an inverse relationship between faculty overall readiness for all the tasks and achievement motivation measured by the AO scale.
Ho10. There is no significant relationship between overall faculty's readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively.

In testing the null hypothesis, six Pearson $r$ correlation tests were employed to determine the relationship between faculty overall readiness perceived by the department chair for teaching, research, and service and faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO and NachNaff scales, respectively (see Table 11).

None of the correlations between the scores of faculty overall readiness for the three tasks rated by the department chair and the respective scores of the AO and NachNaff scales were statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 4. What is the relationship between overall employee task-relevant readiness defined by Hersey and Blanchard and employee's education and work experience?

Holl. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated overall readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty educational experience.

Three t-tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty self-
Table 11
Correlations for Chair-Rated Faculty Overall Readiness and Achievement Motivation Measured by the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO) and the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness and Achievement Motivation</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>ξ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (AO)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service And Achievement Motivation (NachNaff)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service between faculty with a doctorate and faculty with a master's degree. Since only two subjects had a specialist degree, this group was excluded in the testing (see Table 12).

There was a statistically significant difference in faculty overall readiness for research ($t = 2.72$, $df = 139$, $p < .01$) between faculty with a doctorate ($M = 67.73$) and faculty with a master's ($M = 61.11$). Faculty with a doctorate rated themselves higher on overall readiness for
Table 12
*t-tests for Difference in Faculty Self-Rated Overall Readiness Scores by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Readiness For Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>75.98</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Readiness For Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67.73</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Readiness For Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>66.71</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01.

research than did faculty with a master's degree. The null hypothesis was rejected for faculty overall readiness for research and educational level and retained for teaching and service and educational level.

Ho12. There is no significant difference in overall faculty's readiness as perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty educational experience.

As with Ho.11, three t-tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant
difference in faculty chair-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service between faculty with a doctorate and faculty with a master's degree (see Table 13).

Table 13
\textit{t}-tests for Difference in Chair-Rated Faculty Overall Readiness Scores by Educational Level

\begin{tabular}{lccccc}
\hline
Overall Readiness & n & M & SD & df & t \\
And Education & & & & & \\
\hline
Overall Readiness & & & & & \\
For Teaching & & & & & \\
Doctorate & 93 & 72.99 & 7.12 & 110 & .02 \\
Master's & 19 & 72.95 & 6.92 & & \\
Overall Readiness & & & & & \\
For Research & & & & & \\
Doctorate & 92 & 67.58 & 11.14 & 108 & 1.69 \\
Master's & 18 & 62.28 & 16.52 & & \\
Overall Readiness & & & & & \\
For Service & & & & & \\
Doctorate & 90 & 68.02 & 12.78 & 105 & -.47 \\
Master's & 17 & 68.41 & 5.91 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The null hypothesis was retained since none of the test results were statistically significant. Department chairs' ratings of the faculty on their overall readiness for teaching, research, and service were not related to faculty's educational levels.

\textbf{Ho13.} There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated overall readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks
and faculty work experience.

Data collected for work experience included the total number of years of teaching for the teaching task; the total number of publications of books, chapters, and articles as well as presentations at national, regional, and state conferences during the last three years for the research task; and the total number of hours of public service at the departmental, school, and university levels during the last two years for the service task. Three Pearson ρ correlation tests were conducted to determine the relationship between faculty self-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service and faculty work experience related to each of the three tasks (see Table 14).

Table 14
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated Overall Readiness and Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Work Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching And Work Experience</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research And Research Experience</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service And Service Experience</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.

A statistically significant correlation was found
between the scores of faculty self-rated overall readiness for research and faculty research experience ($r = .32, p < .001$). The null hypothesis was rejected for faculty overall readiness for research and research experience but retained for teaching and service and the related experience.

Ho14. There is no significant relationship between faculty's overall readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty work experience.

The relationship between faculty overall readiness for teaching, research, and service perceived by the department chairs and faculty work experience related to the tasks was tested using a Pearson $r$ correlation test (see Table 15).

Table 15
Correlations for Chair-Rated Faculty Overall Readiness and Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Work Experience</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching And Work Experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research And Research Experience</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service And Service Experience</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the correlations between department chairs' ratings on faculty overall readiness for teaching, research,
and service and related work experience were statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained.

\[ H_0 \text{15. There is no significant difference in faculty's self-rated overall readiness concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty rank.} \]

Three ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty self-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service among three faculty ranks (see Table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness For Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75.93</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76.16</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74.96</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness For Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.40</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>139.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>137.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness For Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67.22</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>134.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>103.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The null hypothesis was retained since no statistically significant difference was found between any of the groups of different ranks. Faculty overall readiness for teaching, research, and service was not associated with rank.

H06. There is no significant difference in faculty's overall readiness perceived by the department chair concerning each of the three specific tasks and faculty rank.

Three ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in faculty overall readiness as perceived by the department chairs for teaching, research, and service among the three ranks of full, associate, and assistant professors (see Table 17).

None of the groups were statistically different from the others. The null hypothesis was retained. Department chairs' perceptions of faculty overall readiness for teaching, research, and service were not influenced by faculty rank.

Research Question 5. What is the relationship between employees' self-perceptions of their task-relevant readiness and their employers' perceptions of it?

H07. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated psychological readiness and their department chair's rating of it concerning each of the three specific tasks.

Three Pearson $r$ correlation tests were employed to
Table 17
Analysis of Variance of Chair-Rated Faculty Overall Readiness Scores by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>38.95</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73.46</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71.95</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67.54</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66.44</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>158.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.32</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.76</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67.26</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>149.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

decline if there was a statistically significant relationship between faculty psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service as perceived by faculty and that as perceived by the department chairs (see Table 18). None of the correlations between faculty self-rated scores of psychological readiness for the three tasks and those rated by the department chairs were statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained.

**Ho18.** There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated job readiness and their department chair's rating of it concerning
each of the three specific tasks.

Three Pearson $r$ correlation tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant relationship between faculty's perceptions of their job readiness for teaching, research, and service and their chairs' perceptions of it (see Table 19).

Table 18
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated and Chair-Rated Psychological Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Rated &amp; Chair-Rated Psychological Readiness</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Research</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Readiness for Service</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated and Chair-Rated Job Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Rated and Chair-Rated Job Readiness</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Research</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness for Service</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$p < .05$.
The correlation between faculty perceptions of their job readiness for service and the department chairs' perceptions of it was found statistically significant ($\rho = .21, p < .03$). The null hypothesis was rejected for faculty and department chairs' perceptions of faculty job readiness for service but retained for teaching and research.

H019. There is no significant relationship between faculty's self-rated overall readiness and their department chair's rating of it concerning each of the three specific tasks.

Again, three Pearson $\rho$ correlation tests were conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant relationship between faculty perceptions of their overall readiness for teaching, research, and service and the department chairs' perceptions of it (see Table 20).

Table 20
Correlations for Faculty Self-Rated and Chair-Rated Overall Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Rated &amp; Chair-Rated Overall Readiness</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$\xi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Teaching</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Research</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness for Service</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the correlations between faculty's perceptions
of the overall readiness for the three tasks and the perceptions of the department chairs' of it were statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained.

**Research Question 6.** What is the concurrent validity of the two instruments used in the study measuring achievement motivation defined by McClelland?

**Ho20.** There is no correlation between the two instruments of AO and NachNaff used in the study to measure achievement motivation defined by McClelland.

A Pearson $r$ correlation test was employed to determine if there was a statistically significant correlation between faculty achievement motivation measured by the AO scale and that measured by the NachNaff scale.

The correlation between the scores of the AO scale and the scores of the NachNaff scale was found statistically significant ($n = 142$, $r = -.24$, $p < .05$). The null hypothesis was rejected. The correlation between the two instruments that were supposed to measure the same variable of achievement motivation was negative, which indicated an inverse relationship between the two instruments.

**Other Findings Related to the Study**

Descriptive statistics on faculty readiness scores showed that faculty readiness scores related to teaching,
research, and service were skewed towards the highest readiness level of the four. No mean scores of faculty readiness, both self-rated and department chair-rated, on job readiness or psychological readiness were lower than 31 within a possible range of 0-40. For instance, the mean scores of faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service were 37.95, 32.93, and 35.05, respectively. The mean scores of faculty self-rated psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service were 37.70, 33.53, and 31.85, respectively. For chair-rated faculty job readiness for teaching, research, and service, the means were 36.66, 33.69, and 35.19, respectively. The mean scores of chair-rated faculty psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service were 36.36, 32.69, and 33.39, respectively.

According to Situational Leadership, age should not be considered as an intervening variable that affects the employee's job readiness level related to a specific task; only the variable of the employee's education and work experience should. In order to judge if such was true in this particular study, four further statistical analyses were conducted, all of which were related to faculty's age and their readiness for teaching, research, and service.

In the statistical tests, the faculty were divided into four age groups with a 10-year difference: 25-35, 36-45, 46-55, and over 55. ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if
there was any statistically significant difference in faculty job readiness and overall readiness for teaching, research, and service among different age groups of the faculty (see Tables 21-24).

Table 21
Analysis of Variance of Faculty Self-Rated Job Readiness Scores by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness For Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.79</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>Between Groups 13.97 3.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Within Groups 3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness For Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>Between Groups 4.87 .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>Within Groups 36.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Readiness For Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>Between Groups 155.60 7.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>Within Groups 20.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .001.

There were statistically significant differences in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching ($F[3, 142] = 3.57, p < .05$) and service ($F[3, 138] = 7.63, p < .001$) among different age groups. In order to decide which
Table 22
Analysis of Variance of Chair-Rated Faculty Job Readiness Scores by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Readiness For Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.21</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Readiness For Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.23</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Readiness For Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.36</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>32.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.74</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

group(s) was statistically different, Student Newman-Keuls tests were conducted and the results indicated that two groups were statistically different from each other in job readiness for teaching. These were the group of ages 25-35 (M = 36.79) and the group of ages 46-55 (M = 38.47). In the case of job readiness for service, the group of ages 25-35 (M = 29.38) was found statistically different from all the other age groups. The other tests did not reveal any statistically significant difference in job and overall readiness for teaching, research, and service among the
Table 23
Analysis of Variance of Faculty Self-Rated Overall Readiness Scores by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74.43</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75.04</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75.67</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67.23</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.22</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>45.96</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66.43</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>139.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67.22</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>238.66</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.55</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>100.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.53</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another noteworthy result was related to the instruments of the readiness scales. The researcher encountered some unsolicited comments from the respondents that the instruments measuring the readiness variable were confusing. Some of the respondents had difficulty understanding the Readiness Scales and were unable to complete the scales in the correct way. Due to this particular problem, some of the data collected for the readiness variable were unusable. As pointed out in
Table 24
Analysis of Variance of Chair-Rated Faculty Overall Readiness Scores by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Readiness And Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70.09</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>76.79</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73.60</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>48.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71.05</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67.64</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>40.88</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.31</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>160.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.48</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.68</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>Betwn. Groups</td>
<td>132.29</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>147.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.94</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 3, the instruments were simply reproduced from the original ones and no attempt was made to make any changes of the instruments of the readiness scales when they were sent out to the subjects.

Summary of the Findings

Findings Related to Research Question 1

The statistical analyses in this study did not generate much support for Hersey and Blanchard's claim that the employee's psychological readiness related to specific tasks
was affected and mediated by the person's achievement motivation. Out of the 12 Pearson $r$ correlation tests for the relationship between the two variables of psychological readiness and achievement motivation, only one correlation was statistically significant—the correlation between faculty self-rated psychological readiness for research and achievement motivation measured by NachNaff.

**Findings Related to Research Question 2**

The hypothesis testing for Research Question 2 generated mixed results. With regard to faculty educational levels, there was a statistically significant difference in faculty self-rated job readiness scores for teaching and research between the faculty with a doctorate and the faculty with a master's, and no significant difference was found in faculty self-rated job readiness for service between the two groups. Furthermore, no statistically significant difference was found in faculty chair-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service between the faculty with a doctorate and the faculty with a master's degree.

Similar situations occurred for testing the correlations between faculty job readiness and their work experience. All the correlations between faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching, research, and service and their relevant work experience were found statistically significant although no correlations were very high.
However, no correlations were statistically significant when the relationship was tested between faculty chair-rated job readiness for the three tasks and faculty relevant work experience.

In terms of faculty rank, statistically significant differences in faculty self-rated job readiness for both teaching and service were found among full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors while no statistically significant difference was found in faculty self-rated job readiness for research among the three ranks. Again, a statistically significant difference was found in the subscale of faculty chair-rated job readiness for teaching among full, associate, and assistant professors, whereas no significant differences were found in the other two subscales of research and service among the three faculty ranked groups.

Findings Related to Research Question 3

A statistically significant correlation was found between the scores on the subscale of faculty self-rated overall readiness for research and their achievement motivation as measured by NachNaff. However, no statistically significant correlations were found between other readiness subscales for teaching and service and achievement motivation as measured by the NachNaff and AO scales, respectively.
No statistically significant correlations were found between the scores of faculty chair-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service and the scores of the NachNaff and AO scales, respectively. Faculty chair-rated overall readiness for service and faculty achievement motivation as measured by NachNaff was found to be negatively correlated.

Findings Related to Research Question 4

There was a statistically significant difference in the scores of faculty self-rated overall readiness for research between the faculty with a doctorate and the faculty with a master's degree. However, no statistically significant differences were found in the scores on the other two readiness subscales for teaching and service between the two groups of faculty with different terminal degrees. On the other hand, no statistically significant difference was shown in the scores of faculty chair-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service between the faculty with a doctorate and the faculty with a master's degree.

There was a statistically significant correlation between the scores faculty self-rated overall readiness for research and faculty research experience, but no significant correlations were found between the scores on the other two subscales for teaching and service and the relevant experience. Again, none of the correlations between faculty
chair-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service and the relevant experience were statistically significant.

No statistically significant differences were found in faculty self-rated overall readiness for teaching, research, and service among the three groups of full, associate, and assistant professors. Similar findings were generated in the case of the department chairs' perceptions of the variable of faculty overall readiness, and no statistically significant difference in faculty overall readiness for teaching, research, and service was found.

Findings Related to Research Question 5

No statistically significant correlations were found between the scores of faculty self-rated psychological readiness for teaching, research, and service and the scores rated by the department chairs. As for faculty job readiness for the three tasks, a statistically significant correlation was found between faculty self-rated scores for their job readiness for service and the department chairs' ratings of it although the correlation was not very high.

In the case of faculty overall readiness, once again there were no statistically significant correlations between the scores of faculty self-rated overall readiness and the scores rated by the department chairs related to the three tasks of teaching, research, and service. This finding
suggested that with regard to employee readiness related to specific tasks as measured on the readiness scales, faculty tended to perceive themselves differently than did their department chairs.

**Findings Related to Research Question 6**

The scores of the AO scale and those of the NachNaff scale, both of which were supposed to measure the same variable of achievement motivation, were found significantly negatively correlated with $r = -0.24$, $p < .001$. This finding is critical since it raises serious doubt about the validity of the two instruments measuring achievement motivation.

**Other Related Findings**

There were statistically significant differences in faculty self-rated job readiness for teaching and research among the four age groups of 25-35, 36-45, 46-55, and 56 and over. No statistical significant differences were found in either faculty task relevant job readiness or overall readiness rated both by the faculty and by the department chairs.

Also, there were some comments from the participants that the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale—were confusing and difficult to understand.

All the findings presented in this chapter will be
further discussed, and conclusions and implications of the findings will be drawn in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
Conclusions and Recommendations

In this chapter, conclusions will be drawn from the major findings concerning the research questions raised in the study, and recommendations will be made for further research on Situational Leadership.

Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to determine the construct validity of the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale—used in Situational Leadership to measure employees' readiness levels. The study was conducted in a higher educational setting and data were collected from department chairs and faculty members in higher educational institutions in the 12 Southern states.

Six research questions were posed in this study and data were gathered from five different instruments: Readiness Scale—Manager Rating Scale, Readiness Scale—Staff Member Rating Scale, the Achievement Orientation Scale (AO), the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff), and a faculty demographic questionnaire. This section addresses the conclusions drawn from the major findings related to the six research questions raised in the study and also from other related findings.

1. There was no evidence to show that the Readiness
Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale--developed by Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey (1977) generated valid data to show that there was a relationship between the two variables of achievement motivation and psychological readiness.

According to Situational Leadership, the construct of employee readiness is composed of two essential elements: psychological readiness, or willingness, and job readiness, or ability. When analyzing the dimension of psychological readiness, Hersey and Blanchard contend that employee's psychological readiness is decided and affected by the person's achievement motivation (1988). The person who is achievement motivated is willing to accept responsibility, sets high but attainable goals, and has a high psychological readiness level to carry out the given task. There exists an underlying relationship between the two concepts of psychological readiness and achievement motivation. A person who has high achievement motivation should have a high level of psychological readiness, and thus a high level of overall readiness. On the other hand, a person who has low achievement motivation should have a low level of psychological readiness, and thus a low level of overall readiness.

However, almost no statistically significant positive correlations either between psychological readiness and achievement motivation or between overall readiness and achievement motivation were found in the study. The
statistically significant correlations were found only between the readiness subscale for research and achievement motivation measured by the NachNaff Scale. This does not provide sufficient evidence for affirming that the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale--generated reliable and valid data on psychological readiness, given such a relationship between the two variables is purported in Situational Leadership.

Another alternative interpretation of the results could be that the construct of employee psychological readiness is not accurately defined in Situational Leadership. Previous studies have raised the question about the conceptually ambiguous definition of the readiness construct. Graeff (1984) noted that Situational Leadership failed to indicate clearly how the two elements of psychological readiness and job readiness influenced the overall readiness. There was a lack of awareness of full human development since none of such human aspects as cognitive, affective, psychomotor, life-span development were considered in the theoretical framework. Also, the framework of Situation Leadership failed to incorporate and distinguish different degrees of psychological readiness and job readiness (Graeff, 1983; Nichols, 1985). Consequently, it is possible that the construct lacks a clear definition in terms of its theoretical components.

2. This study provided evidence that the Readiness
Scale—Staff Member Rating Scale—generated valid data on task-relevant job readiness and that employee educational and work experience were intervening variables for task-relevant job readiness.

Situational Leadership postulates that employee job readiness related to specific tasks is determined and influenced by the person's education and work experience. In this study, such a relationship was found between faculty job readiness measured by the Readiness Scale—Staff Member Rating Scale—Staff Member Rating Scale—and faculty education and work experience. Factors of faculty rank, length of teaching experience, number of publications and presentations, hours of public service, and terminal degree earned were mediating factors for faculty job readiness.

Such results differ from some of the findings in previous research on employee readiness and employee education and/or work experience. Clothier (1984) conducted a study to investigate whether leader effectiveness was enhanced when the leadership styles of higher education administrators matched faculty readiness levels. Variables such as faculty rank, teaching experience, and education levels were also examined to see whether they influenced faculty task-relevant readiness. The instrument used to measure faculty readiness was another version of the Readiness Scale. No evidence was found in that study that faculty teaching experience, rank, and education experience
mediated faculty readiness.

3. Little or no evidence was found for concurrent validity of the Readiness Scale--Manager Rating Scale completed by department chairs and the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale completed by faculty in this study. Almost all faculty self-ratings of job relevant readiness and the ratings by department chairs were found statistically uncorrelated. Faculty perceived themselves differently on psychological readiness, job readiness, and overall readiness from the way their department chairs perceived them. The lack of relationship between faculty perceptions and those of the department chairs suggests that the instruments may have poor concurrent validity.

Another possible explanation about such a result is that there may be other unidentified factors that affect department chairs' assessment of faculty's task-relevant readiness. One possible factor is the contact between faculty and the department chair. In Clothier's study where higher educational administrators' perceptions of faculty readiness levels were examined, it was found that frequency of contact between faculty and department chairs served as an intervening factor that affected department chairs' perception of faculty's readiness levels. According to the study, as the frequency of contact between faculty and department chairs increased, the faculty member would be perceived, by the department chair, to be at a higher level
of task-relevant readiness (Clothier, 1984). The author explained that such a finding suggested that when frequency of contact increased, opportunity for guidance and professional development of the follower also increased. This increase in professional development would, in turn, lead to an increase in faculty task-relevant readiness (Clothier, 1984).

In the present study, however, the department chairs' ratings of faculty task-relevant psychological readiness, job readiness, and overall readiness correlated less than the faculty ratings with the variables of achievement motivation and faculty education and/or work experience. One possible explanation of this could be that there was a lack of contact between faculty and the department chair in general. Such a lack of contact might have caused the department chair to inaccurately assess faculty's readiness levels related to specific tasks. It has been widely accepted that in the setting of higher education, the environment is relatively loosely controlled. Faculty have considerable authority and control over their working environment. Teaching and the classroom are considered the teacher's terrain. Educators have the freedom to make decisions about carrying out responsibilities such as teaching and research. Interference over these tasks is considered as an infringement upon academic freedom to which educators are entitled. All this could possibly result in a
lack of tight control that usually comes down from the organizational hierarchy in other environments such as those of industries and business. Consequently, there would be a less close direct contact between faculty and department chairs. Such a lack of contact could create less opportunity for the department chair to observe faculty performance and to have accurate assessment of faculty readiness related to specific tasks.

4. The current Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating—are not discriminative enough to identify four levels of employee readiness. In this study, no mean scores of faculty job readiness or psychological readiness related to teaching, research, and service were lower than 31 within a possible range of 0-40. Such a problem of skewing readiness scores towards the highest or higher levels of readiness has been reported by several previous researchers (Beck, 1978; Vetter, 1985; Clothier, 1984). The lack of discrimination among the readiness levels suggests that the readiness scales do not accurately assess employ readiness levels. Such a result may also help explain why many significant correlations between scores of psychological readiness and those of achievement motivation were not significant since the restricted range of the readiness scores would reduce the value of correlations.

5. No evidence was found for the concurrent validity for the NachNaff Scale (NachNaff) and the Achievement
Orientation Scale (AO), both of which measured achievement motivation.

The statistically significant negative correlation found between the scores of the AO scale and those of the NachNaff scale indicates that there was a lack of concurrent validity of the two instruments, both of which measured the same concept of achievement motivation. Although both instruments have been reported to have relatively good reliability and validity (Lindgren, et al., 1986; Wiltse, et al., 1976; Ray, 1980), this study provides no evidence for the concurrent validity of the two instruments.

Although such a finding raises reasonable doubt about the overall validity of the two instruments of the AO scale and the NachNaff scale and thus the credibility of the data generated from the two instruments, an inspection of the statistical results shows that almost all the correlations between the scores of the NachNaff Scale and faculty self-rated psychological readiness and overall readiness were positive, and in the predicted direction. On the other hand, all correlations between the AO scale and faculty self-rated psychological readiness and overall readiness were negative, which indicated an inverse relationship between the two variables as measured by the AO scale and the Readiness Scale. The positive correlations of the NachNaff scale scores with the scores of Readiness Scale provided some evidence for the construct validity of the
NachNaff Scale.

6. Statistically significant differences were found between the variable of age and faculty job readiness measured by the Readiness Scale--Staff Member Rating Scale, but not between age and faculty overall readiness.

According to Situational Leadership, employee job readiness related to specific tasks should only be affected by the person's knowledge and skills related to the tasks, and age should not be a factor that mediates employee task-relevant job readiness. However, since it is only logical to speculate age to be related positively with years of teaching experience, it was not surprising that age was related to faculty job readiness, too.

7. The current format of the Readiness Scales--Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale--lacks clarity and needs revision.

A number of the respondents complained that the Readiness Scales were confusing, and the scales were returned unfinished. Others did not understand the instructions and were unable to complete the Readiness Scales correctly, which resulted in unusable data returned. However, in this study, no major changes had been made either with the scales themselves or with the instructions attached to them when these scales were sent to the subjects. These reports suggest a lack of clarity of both the format and the instructions of the Readiness Scales.
Recommendations

Based on the conclusions cited in this chapter, the following recommendations are made for further research on the instruments used in Situational Leadership:

1. Further study needs to focus on validation of the Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale. The results of this study did not provide sufficient evidence to establish the construct validity of the readiness scales in that no relationship was found between the variables of readiness and achievement motivation.

Further efforts should also be made to examine the construct of employee psychological readiness as is defined in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership. Problems have been raised in previous studies that the construct of employee readiness is not clearly and well defined, and the findings of the present study have also added further doubt about the conceptual definition of the construct.

2. The present study has identified a discrepancy between the follower's (faculty's) self-perceptions of readiness and those of the leader (department chair). According to Situational Leadership, it is critical that the leader is able to assess accurately the follower's readiness level so that the appropriate leadership style can be applied to match the readiness level. Such a match between the follower's readiness level and the leadership style will
maximize leadership effectiveness. Further study is necessary to identify any underlying factors other than achievement motivation and education and work experience that may affect the leader's assessment of the follower's readiness related to specific tasks. There is also a need for studying whether the leader is always capable and has the necessary information to decide a follower's task-relevant readiness.

3. The Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale—need modification and revision to improve the accuracy of their assessment and to increase the capacity of their discrimination of the four readiness levels.

4. The Readiness Scales—Manager Rating Scale and Staff Member Rating Scale—need to be revised to improve their clarity and effectiveness. The current format and instructions appear to cause participants some confusion about the appropriate method for completing the forms.

5. Further study should focus on validation of the Achievement Orientation Scale and the NachNaff Scale since no support was found in this study for the concurrent validity of the two instruments.

Summary

This study has provided data and information about the
construct validity of the two instruments measuring employee readiness: the Readiness Scale—Manager Rating Scale and the Readiness Scale—Staff Member Rating Scale developed by Hambleton, Hersey, and Blanchard in 1977. The findings that a follower's educational and work experience were correlated with the follower's task-relevant job readiness have confirmed that leaders can rely on the factors of education and work experience for accurately assessing the follower's job readiness related to specific tasks. The lack of identified relations between the two concepts of psychological readiness and achievement motivation suggests that both the psychological readiness construct and the instrument that measures the construct need further investigation. Also, the study raises a serious question about whether the leader always has sufficient information to assess accurately the follower's overall readiness levels related to specific tasks. There are also reasons to question whether there are unidentified factors other than achievement motivation and education and work experience that affect the follower's job relevant readiness. Further identification of these factors can help the leader accurately judge the follower's readiness levels.

Although no single research study can generate all the answers to the questions at hand, this study has certainly contributed to enlarging the data base for research on Situational Leadership and its instruments. It is also true
that the study has generated findings that have pointed out new directions for further research on Situational Leadership.
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Departments in the 12 Institutions
Selected for The Study

**Alabama State University**

- Curriculum and Instruction
- Health, Physical Education and Recreation
- Humanistic and Behavioral Studies
- Instructional Support Services
- Art
- Biology
- Communications Media
- Criminal Justice
- English
- History and Social Sciences
- Mathematics and Physical Sciences
- Accounting and Finance
- Computer Information Systems
- Business Administration

**Arkansas Technical University**

- Accounting
- Business and Economics
- Elementary Education
- Health and Physical Education
- Secondary Education
- Art
- Behavioral Sciences
- English and Foreign Language
- Music
- Social Science and Philosophy
- Speech, Theater, and Journalism
- Biological Sciences
- Nursing
- Physical Sciences
- Agriculture
- Engineering
- Mathematics
- Recreation and Park Administration
University of North Florida

Economics and Geography
Communications and Visual Arts
History, Philosophy and Religious Studies
Language and Literature
Mathematical Sciences
Natural Sciences
Political Sciences & Sociology, Criminal Justice
Psychology
Accounting and Finance
Management, Marketing and Logistics
Educational Services and Research
Computer and Information Sciences

Augusta College, Georgia

Biology
Chemistry
Developmental Studies
Fine Arts
History, Political Science, and Philosophy
Languages and Literature
Mathematics and Computer Science
Nursing
Psychology
Sociology
Accounting, Economics, and Finance
Management, Marketing, and Management Information Systems
Health and Physical Education

Nicholls State University, Louisiana

Art
Chemistry and Physics
Computer Science
Earth Sciences
English
Foreign Languages
Government
History
Music
Speech
Administration Services and Vocational Business Education
Economics and Finance
Developmental Programs
Health and Physical Education
Psychology and Counselor Education
Aeronautical Science
Agriculture
Biological Sciences
Engineering Technology

Delta State University, Mississippi

Arts,
Biological Sciences
History
Languages and Literature
Mathematics
Music
Physical Sciences
Social Sciences and Philosophy
Accounting
Commercial Aviation
Computer Information
Economics and Finance
Management and Marketing
Behavioral Sciences
Curriculum, Instruction, Leadership and Research
Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Home Economics

University of North Carolina--Asheville

Art
Atmospheric Sciences
Biology
Chemistry
Classics
Computer Science
Drama
Economics
Education
Engineering
Environmental Studies
Foreign Languages
Health Promotion
History
Humanities
Literature and Language
Management
Mass Communication
Mathematics
Music
Philosophy
Physics
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Accounting
Aerospace
Art
Biological Sciences
Business Administration and Management
Business Education and Secretarial Administration
Communication and Theater
Computer Science and Information Systems
Economics
Electronics
Elementary Education
English, Humanities and Languages
Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Home Economics
Industrial Education
Mathematics
Music
Physical Sciences
Professional Education and Psychology
Safety
Social Sciences
Sociology

Coastal Carolina College, South Carolina

Early Childhood and Elementary Education
Secondary Education
Physical Education and Recreation
Nursing and Health
Art
English and Speech
Foreign Languages
History
Music
Philosophy and Religion
Biology
Government and International Studies and Geography
Marine Science
Mathematics
Psychology and Sociology

Tennessee State University

Agricultural Sciences
Home Economics
Dental Hygiene
Medical Record Administration
Respiratory Therapy
Speech Pathology and Audiology
Biological Sciences
Chemistry
Criminal Justice
Languages, Literature, and Philosophy
History, Geography and Political Sciences
Music
Physics, Mathematics and Computer Science
Social Work and Sociology
Accounting and Law
Business Administration
Business Education and Office Administration
Economics and Finance
Educational Administration
Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Psychology
Teaching and Learning
Architectural Engineering
Civil Engineering
Electronic Engineering
Industrial Arts and Technology
Baccalaureate Degree Nursing

University of Texas--San Antonio

Accounting and Information Systems
Economics and Finance
Management and Marketing
Art and Design
English, Classics, and Philosophy
Foreign Languages
Foreign Languages
Earth and Physical Sciences
Engineering
Life Sciences
Mathematics, Computer Science, and Statistics
Behavioral and Cultural Sciences
Bicultural, Bilingual Studies
Social and Policy Sciences

Virginia State University

Agriculture
Engineering Technology
Industrial Education and Technology
Human Ecology
Accounting and Finance
Business Administration
Business Education and Office Management
Business Information Systems
Economics
Marketing and Management
Public Administration
Academic Support Service
Curriculum and Instruction
Educational Leadership
Fine and Commercial Art
History and International Studies
Languages and Literature
Political Science
Sociology and Social Work
Chemistry
Geological Sciences
Life Sciences
Mathematics
Physics
Psychology
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Faculty Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please complete the following items by checking the appropriate number or filling in the appropriate number, whichever is appropriate.

1. Sex ______ 1. Male ______ 2. Female

2. Age ______ 1. 25-30 ______ 5. 46-50
   ______ 2. 31-35 ______ 6. 51-55
   ______ 3. 36-40 ______ 7. 56-60
   ______ 4. 41-45 ______ 8. 61-65
   ______ 9. Over 65

3. Academic Rank:
   ______ 1. Professor
   ______ 2. Associate Professor
   ______ 3. Assistant Professor

4. Highest Education Level:
   ______ 1. Doctorate
   ______ 2. Specialist
   ______ 3. Master's
   ______ 4. Bachelor's

5. Number of years of experience in the present teaching position (please include this year):______

6. Total number of years of experience of higher education teaching (Please include this year):______

7. Number of publications of research articles, books, and chapters in books during the last three years:

   Books ______  Chapters ______  Articles ______

8. Number of presentations made at national, regional and state professional conferences during the last three years:

   National ______  Regional ______  State ______

9. The yearly average number of hours that have been spent serving on committees during the last three years:

   1) 1989-1990 ______
   2) 1988-1989 ______
   3) 1987-1988 ______
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