SUPERIORS' AND SUBORDINATES' PERCEPTIONS AND

EXPECTATIONS OF THE LEADER BEHAVIOR OF

THE DEAN OF INSTRUCTION:

A SURVEY OF THE

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

Edward W. Cox

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1973

Approved by

_____
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee
of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Caro-
lina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

Oral Examination
Committee Members

ABSTRACT

COX, EDWARD WILTON. Superiors' and Subordinates' Perceptions and
Expectations of the Leader Behavior of the Dean of Instruction: A
Survey of The North Carolina Community College System. (1973)
Directed by: Dr. Roland H. Nelson. Pp. 191.

The concern of this investigation was chiefly with a des-

cription of faculty perceptions of and expectations for the dean of

instruction's leader behavior as compared with similar ratings by

the president and the dean himself. In this study the faculty were

referred to as subordinates and the presidents were referred to as

superiors.

Perceptions of leader behavior reflect the different styles

of leader behavior in which educational administrators engage in

interacting with and relating to their various reference groups.

Expectations of leader behavior reflect the different roles

which administrators must seek to fulfill in the course of their

duties. Previous studies suggest that educational administrators

adopt different styles of leader behavior in dealing with different

groups, and that they experience role conflict stemming from conflict-

ing perceptions and expectations of superiors and subordinates.

The investigation was designed as a study of the leader behavior

of the dean of instruction in the community college setting. The dean,

as appointed head of the instructional program, is confronted with a

dual leadership role. The dean's role behavior is his behavior as

perceived by others with whom he interacts and himself. The dean's

role expectation is the pattern of behavior considered ideal by others

with whom he interacts and by himself. Role behavior is perceived differently by different groups and at times differently by the same group under other circumstances. Role expectations also change or vary with changing situations.

The focus of the study was on the influence the dean of instruction as a leader exerts in his interaction with superiors and subordinates, his behavior as he exerts this influence, and how his behavior is perceived by himself, his superiors, and subordinates as he endeavors to establish well-defined patterns for achieving organizational goals while maintaining personal relations indicative of friendship, mutual trust, and respect.

In a formal organization the leader is provided feedback or stimulus in the form of individual and group reactions to his behavior as a leader. This enables him to form personal perceptions about his own behavior. Thus the leader develops knowledge of his own behavior either by being told how he behaves or by observing the reactions of others to his behavior.

If the dean of instruction is receptive to differences between the perceptions of the superiors and subordinates, and those he holds about his own behavior, then he should synthesize these perceptions to form leader behavior more appropriate to the needs of the group and the organization. He thus tends to integrate knowledge about the difference in perceptions.

The study centered on the leader behavior of the dean of instruction and his interpersonal relations and interactions with other superior and subordinate members of the hierarchical organization. Two dimensions

of leader behavior were examined: Initiating Structure, in which well-defined organizational goals and procedures are emphasized, and Consideration, which refers to behavior indicative of personal respect and warmth between the leader and group members. These two dimensions were analyzed under both actually perceived or "Real" behavior, and expected or "Ideal" behavior.

In order for the dean to perform effectively he should be able to adapt his behavior to the needs of faculty members. Effective operation permits the realization of organizational goals. For this to occur efficiently, the dean should be able to perceive accurately feedback from superiors and subordinates about his own behavior. Efficiency is concerned with the satisfaction of individual needs.

No attempt was made to evaluate the effectiveness or efficiency of a particular administrator involved in the study. Comparisons were made of total groups. A methodological weakness in the analysis and reporting of data collected known as the "good-bad" syndrome was avoided.

In response to the initial letter to the president, replies were received from forty of the fifty-six institutions in the North Carolina Community College System. Out of these forty replies, one was not acceptable for the study because the president was also serving as dean of instruction. Twelve other institutions declining to participate had good and sufficient reasons. For example, some of the staff and faculty were involved in institutional self-studies, meeting requirements for accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation, and bond referendums. Twenty-seven of the fifty-six institutions yielded sufficient response from the faculty, deans, and presidents to be included in the final institutional sample.

A random selection of faculty members resulted in three hundred and five being invited to participate in the study. Responses were received from one hundred and ninety-nine faculty which represents a 65 per cent return. Each of the twenty-seven presidents and twenty-seven deans in the final sample returned their questionnaires which represents a 100 per cent return. The distribution of useable replies among the faculty was such that there were no institutions with fewer than four faculty observations of the dean's behavior. The maximum number of replies which could be expected from any one institution was twelve. The minimum replies received from any one faculty group was four (two institutions) and the maximum was ten. The leader behavior of the dean of instruction as perceived (Real) and as expected (Ideal) was described by the president, a sample of faculty members, and the dean himself.

The null hypothesis stated in this study asserted that there are no significant differences in the faculty's, presidents', or deans' ratings, or responses, for each dimension when compared with each other.

The chi square analysis was used to determine if there were significant differences in the frequency of responses or ratings between faculty and presidents, between faculty and deans, and between presidents and deans for data on the "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions of leader behavior as contained in the forty items on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. As stated previously, the .05 level of confidence was selected as an acceptable level to denote significance.

This questionnaire was developed by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University. The instrument focuses upon a "description"

of what a leader does rather than upon an "evaluation" of what he does. The two dimensions of leader behavior identified by this questionnaire are Initiating Structure and Consideration.

The respondents were asked to describe the dean of instruction's leader behavior as they actually perceived it and as they thought it should be. They were not asked to judge whether the behavior was desirable or undesirable. Each item on the LBDQ describes a specific kind of behavior and the respondents were simply asked to describe the dean's leader behavior as accurately as they could. On the LBDQ "Real" the respondent presidents, faculty, and the deans themselves were asked to think how frequently the dean engages in the behavior described by the item (forty items) and then decide whether he (1) always, (2) often, (3) occasionally, (4) seldom, or (5) never, acts as described by the item. After making the decision, each of the respondents was asked to draw a circle around one of the five letters to show the answer they selected. On the LBDQ "Ideal" the same group of respondents were asked to decide how frequently the dean "should" act as described by the item (forty items).

Significant differences were found on a number of items between ratings by faculty members and presidents, between faculty members and deans, and between presidents and deans for "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions relative to Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Mean scores of faculty members, presidents, and deans as total groups were tabulated for "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions for both Initiating Structure and Consideration items on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Low mean scores in this study were indicative of high expectations or perceptions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express particular appreciation and gratitude to his committee chairman, Dr. Roland H. Nelson, Jr. The author also wishes to tender sincere appreciation to Dr. Dale Brubaker, Dr. Donald W. Russell, and Dr. E. William Noland who contributed generously of their knowledge and time in guiding certain phases of the study and making valuable suggestions for its improvement.

Expression of appreciation is extended to Dr. Gary L. Sapp of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and to Dr. Herbert Kirk of the faculty at North Carolina State University who afforded much help in regards to certain phases of the statistical treatment.

Acknowledgment is also made of the valued services of Mrs. Jeanette Dean, Mrs. Betty Swift, and Mrs. Bobbie Tillery.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The unprecedented growth of the community college movement

has been at the same time both the most outstanding and the most

controversial development in American post-secondary education

during the decade of the 1960's (and even into the 1970's).

The community college is a unique twentieth-century innova-

tion in higher education created to serve America's dynamic educa-

tional needs ever changing in the rapid techno-cosmo society. The

former State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Florida, Thomas

D. Bailey, expressed his thoughts on the growth and development of

community colleges:

> If I were asked to name the fastest growing phase of
> education in the nation today, I would answer unhesi-
> tatingly, the community junior college. If I were asked
> to name what I considered to be the most significant and
> promising development in education in recent years, I
> would answer the same--the community junior college.
> And if I were asked what I considered the most promising
> facet of education in the future, I would answer again--
> the community college.[1]

It is the most rapidly expanding segment of higher education

which has led William A. Harper to make the observation in 1970

---

[1]Thomas D. Bailey, "Social and Economic Necessity of Community
Junior Colleges," The Community College in the South: Progress and
Prospect. (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern States Work Conference, 1962),
p. 122.

that should the present rate of growth continue, there would be over

1200 such educational institutions by 1975 affording the most exten-

sive and comprehensive educational opportunities that man has ever

experienced.[2]

Most people have come to expect six major purposes or func-

tions to be filled by the community colleges:

1. Two years of pre-professional or liberal arts educa-
   tion as part of a four-year degree program.

2. One-to-two years of vocational or technical education
   to meet pre-employment requirements for the world of
   work.

3. Guided studies or remedial education to assist one
   to enter a higher level of occupational or transfer
   education.

4. Exploratory education to assist one with occupational
   and educational planning.

5. Adult education for occupational inservice, citizenship
   development, consumer enlightenment, and self-realization.

6. Community educational services for resource development,
   problem-solving, and long-range planning.[3]

In commenting on the philosophy of the "open-door" institution,

Dr. Dallas Herring, Chairman of the North Carolina Board of Education,

observes that the only valid philosophy for that state is a philosophy

of total education for it's constituents recognizing the belief in the

[2]William A. Harper, 1970 Junior College Directory. (Washing-
ton, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), p. 9.

[3]Dewey A. Adams, "The Philosophy of the Comprehensive Community
College and A Challenge to the Adult Education Instructor." A speech
delivered to a Faculty Workshop, College of The Albermarle, Elizabeth
City, North Carolina, April 27, 1971.

incomparable worth of all human beings whose talents must be developed
to the fullest degree.[4] This tends to reinforce the concept that with-
in the assigned function of the system of community colleges, the insti-
tutions must never be closed to anyone of suitable age who can learn
what is taught in the institutions.

Truly the "open-door" institution is unique in the annals
of higher education. This uniqueness is clearly identified by
Fields when he describes five fundamental characteristics which con-
tribute to their uniqueness: democratic, comprehensive, community-
centered, adaptable, and dedicated to life-long learning.[5]

Further exploration would reveal that the institutions are
democratic in that tuition and student costs are relatively low,
most of the institutions are geographically close to the people of
the community, and admission is on a non-selective basis, the only
requirement being that the person must have a high school diploma
or its equivalent. However, some institutions probably have a policy
of selective admissions in which students are admitted only to those
programs where there is some reason to believe they will service.
The institutions are comprehensive in that they accommodate a wide
range of students with varying aptitudes, abilities and interest,

[4]Dallas W. Herring, "Open the Door--All the Way," Proceed-
ings. . . An Orientation Conference. . . Community Colleges, Techni-
cal Institutes, Industrial Education Centers, Chapel Hill, N.C.,
June 7 and 8, 1964.

[5]Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement. (New
York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 63-95.

and community-centered by a virtually benefiting exchange of leader-
ship and coordination between the community and the institution.
Facilities and programs often are easily changeable to meet dif-
ferences of students and needs of the communities, thus they are
adaptable, and life-long learning is provided through continuing
adult education to a host of individuals and groups of all ages,
needs, backgrounds, and interests.

The community college has become one of the chief instru-
ments with which the nation has democratized higher education.
They are by definition educational and cultural centers for the
communities which they serve. As previously mentioned, they offer
a wide range of transfer and occupational courses as well as con-
tinuing adult education and community services. The community ser-
vice programs may include courses for teaching or upgrading of job
skills, courses for general cultural enrichment, community concert
or lecture series, or other activities which use the resources of
the college, including the physical plant and staff, for the benefit
of the community. The aim of state laws and municipal ordinances
creating community colleges is to make them financially and geograph-
ically accessible to all who can benefit from and wish to take ad-
vantage of their offerings. This commitment to accessibility is
further enhanced by low cost tuition and fees and strategic location
of institutions within commuting distance of ninety to ninety-five
percent of all citizens who need and can benefit from such education.
In an effort to attain this goal, 56 post-secondary institutions have
been established throughout the state. Currently one or more of these

schools is within commuting distance of 95 percent of the state's population. Both the academically talented and the disadvantaged can find programs to fit their needs in the community college whether the needs are for preparation for a new career or to upgrade skills for their present occupation. A high value is placed on the "teaching skill" of faculty members. "Publish or perish" is not a major concern of the community college faculty members. Research and publication is not discouraged, but the principal emphasis is on teaching and counselling with students.

Dr. Ben Fountain, now president of the North Carolina Community College System has commented that:

> The objective of the State Board of Education is to create institutions, with a high level of autonomy in a coordinated system, which offer comprehensive educational opportunities for adults. Teaching, learning, and community service are the primary missions of the community college system. Occupationally trained and educated citizens are the expected outcomes.[6]

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Dean of Instruction has a very influential status in the local institutions. His leader behavior may affect profoundly the efficient and effective operation of a particular institution. The relatively high status within the organizational framework

---

[6]Ben E. Fountain, "The Citizen and His Community," _North Carolina Education_, (September, 1968), p. 13.

accorded him is reflected in the magnitude of his delegated responsibility in the instructional area. He is the person to whom the President normally delegates the responsibility for and authority to implement instructional policies determined by the governing board. In this role he should use his influence to carry out the wishes of his superiors but at the same time he should be responsive to his subordinates (faculty) and receptive to their wishes and needs.

The concern of this study is the influence the dean of instruction as a leader exerts in his interaction with superiors and subordinates, his behavior as he exerts this influence, and how his behavior is perceived by himself, his superiors, and subordinates as he endeavors to establish well-defined patterns for achieving organizational goals while maintaining personal relations indicative of friendship, mutual trust, and respect.

In a formal organization the leader is provided feedback or stimulus in the form of individual and group reactions to his behavior as a leader. This enables him to form personal perceptions about his own behavior. Thus the leader develops knowledge of his own behavior either by being told how he behaves or by observing the reactions of others to his behavior.

If the dean of instruction is receptive to differences between the perceptions of superiors and subordinates, and those he holds about his own behavior, then he will synthesize these perceptions to form leader behavior more appropriate to the needs of the group and the organization. He will tend to integrate knowledge about the differences in perceptions.

The rationale is that the perceptiveness of the dean of in-
struction to synthesize the perceptions of superiors and subordinates
will result in his developing adaptive behavior which is a pre-
requisite to the developing of remunerative behavior.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The dean of instruction is the functional administrator in
the community college who can make a significant educational con-
tribution while building a strong and viable instructional program
and at the same time create a learning climate conducive to free
inquiry and development of the individual's talents, both latent
and manifest.

This study will focus on the leader behavior of the dean
of instruction and his interpersonal relations and interactions
with other superior and subordinate members of the hierarchical
organization as measured on two dimensions of leader behavior,
Initiating Structure and Consideration.

In order for the dean to perform effectively he must be able
to adapt his behavior to the needs of the faculty. For this to
occur efficiently, he must be able to perceive accurately feed-back
from superiors and subordinates about his own behavior. The author
contends the role of the executive as described by Barnard is that
he is primarily concerned with decisions which facilitate or hinder
in the effective and efficient operation of the organization. Effective[7]

---

[7]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive. (Cambridge,
Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 215.

operation permits the realization of organizational goals.[8] Efficiency is concerned with the satisfaction of individual needs.[9] Thus the study will be a descriptive analysis of superior--subordinate relationships.

In implementing or realizing the "open-door" policy community colleges have developed varied patterns of organization and emphasis. Some have been primarily concerned with general education while others have emphasized comprehensive programs fulfilling all six purposes or functions enumerated earlier. Still others, as do North Carolina's technical institutes, have given extensive emphasis to occupationally related programs while gradually advancing toward more comprehensive programming. The primary concern has been toward serving the unique community of interest, and regardless of the programs of greatest emphasis, the one person in the hierarchical organization who should be aware that weakness in any one of these areas acts adversely on the whole educational and instructional program is the dean of instruction. He should realize that mediocrity at any level of education denies fulfillment of the aspirations of individuals and society. His fundamental challenge, therefore, is to achieve excellence and coordination for the total instructional program of the particular institution with which he is associated.

---

[8]Ibid., p. 19.

[9]Ibid., p. 37.

Further support for this study was found in a study by Gould,

The Academic Deanship, in which he made two proposals:

1. It would be profitable to make a close study of
    individual academic deans for the sake of des-
    cribing and analyzing the totality of their
    decanal behavior in the context of institutional
    tradition, organization, and interpersonal rela-
    tionships. Such studies would serve to identify,
    among other things, the leadership techniques
    which these deans have proved most helpful.

2. Parallel studies might be made of the role of the
    academic dean of a given college as perceived by
    the president, the dean himself, the department
    chairman, and members of the faculty. It is
    hoped that such studies might reveal the places
    where disagreement and misunderstanding are
    generated, with implications for remedial action
    in the colleges studied and in others as well.[10]

Gould's second proposal thus serves as impetus for this

study in hopes that it might reveal places where misunderstanding

and disagreement are generated and harbored and with further hopes

that an analysis of the situation and problem will generate suf-

ficient data to allow the author to make recommendations with

implications for actions to remedy the situations as they might

exist in the North Carolina Community College System and in the

individual institutions.

Much of the recent emphasis on leadership style and be-

havior has been placed not only on the achievement of organizational

structure, but additional emphasis has been placed on fulfilling the

---

[10]John W. Gould, The Academic Deanship. (New York: Teachers
College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1964), p.
101.

needs of the individuals in the organization, referred to as
group maintenance or consideration. Thus seen, leadership is
an aspect of organization and could operationally be considered
as "the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organized
group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement."[11]
In this context, the dean of instruction emerges as that person
who becomes differentiated from other members of the institution
staff in terms of the influence he exerts upon the goal setting
and goal achievement instructional activities of the organization.

Coladarci and Getzels express concern for the authoritarian
personality on the educational scene:

> The reason that an authoritarian relationship
> is likely to fail in the educational setting is
> not that authoritarian leadership is intrinsically
> inefficient and democratic leadership efficient, or
> that school men are by nature temperamentally inde-
> pendent and unsuited to authoritarian relationships.
> It is, rather, that authoritarian leadership does not
> have legitimacy in the common American educational
> setting. Authoritarian leadership is based more
> readily on charismatic and traditionalistic relation-
> ships, democratic leadership on rational relation-
> ships. It would be as inherently contradictory for
> a leader who bases his authority on traditional grounds
> (e.g., the monarch) or on charismatic grounds (e.g.,
> the prophet) to be 'democratic' as it is for the
> leader in the educational setting to be 'authori-
> tarian.'[12]

---

[11]C. A. Gibb, _Leadership_. (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1969), p. 42.

[12]Arthur P. Coladarci and Jacob W. Getzels, _The Use of Theory in Educational Administration_. (Educational Administration Monograph No. 5, Stanford: School of Education, Stanford University, 1955), p. 13.

Robb indicates that "effective participation by the dean in governing a college should be based upon neither authoritarianism nor the vaporous processes of group dynamics."[13]

The author of this dissertation takes the viewpoint that leadership is an aspect of group organization. That is, organization is viewed as a group in which members are separated as to their responsibilities in achieving group goals. A distinction has been made by Stogdill as follows:

> The members of a group may or may not have responsibilities for a common task. If the members do have differentiated responsibilities in relation to common goals, then the group is an organization--a particular kind of group.[14]

Other writers in the field of business organizations share Stogdill's view. Davis, for example, states that ". . . the development of organization, structure is largely a problem in the division of responsibility, and involves two important problems: (1) the grouping of similar functions to form the various organization elements in a manner that will promote effective cooperation, and (2) the determination of the proper relationships between functional groups and organization elements; with a view to promoting both cooperation and effective leadership."[15]

---

[13]Felix C. Robb, "Introduction," in The Deanship of the Liberal Arts College, eds. David G. Mobberly and Myron F. Wicke, (Nashville, Tennessee: The Methodist Church Board of Education, 1962), p. 11.

[14]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Leadership, Membership and Organization," Psychological Bulletin, XLVII, (January, 1950), p. 3.

[15]R. C. Davis, as quoted in Leadership by C.A. Gibb, ed., op. cit., p. 43.

Doi has commented that research is needed in context of
current frames of references which considers "the theories and
concepts developed by behavioral scientists and students of public
and business administration. The major barriers to the new and
further exploration is the sensitivity of colleges and universities
to intensive scrutiny of organizational values, of administrative
behavior, and of patterns of authority, influence, and communication."[16]
The author assumes the barriers referred to by Doi will not be major
ones in this study.

In the surge of unprecedented growth in the community col-
lege system in North Carolina mentioned previously, the one role
that has become preeminent, other than the presidency, in achieving
organizational goals and maintaining cohesiveness, has been that
of the dean of instruction. In some of the community colleges in
North Carolina this position is held by a director or chairman of
instructional services, vice president for instruction, or director
of occupational education. For purposes of this study we use the
designation dean of instruction.

The president, dean of instruction, other staff members, and
the faculty, influence the nature and the quality of the academic
and occupational programs. The person in the organization hierarchy,
however, who has the major task of implementing policy for academic
outstandingness, whether college transfer, occupational, general

---

[16]James I. Doi, "Organization, Administration, Finance, Facili-
ties," Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXV, (October 1965), p. 32.

education, or continuing adult education, is the dean of instruc-

tion. In recommending and implementing education policies, the

dean of instruction is influenced, among others, by his superior,

staff subordinates, and by faculty members.

His perception of the president's and faculty members' ex-

pectations of his role behavior tends to shape his behavior.

Hollander comments that:

> Who perceives what about whom is of central importance
> not just in terms of the literal case, but also in terms
> of expectancies. The behavior of the object person is
> not seen just by itself; it is also effectively matched [17]
> against a standard of expectation held by the perceiver.

Therefore a better understanding of the president's and faculty

members' perception and expectations of his behavior is necessary

for efficient and effective leader behavior--<u>effective</u> to the degree

that he delineates the relationship between himself and the members

of the group, and endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of

organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the

job done (Initiating Structure)-- <u>efficient</u> in that his behavior

is indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in

relationship between himself and members of the institution with

whom he is associated (Consideration).

Thus the dean of instruction has a unique and dual leader-

ship role. He must be concerned with group maintenance, referred

to in this study as Consideration, and he also must be concerned

---

[17]E. P. Hollander, in <u>Leadership</u>, quoted by C.A. Gibb, ed.,
1969, p. 294.

with goal achievements, referred to in this study as Initiating Struc-

ture. During World War II, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS)

personnel assessment section defined this type of dual leadership

role: Leadership is "a man's ability to take the initiative in

social situations, to plan and organize action, and in doing so to

evoke cooperation."[18]

Cooperation is the key concept because the best possible

decisions quite possibly will not be implemented without coopera-

tion from superiors and subordinates. Barnard in distinguishing

between the effectiveness and efficiency of cooperative action

observes that the persistence of cooperation depends upon two

conditions:

> (a) its effectiveness; and (b) its efficiency. Effective-
> ness relates to the accomplishment of the cooperative pur-
> pose, which is social and nonpersonal in character. Efficien-
> cy relates to the satisfaction of individual motives, and is
> personal in character. The test of effectiveness is the
> accomplishment of a common purpose or purposes: effective-
> ness can be. measured. The test of efficiency is the elic-
> iting of sufficient individual wills to cooperate . . . the
> survival of cooperation depends upon these two interrelated
> and interdependent classes of processes.[19]

With the description of the two major group objectives defined,

this research study will attempt to delineate the leader behaviors

---

[18]Office of Strategic Service Assessment Staff, The Assess-
ment of Men (New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1948), p. 301.
in Andrew W. Halpin (ed.), Theory and Research in Administration,
(London: The MacMillan Company, 1969), p. 37.

[19]Barnard, op. cit., pp. 60-61, in Andrew W. Halpin Theory
and Research in Administration (London: The MacMillan Company,
1969), p. 38.

associated with the accomplishment of these objectives. For this

purpose the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, devised by

the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University will be used.

Earlier research using this instrument identified two dimensions

of leader behavior: Initiating Structure in Interaction and Con-
sideration.[20] Halpin and Winer in reporting the development of an

Air Force adaptation of the instrument delineated these same dimen-

sions on the basis of a factor analysis of responses to the
questionnaire.[21]

ASSUMPTIONS

Perception involves the reception and interpretation of

external stimuli. It is concerned with an awareness of condi-

tions or objects around a subject, and an understanding of these
objects and events.[22] The manner in which a stimulus is perceived

will largely determine the effect it has upon the receiver. If an

individual does not perceive an object or event objectively, he

does not know the stimulus as it really is. An object or event

is perceived objectively when it is in accord with reality.

---

[20]Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration
(London: The MacMillan Company, 1969), p. 39.

[21]Ibid., p. 39.

[22]Floyd H. Alport, Theories of Perception and the Concept
of Structure (New York: John Wiley, 1955), p. 15.

A person's mental image of an object or event is called a
23
percept.   However, the percept may not always be in accord with

reality because the formation of the percept is "private" or

"observer involved." It results from mental processes and is

therefore dependent upon personality. Since high or low scores

on the dimensions of Initiating Structure or Consideration as per-

ceived by superiors and subordinates would be indicative of per-

ceived personality development, the phenomenon of perception provides

the foundation for associating the leader behavior dimensions of

Initiating Structure and Consideration with perceptual accuracy

and different styles of leader behavior.

The author assumes those who participate in this descrip-

tive study will share an awareness that Flocco has referred to in

an unpublished Doctoral dissertation:

> Moderate self-assessment results from a mind open
> to self examination. This attitude in turn fosters
> quality behavior because of the resulting recogni-
> tion of personal shortcomings, which when modified
> results in more desirable behavior. Therefore,
> casual relationships for moderate self-assessment
> should be examined, and subsequent relationships
> to daily behavior should be suggested.[24]

---

[23]Ibid., p. 23.

[24]Edward C. Flocco, "An Examination of the Leader Behavior
of School Business Administrators." Unpublished Doctoral dis-
sertation, New York University, New York, N. Y., 1968, p. 100.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

The respondent sample for the study is drawn from the
56 institutions which comprise the North Carolina Community College
System. The system includes 15 institutions which carry the desig-
nation technical institute. The sample is drawn from the 56
presidents, the 56 deans of instruction, and approximately four
to twelve faculty members from each institution. Each respondent
included in the study, has been employed at least six months in
his present position at the time of the study.

The study is a descriptive research design. The research
instrument is the <u>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire</u>--
(Real, Ideal, and Ideal Self)--to measure reference group and
individual perceptions of the leader behavior of the dean of
instruction. The items on the questionnaire describe a specific
kind of behavior, but do not ask the respondent to judge whether
the behavior is desirable or undesirable. The respondent is only
to describe as accurately as possible the behavior of the dean of
instruction as he perceives it.

No attempt is made to evaluate the effectiveness or
efficiency of a particular administrator involved in the study.
The author attempts to avoid a methodological weakness referred
to by Lipham as the "good-bad" syndrome in the analysis and report-
ing of the data collected.[25]

---

[25]James M. Lipham, "The Role of the Principal: Search and
Research," <u>Elementary Principal</u>, Vol. XLIV, (April), pp. 28-33.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Leader--the formally designated leader of a specified work
group. For purposes of this study, all deans of instruction are
designated as leaders.

Behavior--the term is used in a broad sense to include an
individual's perceptions, feelings, attitudes, thoughts and ver-
balizations as well as overt actions.[26]

Leader Behavior--the manifestation of Initiating Structure
and Consideration as displayed by the leader in his interactions
with the work group, including superiors and subordinates, and
his behavior as described as a broad sense referred to in the
above definition of behavior.

Initiating Structure--refers to the leader's behavior in
delineating the relationship between himself and members of his
group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of
organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the
job done.[27] It is one of two dimensions of leader behavior examined
in this research.

---

[26]Halpin, op. cit., p. 28.

[27]Andrew W. Halpin, Manual for the Leader Behavior Descrip-
tion Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research,
The Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1 (Mimeographed).

Consideration--refers to behavior indicative of friendship,

mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationship between the leader
                                28
and members of the group.   It is the second of two dimensions of

leader behavior examined in this research.

Group--refers to a department, division, or other unit or

organization which is supervised by the person (leader) being des-
        29
cribed.   In this study this is the various department and division

chairmen and/or directors and other faculty members.

Members--refers to all the people in the unit or organization
                                                            30
which is supervised by the person (leader) being described.

Dean of Instruction--the person other than the president of

an institution who is directly responsible for the entire instruc-

tional program.

Superior(s)--refers to that person(s) who has the power and

authority to make decisions which guide and influence the actions

of others.   For purposes of this study, the superior is the presi-
                                                            31
dent or chief administrative officer of the institution.

_____

[28]Ibid., p. 1.

[29]Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio:
Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration,
The Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1.

[30]Ibid., p. 1.

[31]Maurice G. Verbeke, "The Junior College Academic Dean's
Leadership Behavior as Viewed by Superiors and Faculty." Unpub-
lished Doctoral dissertation, Pittsburgh, The Pennsylvania State
University, 1966.

Subordinate(s)--refers to the members of a group over whom
the dean of instruction has the power and authority to make decisions
affecting them, irrespective of their own feelings.[32] For purposes of
this study subordinates include various department and division chair-
men and/or directors and other faculty members.

Perception--is an immediate or intuitive cognition or judgment.[33]

Expectation--is defined as the desirable or appropriate be-
havior associated with a certain role. For purposes of this study
the president and individual instructional members of the staff con-
sider the dean of instruction's leader behavior in terms of how he
should act in certain leadership situations.[34]

Staff--that group of supervisory or executive personnel who
reports directly to the dean of instruction, or indirectly through
department or division chairmen. For purposes of this study this
includes all instructional personnel.

Ideal Leader Behavior--(What You Expect of Your Leader) re-
fers to the description of what an ideal leader ought to do in
supervising his group.[35] In this study superiors and subordinates

---

[32]Ibid., p. 16.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ideal Leader Behavior (Columbus, Ohio: Center for Business
and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio
State University, 1957), p. 1.

select from a list of items on the questionnaire those items which

describe what an ideal leader ought to do in supervising his group.

Ideal Leader Behavior-Ideal Self--refers to the description

of how you believe you ought to act as leader of your group.[36]   In

this study the dean of instruction selects from a list of items on

the questionnaire those items which describe his behavior as he

thinks he should act.

Formal Organization--organizations characterized by explicit

goals, rules and regulations with a well-defined structure with

clearly marked lines of authority and communications.[37]

Random Sample--"A random sample is one drawn in such a fashion

that every member of the population has an equal probability of being

included in it."[38]

ANCILLARY QUESTIONS

Is there a significant difference between the faculty per-

ceptions and expectations of the leader behavior of the dean of

instruction and the perceptions and expectations of the dean of

instruction himself as regards his own leader behavior on the

two dimensions?

---

[36]Ideal Leader Behavior-Ideal Self (Columbus, Ohio: Center
for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science,
The Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1.

[37]Peter M. Blau and Richard Scott, Formal Organizations,
(San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), p. 5.

[38]George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and
Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 4.

Is there a significant difference between the president's perceptions and expectations of the leader behavior of the dean of instruction and the perceptions and expectations of the dean of instruction himself as regards his own behavior on the two dimensions?

Is there a significant difference between the faculty's and president's perceptions and expectations of the leader behavior of the dean of instruction on the two dimensions?

HYPOTHESES

In an attempt to answer the ancillary questions, hypotheses developed and stated in null form are:

1. There is no significant difference in the faculty "Real" ratings for each dimension when compared with presidents'.

2. There is no significant difference in the faculty "Ideal" ratings for each dimension when compared with presidents.

3. There is no significant difference in the faculty "Real" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instructions' ratings of their own behavior for each dimension.

4. There is no significant difference in the faculty "Ideal" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instructions' ratings of their own behavior on each dimension.

5. There is no significant difference in the president's "Real" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instructions' ratings of their own behavior.

6. There is no significant difference in the president's "Ideal" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instructions' rating of their own behavior.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Leadership is a phenomenon which has intrigued man from
earliest times.   Philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle, have
speculated about it; prophets, such as Jesus and Paul, have fore-
told its influence; and theorists, such as Hemphill and Stogdill,
have pondered its attributes.

Some, according to an old saying, are born to leadership,
some achieve leadership, and others have leadership thrust upon
them. We have many beliefs and practices surviving from earlier
days regarding leaders and leadership. Typically, men and women
of Western European society believed that leadership behavior
could be learned, and that one did not have to be born of the
"purple robe of majesty" in order to lead. One can see here a
contradiction to the feudal conception of leadership which held
that leadership skills were the exuded product of generations of
rule. The feudal approach held that leaders must possess the in-
born instinct. The feudal conception of leadership maintained, as
Karl Mannheim has pointed out, that ". . . only a traditionally in-
herited instinct . . . can be of aid in moulding the future."[1]

---

[1]Alvin W. Gouldner, Studies in Leadership, (New York: Harper
& Brothers, 1950), p. 4.

Thus this ideology served to legitimate and reinforce the "heredi-tary--aristocracy" leadership status. Several early theorists attempted to explain leadership on the basis of inheritance as will be pointed out later in this discourse.

The ascending middle class in Western Europe finally sup-planted the aristocracy but in doing so had to confront, and take account of, the justification of the old aristocratic leadership. As part of their conflict with the feudal nobility, the bourgeois supported a concept of leadership as a learnable behavior, access-ible to all men of will and intellect, and which could be used through thought, discussion, and rational organization to master the social process.

As to the social function of this new concept of leadership, it served both as an ideological weapon against the established elite and as a justification to stabilize the power which the middle class had newly acquired.

Thus we see the middle class ascending to power in the European countries searching for leaders to rescue them from the perplexity of this triumph over the elite. This wave of enthusiasm which surrounded the great mass of workers followed the movement of man from the European countries to the shores of America.

In this study, the historical development of leadership has been somewhat confined to Western Europe because this approach seems to facilitate development of a perspective of leadership as it has evolved in this country. Many of the leaders of the freedom move-ments in Europe ultimately migrated to what became American shores

and by espousing various causes which appealed to a following
of like commitment became leaders in the early history of this
country.

The need for leadership seems to be somewhat proportional
to the magnitude of concern of the followers. If this holds true,
then in the early settlement of this country there was a dire need
for strong leaders committed to the task at hand--carving out the
new frontier. It is in large measure out of a challenge to the
fundamental value of freedom that emphasis on leadership derives,
and by which it is given its distinctive stamp. When leadership
is invoked today, often what is being asked for implicitly are
men or women who can accomplish what the alienated individual, over-
come by a sense of powerlessness, feels he cannot. Could this have
been the plight of the early settlers? If so, then the leader be-
comes the symbol of control and of knowledge and insight denied
the masses by themselves. In this way man turned to the impossible
"him," whomever it might be, who presumably could satisfy all his
wants and needs--and there were great men awaiting this call to
destiny and glory--leaders of the multitude of followers, strong
and courageous.

Leadership then might be seen as a complex of mediation
between the leader's personality, the follower's expectations,
the circumstances, and a set of goals. Rustow contends: "The need
for leadership is proportionate to the distance between circumstances

and goals."² Hence, the leader will be considered indispensable by

his followers in proportion to the magnitude of the task at hand.

Rustow further observes that: "Successful leadership seems

to rest on a latent congruence between the psychic needs of the

leader and the social needs of the followers."³ Thus leaders of

all situations should be cognizant of the fact that the really

hard work of the leadership process itself then is to make the

latent congruence manifest, and the large part of this work is

done by the leader himself. The task at hand is a process of dis-

covery, adjustment, and of consideration. And, as has been indi-

cated by Rustow in his writing on leadership style, that insofar

as there are traits common to all leaders, they are likely to be

traits that help in the performance of these several tasks.⁴

Communication is a chief resource of a leader. Since leader-

ship is usually competitive, the most effective leaders are likely

to be those who master some new technique of communication. Ken

Kesey, the leader of the Pranksters in Tom Wolfe's The Electric

Kool-Aid Acid Test had the ability to arouse the interest of his

followers so they would accept his goals and support him enthusias-

tically. He became a symbol of the whole movement he had initiated.

---

²Dankwart A. Rustow, Philosophers and Kings. (New York:
George Braziller, Inc., 1970), p. 20.

³Ibid., p. 23.

⁴Ibid.

Kesey used the technique of motion pictures complete with sound tract--no inhibitions--everything that happened to the leader and his followers was recorded on tapes or film or in writing. Martin Luther recognized the potential of the media when he distributed his _Ninety-two Theses_. Mahatma Ghandi traveled extensively by railroad communicating with his followers along the route. In addition, Ghandi was getting "sight exposure"--a form of communication also.

These examples tend to illustrate generalizations that leadership is recognized through the communication of ideas to the minds of others and that seemingly the great leaders usually combine their new movement with the mastery of a new technology of communication, and, in many instances, this takes the form of a new language--a language unique to the movement. Too, many of our great leaders, Roosevelt, Churchill, and DeGaulle for example, have been able to mediate between circumstances and goals and have been able through foresight, and maybe hindsight, to make use of unforseen events to pursue major goals. It appears to be a matter of timing. For instance, DeGaulle formed a highly critical view of the secularist republic under which he grew up a result of his family's religious and monarchist views. He also made use of his soldierly experience to rescue France from imminent or actual military occupation.[5]

---

[5]_Ibid._, p. 245.

There was no doubt charismatic response to the war leadership

of Sir Winston Churchill who in Great Britain's struggle with the

Germans in 1940 personified the will never to surrender and the

determination to fight on to victory. Franklin Roosevelt became

President of a crisis-stricken USA in 1933; he quickly proclaimed

the people had nothing to fear but fear itself while exuding a

charismatic response of confidence and optimism.[6] American Presidents,

Kennedy and Johnson, all successful to some degree, had the ability

not only to promote change but also to become aware of changes that

had gone unrecognized.

Leadership development has always been a serious concern

to society and scientists and non-scientists alike have long tried

to distinguish the talents and skills that have been attributed to

many of the outstanding and exceptional leaders of the past centuries.

In the pre-scientific era the focus seems to have been one

of folk wisdom. The pre-scientific era relied on intuition and

mostly experience to provide methods of developing leaders, and in-

dividuals were thus sought who had such God-given characteristics

as personal magnetism, exceptional energy, quick decision-making

style--all characteristics thought to be prerequisites for success-

ful leadership. The emphasis was on finding the person with the

necessary characteristics, providing the person with the suitable

knowledge and skills for the particular job--presto!--a new leader.

---

[6]Ibid., p. 82.

Contrast the scientific era. It is one of testing, measurement, and questioning. In this era we have the objective observation, the controlled experiment and statistical methods of research to provide a body of knowledge from which the principles and methods of leadership can be derived.

Rather than leadership as characteristics and traits common to some but not to all in the pre-scientific era, it is defined in the scientific era as a set of functions unique to a situation.[7] In a specific situation, leaders tend to develop traits which set them apart from followers in an organization or group context, but what traits set what leaders apart from followers will vary from situation to situation. Variance in leadership behavior has been shown to be significantly associated with situational variance, e.g., size of group.[8]

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Probably the turning point in the scientific era came with the classic studies in the 1930's by Lewin, Lippitt, and White. They studied the effects of artifically created leadership climates on the behavior of groups and their members. These studies demonstrated that certain variables in group situations, such as

---

[7]Murray G. Ross and Charles E. Hendry, New Understandings of Leadership. (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 19-26.

[8]J. K. Hemphill, "The Leader and His Group," in C. A. Gibb, Leadership. (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1969), pp. 223-229.

leadership style and social climate, can be manipulated in experimental settings and that their effect on other variables, such as productivity and interpersonal relations, can be quantitatively analyzed. Lewin's research staff were trained in the following three leadership styles:

> authoritarian. The general group goals, specific activities, and procedures for carrying them out are all dictated by the leader. However, the leader remains aloof from active participation except when demonstrating or assigning task;
>
> democratic. All policies, activities, and work procedures are decided upon by the group as a whole. The leader takes an active part and tries to be a regular group member in spirit without doing too much of the work;
>
> laissez-faire. There is complete freedom for group or individual decision-making, with a minimum of participation by the leader.[9]

The researchers found in their experimental research that democratic leadership proved in the long run to produce the best results in terms of things accomplished, personal growth, and cooperative relationships. In this group the leader helped the group to organize itself to make its own decisions.

In contrast, authoritarian leadership, in which the leader maintained rigid control and direction, produced less over a period of time, in terms of things accomplished, personal growth, and cooperative relationships, and encountered a great deal more friction

---

[9]Sarane S. Boocock, An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972), pp. 131-132.

and frustration. The laissez-faire leadership scored lowest on all accounts. Here the leader remained comparatively passive.

Discussion of these experiments usually emphasize the higher levels of satisfaction and "group-mindedness" and the lower levels of aggression in the democratic groups. Less often reported is the finding that the quality of work produced was greater in the autocratic setting, although activity in this setting requires the presence of the leader--when the autocratic type of leader left the room, output tended to drop off.

Since the classic studies of Lewin and associates an increasing number of aspects of group situations have been subjected to scientific study.

One theorist, E. A. Wiggam, attempted to explain leadership on the basis of inheritance (hereditary background). He advanced the "great man" theory which was the proposition that the survival of the fittest and intermarriage among them produces an aristocratic class that differs biologically from the lower classes. Thus an adequate supply of superior leaders depends upon proportionately high birth rate among the abler classes.[10] The essence of the great man theory was that the progress of the world that mankind has experienced is the product of the "individual"

[10]E. A. Wiggam, "The Biology of Leadership," in H. C. Metcalf, Business Leadership. (New York: Pitman, 1931).

achievements of great men who lived during a particular period in
11
which the advances occurred.

The traits of personality and character theory holds that

in the past, the conditions which permitted an individual to be-

come or remain a leader were often assumed to be "qualities" of

the individual. These were in some way believed to be located

in the leader. It was postulated that leadership could be ex-

plained in terms of the "traits" possessed by the leader. Some

of the traits identified were personality traits (enthusiasm,

initiative, imagination, purpose) and some were social traits

(tact, sympathy, patience) and then there were personality char-
12
acteristics of height, weight, physical attractiveness.

Mumford in commenting on the environmental theory emphasized

the view that the emergence of a great leader is strictly a matter
13
of time, place, and circumstance. Leader figures such as Hitler

and Mussolini, invested with a somewhat phony "charisma," are

seen as examples of persons who are the ultimate beneficiaries

of societal change and leadership due to circumstance. In one

study of leadership it was found that the number of great military

---

[11]T. O. Jacobs, _Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organiza-
tion_, (Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization
[Hum RRO]), 1971, p. 3.

[12]_Ibid._, p. 6.

[13]Ralph M. Stogdill, _Leadership: A Survey of the Literature_.
(Greensboro, N.C.: The Creativity Research Institute of the Smith
Richardson Foundation), July 1968, p. 32.

leaders in England was proportional to the number of conflicts in which the nation engaged.[14] Although times of crisis such as wars do indeed present opportunities for leadership to emerge, theorists who reject this line of thought raise the question of "how many crisis situations arise that do not produce a man who is equal to the situation?"[15] After the crisis, if one does appear, he is more likely to disappear and become anonymous again.

Dissatisfaction with the trait approach gave rise not only to an examination of group functions and their relation to leadership, but also to the situation in which the group is located. One theorist's studies of leadership, notably Fillmore H. Sanford, start with the notion that "there are three basic and delineable factors in any leadership phenomena: (a) the leader, (b) the situation, and (c) the follower . . . [and that] we must ultimately deal--and deal simultaneously--with each of these general factors."[16]

The situational approach to the study of leadership, according to Cecil A. Gibb, involves four elements:

> . . . The situation includes (1) the structure
> of interpersonal relations within a group, (2)
> group characteristics of goal achievement and group

[14]J. Schneider, "The Cultural Situation as a Condition for the Achievement of Fame." American Sociological Review, (1937), Vol. 2, pp. 480-491.

[15]Stogdill, op. cit., p. 33.

[16]Fillmore H. Sanford, "Leadership Identification and Acceptance," in Harold Guetzkow, ed., Groups, Leadership and Men, (Pittsburg: Carnegie Press, 1951), p. 158.

maintenance, (3) characteristics of the total cul-
ture in which the group exists and from which group
members have been drawn, and (4) the physical condi-
tions and the tasks with which the group is confronted.[17]

Shartle comments that leadership performance not only depends

on the outcome but it is also related to the particular situation

in which the executive (leader) finds himself.[18]

Reference was made previously to a careful study by Hemphill

of approximately 500 assorted groups in which it was empirically

demonstrated that variance in leader behavior is significantly

associated with situational variance, such as size of group.[19]

Many of the personal factors that have been found associated

with leadership could possibly be categorized under five general

headings: (1) status, (2) responsibility, (3) capacity, (4) achieve-

ment, (5) participation. This seems to be the consensus of con-

temporary researchers on leadership. However, another factor for

consideration has been suggested by Ralph D. Stogdill as a result

of a survey he has made of leadership traits.

> The results of the survey, on the surface, seemed
> to support the theory that leaders do have at least
> some unique measurable traits. However, examination
> to the extent to which these traits differed from
> situation to situation, depending on particular
> situational demands, forced Stogdill to conclude:

---

[17]Cecil A. Gibb, "Leadership," in Gardner Lindzey, ed.,
Handbook of Social Psychology, (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-
Wesley Publishing Company, 1954), Vol. II, 901.

[18]Carroll L. Shartle, Executive Performance and Leadership,
(Eaglewood Cliffs, N.J.: 1956), p. 110.

[19]Hemphill, op. cit.

It may be more fruitful to consider leadership as a
relationship that exists between persons in a social
situation, rather than as a singular quality of the
individual who serves as a leader."[20]

This is an important finding or conclusion because many

theorists have felt that a leader in one situation would be a

leader in any situation, if he possessed the "traits" associated

with a leader. The line of thought as regards leaders and leader-

ship which is held by both R. M. Stogdill and C. A. Gibb espouses

that the nature of the situation in which the leader finds himself

determines what characteristics are required for success. This

does not mean that the leader's personal characteristics are un-

important, but it does mean that the goals of followers and the

special abilities of any one of the group will probably affect

who emerges as leader in a particular situation. Thus leadership

in this context holds that a group member assumes a unique leader

role--he is leader so long as he contributes in a singular way to

the attainment of group goals.

One might be led to take an eclectic view of leadership--

that it involves personal traits, situations, tasks to be formed,

and types of expertise demanded at a particular time for a particular

task.

---

[20] Jacobs, op. cit., p. 9.

Stogdill summarized 124 leadership studies through 1948 and concluded:

> A person does not become a leader by virtue of some combination of traits, but the pattern of the personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers.[21]

Gibb in a 1954 review of the literature came to essentially the same conclusion that the many studies had failed to isolate any particular pattern of traits common to all leaders.[22]

In historical perspective then there has been a gradual abandonment of the trait approach to an understanding of leadership because traits have been found hard to measure reliably and the effectiveness of leaders varies from situation to situation. The general trend of much of the research supports the hypothesis that groups tend to accept as leaders those members who exhibit characteristics and abilities that will facilitate the accomplishment of the specific task of the group.

Results from a smaller number of studies support the view that "leaders tend to change certain aspects of their behavior in response to changes in group task demands."[23]

---

[21]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. XXV, (1948), pp. 35-71.

[22]Gibb, *op. cit.*, p. 889.

[23]Stogdill, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

Much of the research on theories of leadership are sociological in that the emphasis of the investigations is concerned primarily with group characteristics, organizational roles, and interpersonal relations. As mentioned elsewhere in this discourse, Gibb indicates that leadership is always relative to the situation; that is, who emerges as leader in one situation will not necessarily emerge as leader in a similar situation.[24]

For the purposes of this study leadership theory is used to mean the line of inquiry initiated by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University beginning with the development of the <u>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire</u> (LBDQ) by Hemphill and Coons in 1950.[25] The approach taken in the Ohio State Leadership Studies was to measure observed behavior of the leader rather than leadership per se. This approach considers the leader as he functions within the organization, and makes no attempt to evaluate the leadership executed.[26] The advantages to this approach are that no assumptions need be made concerning the causes of the observed behavior and the concept of evaluation of leadership is avoided.

---

[24]Gibb, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 902.

[25]John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, <u>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.</u> (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1950).

[26]Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, <u>Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement.</u> (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University Press, 1957), Monograph No. 88.

The shift from the study of leadership to the analysis of leader behavior is explained by Halpin:

> There are two major methodological advantages. In the first place we can deal directly with observable phenomena and need make no a priori assumptions about the identity or structure of whatever capacities may or may not undergird these phenomena. Secondly, this formulation keeps at the forefront of our thinking the importance of differentiating between the description of how leaders behave and the evaluation of the effectiveness of their behavior in respect to specified performance criteria.[27]

The approach to the problem involved in this study of the leader behavior of the Dean of Instruction in the community college setting utilizes this instrument, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, developed as a result of the Ohio State Leadership Studies.

Perhaps the best approach to an understanding of any comprehensive theory of leadership should take into account the fact that roles in groups tend to be structured, and that the leadership role is probably related to personality factors, to the attitudes and needs of followers at a particular time, to the structure of the group, and to the situation at a particular time. Leadership is probably a function of the interaction of such variables, and these undoubtedly provide for role differentiation which leads to the designation of a central figure, or leader, without prohibiting other members in the group from performing leadership functions in various ways, and at various times, in

---

[27]Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration. (New York: The McMillan Company, 1966), p. 86.

28

the life of the group.   Perhaps more research of leader behavior

in the group context should be attempted for a better understand-

ing of the leadership phenomenon.

LEADERSHIP STYLES

It must be kept in mind that different styles of leader-

ship would result in very different types of relationships be-

tween the administrator and his staff members, or between the

leader and his followers.

Three very distinct styles of administrative leadership

described by Robert P. Moser are the nomothetic style, the idio-

29

graphic style, and the transactional style.   The first stresses

goal accomplishment, rules, regulations, and central authority.

The individual is given very, very little consideration.   The

second style, idiographic, stresses minimum rules, less central

authority, and a high degree of individualism.   The third style,

transactional, seems to be an eclectic approach whereby goal

accomplishment is stressed in an organization climate which also

stresses individual need fulfillment.

Another study was conducted by William J. Congreve of the

leadership styles of administrators in different schools.   He

---

28Ross and Hendry, op. cit., p. 36.

29Robert P. Moser, "The Leadership Patterns of School
Superintendents and School Principals," Administrator's Note-
book, VI, (September, 1957), 2.

labeled the styles as "formal" and "informal."[30] The formal style
was characterized by formally stated procedures and extensive use
was made of written communications. The administrator kept a
social distance between himself and his faculty and also kept
a somewhat limited social distance between himself and his staff.
The informal administrator, or leader, relied extensively on face-
to-face contacts with the other staff members, and showed a con-
siderable amount of human relations concern. It might be noted
that in this particular study, although the sample was small,
that the faculty preferred the formal style because the leader
was more consistent and more positive in his dealings with them.
This is borne out in other studies of autocratic and democratic
leaders where it has been found that under certain conditions and
with certain situations, authoritarian leadership results in[31]
greater productivity and efficiency.

Even Plato, in The Republic proposed three types of leader-
ship behavior for his ideal city-state. First, the philosopher;
second, the businessman; and third, the soldier commander. All
would occupy a unique role. The military type would enforce the
will and law of the land, the businessman would provide material
needs, and the philosopher would rationalize behavior and goals.[32]

---

[30]William J. Congreve, "Administrative Behavior and Staff
Relations," Administrator's Notebook, VI, (October, 1957), 1-4.

[31]Roger Bellows, Creative Leadership. (Englewood Cliffs,
N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 41.

[32]Stogdill, op. cit., p. 40.

Other types of leadership behavior, in addition to the ones already mentioned, are the executive type who exercises leadership through authority and the power of his position; the social leader, who seeks to lead his followers to identify with a movement; the professional leader, who seems to stimulate his followers to develop their abilities to the fullest; and the prophet, a leader without office who may arise at a time of crisis but creates his own situation. His real forte is in arousing the interest of his followers so that they will support him enthusiastically and he then becomes a symbol of the whole movement he has initiated.[33] Kesey, the leader of the Pranksters in Tom Wolfe's The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test, could be classified as a "prophet" style leader.

Further attempts have been made to delineate leadership and "headship." Gibb makes a distinction between leadership and headship. Headship, according to him, is characterized by:

(1) Maintenance by an organized system instead of the spontaneous accord of group members.

(2) Unilateral choice of goals by the head, as opposed to decision through group consensus.

(3) Little or no shared feeling of joint action in pursuit of the goal.

(4) A strong desire by the head for high social distance between himself and his subordinates as a tool for their further coercion.

(5) Authority based on extra-group sources, as opposed to derived from the consensus of the group itself.[34]

----

[33]Ibid., p. 41.

[34]Jacobs, op. cit., p. 287.

Also, we have Max Weber's theoretical works in which he proposed

three types of legitimate authority as related to leadership:

bureaucratic, patrimonical, and charismatic.[35]

Recently, theorists and researchers have used the terms

"structured" or "task oriented" when referring to the authori-

tative style and "person oriented" or "considerate" when re-

ferring to the democratic style of leadership.[36]

Several of the authors in a review of the literature have

attempted to classify leaders according to the kinds of "func-

tions" they perform. Stogdill has found in a survey of the

literature on leaders and leadership that out of fifteen authors

of publications, over a 36-year period, that the most often men-

tioned types could be classified in six categories:

1. Authoritative (dominator)

2. Persuasive (crowd arouser)

3. Democratic (group developer)

4. Intellectual (eminent man)

5. Executive (administrator)

6. Representative (spokesmen)[37]

---

[35]Stogdill, op. cit., p. 43.

[36]Ibid., p. 44.

[37]Stogdill, op. cit., p. 44.

IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP

Selznick depicts the essential qualities of leadership from
a personal standpoint:

> Leadership is a responsibility and as such is a
> blend of commitment, understanding, and determi-
> nation. This is partly a matter of self-conception
> of the leader in that whatever his special back-
> ground, and however important it may have been in
> the decision that gave him the office or position
> he occupies, the responsible leader must transcend
> his specialism.[38]

As previously noted, he must understand not only the strengths
and weaknesses and potentialities of the group or institution he
represents, but it is most important that he understand himself in
the same dimensions.

There are many different kinds of leadership--some are born to
leadership, some achieve leadership, and others have leadership thrust
upon them. Those who have leadership thrust upon them are often per-
plexed and baffled by this responsibility which they must utilize con-
structively. Some of the confusion and perplexity no doubt comes
from the conflicting ideas about leadership surviving from earlier
days. Some of the traditional ideas and concepts regarding leader-
ship have become increasingly unsuitable for today's complexity of
interaction between and among groups and individuals.

---

[38]Phillip Selznick, _Leadership in Administration_. (White
Plains, New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957), pp. 142-143.

Howard W. Johnson has described some qualities and conditions which he regards as vital to leadership in the future: "namely a sense of understanding and relation to one's own organization, and a dynamic awareness of trust that builds upon such a sense." The test for the leader must be: Are you related to your times and to your constituency? Can you lead now? And the test for education must be: Are we preparing the leader who will stay contemporary amidst changing conditions.[39]

The challenge is before us as both leaders and educators.

RESEARCH ON LEADER BEHAVIOR

In a study conducted by Guetzkow to measure the impact of the group upon persons in leadership roles it was found that the expectations and perceptions of group members do indeed cause consternation and conflict for the leader or administrator.[40] Hemphill came to the same conclusion in a similar study.[41]

A basic assumption is that the behavior of the administrator or leader cannot be separated from the situation. Considering this assumption, Culbertson, Jacobson, and Reller employed the case study method in viewing administrative processes because to them the most profitable method of studying administrative leadership,

---

[39]Howard W. Johnson, "Education for Leadership," in A Symposium--The Requirements for Leadership in the 1980's. (School of Business Administration, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1968), p. 67.

[40]Harold Guetzkow, Groups, Leadership, Men. (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Carnegie Press, 1951).

[41]John K. Hemphill, Situational Factors in Leadership. (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1949).

or leader behavior, was to view the administrator, or leader, in
the actual work situation.[42]

Other scholars who study the administrative process have enumerated criteria or dimensions of the administrative process and leadership behaviors. Shartle refers to two dimensions which he describes as "human relations" and "get-out-the-work."[43] Stogdill lists these criteria: "production, morale, and integration."[44] Blake and Mouton used a managerial grid to present conceptions. In the grid the axes are labeled "concern for people" and "concern for production."[45] Previously mentioned is the Guba and Getzels conception of the social system as two interacting classes of phenomena represented by a "nomothetic" or "organizational" dimension of activity and an "ideographic" or "personal" dimension.[46] The nomothetic dimension considers the institution composed of roles and role expectations that fulfill the goals of the social system. The ideographic dimension consists of the individual, his personality, and his needs disposition. The resultant leader behavior depends on the interaction between these two dimensions. Halpin refers to

---

[42]Jack A. Culbertson, Paul B. Jacobson, and Theodore L. Reller. Administrative Relationship: A Casebook. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960).

[43]Shartle, op. cit., p. 120.

[44]Ralph M. Stogdill, Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), Chapter VI.

[45]Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid. (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964).

[46]Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, (Winter, 1957), pp. 423-441.

the two dimensions of "initiating structure" and "consideration."

For the purposes of this particular study these two dimensions of

leader behavior will be observed.

Any attempt to identify the parameters of the administrative

process and leadership behavior must be cognizant of the presence

of two very important variables: human beings, and a complex

hiearchy that could be labeled organization-production.

Carson, in commenting on Evenson's writings on the behavior

of high school principals, states that these school leaders need

a framework for viewing leadership ability. [48] Gibb reports that sub-

ordinates' and superiors' perception of leader behavior differs.

This difference is even greater when comparisons are made between

expected or ideal behavior as perceived by subordinates and

superiors. [49] In commenting on this particular point, Halpin ob-

serves that superiors and subordinates are inclined to evaluate

oppositely the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure.

---

[47]Andrew W. Halpin, "The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders," _Harvard Educational Review_, (Winter, 1955), pp. 19-30.

[48]Joseph O. Carson, Jr., "An Analysis of the Leader Behavior of Junior College Deans as Viewed by Student Leaders." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1962.

[49]Andrew W. Halpin, "The Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders," _The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology_, 44, (1954), p. 22.

Hemphill has reported a study in which he investigated the relation between the characteristics of college departments regarding quality of administration. No correlation was found between the thirteen departmental characteristics investigated and the departmental reputation. However, Hemphill did note that, if the chairman met faculty expectations on both leader behavior dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure, the department was more likely to achieve favorable reputation.[50]

Carson reports on a study conducted by Evenson on the leader behavior of high school principals in which it was found that within each of the forty schools in the study that teachers agree in describing the behavior of the principal (leader) on both dimensions, Consideration and Initiating Structure. However, from one staff to the other the analysis revealed much variation in the scoring of the principals on the Consideration dimension, but on the dimension of Initiating Structure, there was much similarity. It was further found that there was no significant correlation between any two reference groups in their perception of the principal's behavior on the Consideration factor. Superintendents and staff do exhibit statistically significant agreement in their perceptions of the principal's behavior on Initiating Structure. Further investigation showed no significant relation between the principal's own description of his leader behavior and that of the description of his leader behavior by superiors and subordinates. All respondent

---

[50]John K. Hemphill, "Leadership Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputation of College Departments," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, 46:7 (November, 1955), p. 399.

groups' perception of "real" behavior differed significantly from
the "ideal behavior on both dimensions.[51]

Halpin contends that, although the findings of earlier in-vestigations had indicated that the really effective leaders are those who score high on both Initiating Structure and Consideration, his interest is in determining the relationship between the leader's own perceptions of how he behaves on the two dimensions as contrasted with the superior and subordinate perception. Furthermore, he is in-terested in discovering the corresponding relationship between his, the superiors', and the subordinates' beliefs concerning how the leader "should" behave. This concern provided the impetus for Halpin's investigation of 50 Ohio school superintendents. The reference to superiors in this study by Halpin is to the board of education. The reference to subordinates is to staff.

Responses from 1274 questionnaires were reduced to 600 scores with 12 scores for each of the 50 superintendents on both dimensions of leader behavior. Halpin's findings reveal that staff and board responses tend to agree among themselves as regards their description of the superintendent's behavior on the two dimensions, but they do not agree with each other. Staffs see the superintendent as showing less consideration than either the boards of education or the super-intendent himself. The school boards rated the superintendent higher on Initiating Structure than did either the staff or the superintendent.

---

[51]Carson, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

In respect to Initiating Structure, the within group agreement for

boards and for staffs is approximately the same for all staffs and

all boards. However, the boards of education do not differ signifi-

cantly from school to school in their expectation of how the superin-

tendent should behave on either dimension. The superintendents set

for themselves higher standards of Consideration than either staffs

or boards set for them. The boards believe that a superintendent

should be very strong in Initiating Structure. [52] The staffs and the

superintendents themselves believe, however, they should initiate

less structure than the boards expect and the staffs in turn prefer

less structure than the superintendents believe they should initiate.

The perceived leadership behavior of the fifty superintendents

differs significantly from the ideal behavior of a superintendent as

conceived by all three respondent groups. A quadrant analysis technique

shows eleven of the 50 superintendents (22 percent of the sample) were

described as effective leaders by both their staffs and boards--that

is, scoring high on both Consideration and Initiating Structure.

Only two of the 50 superintendents were described by both staff

and boards as ineffective--that is, scoring low on both dimensions.

The quadrant analysis technique is a useful way of evaluating

the leadership effectiveness of leaders and is especially useful in

those cases where the description of a leader's behavior by both

---

[52]Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superin-
tendents. (Chicago: Midwest Administrative Center, The University of
Chicago, 1959), pp. 75-78.

superiors and subordinates indicates that he can be classified in
either the "high-high" or the "low-low" quadrants.[53]

Effective or desirable leader behavior is characterized

by high scores on both Consideration and Initiating Structure.

Conversely, ineffective or undesirable leader behavior is reflected

in low scores on both dimensions. The results of the study of the

50 Ohio school superintendents, staffs, and board members is con-

sistent with the findings of the Hemphill study of the college

departments in which it was determined that departments with a

campus reputation for being well administered are directed by

chairmen who score high on both Consideration and Initiating
Structure.[54]

The findings of the 50 Ohio school superintendents also

agree with the results of an earlier Air Force study in which it

was found that aircraft commanders rated effective by both superiors

and subordinates (crew) score high on both these dimensions of
leader behavior.[55]

Halpin comments:

In short, the effective leader is one who delineates
clearly the relationship between himself and members
of the group, and establishes well-defined patterns
of organization, channels of communication, and ways

---

[53]Andrew W. Halpin. _Theory and Research in Administration._
(New York: The McMillan Company, 1966), pp. 116-117.

[54]Hemphill, _op. cit._

[55]Halpin, _op. cit._, p. 118.

of getting the job done. At the same time, his behavior
reflects friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth
in the relationships between himself and the members of
the group . . . evidence from these inquiries shows that   56
effective leadership is characterized by high Consideration.

Perfect congruence between the dean of instruction and

superiors and subordinates is by no means essential, but it is

vital to his leadership that he be able to read and heed the

differences with accuracy. Inaccurate soundings can result in

bad moves, communication distortion, and dysfunctional perceptions

by both the leader and the led.

Carson has conducted a study of the junior college dean's

leadership behavior:

> The results of this investigation indicate that
> student leaders constitute a reference group to which
> the junior college dean should attempt to relate in
> creating an effective and efficient climate for the
> accomplishment of the institution's purposes. Evi-
> dence was obtained that discrepancies of perceptions
> and expectations exist between student leaders and
> the other referent groups, especially presidents.
>
> These discrepancies suggest that role conflicts
> exist for the dean. The discrepancies between the
> expectations of the president on the one hand, and
> those of student leaders on the other, appear to
> produce the dean's major role conflict.
>
> Inasmuch as both student leaders and department
> heads expected significantly more Consideration and
> Initiating Structure than they perceived, the dean
> apparently needs to stress both kinds of behavior
> more in his relations with these two groups.[57]

---

[56]Ibid.

[57]J. O. Carson, Jr., "A Comparative Analysis of the Junior
College Dean's Leadership Behavior," The Journal of Experimental
Education, 32:4 (Summer 1964), p. 360.

At a conference for newly appointed junior college deans
one of the many functions of the dean that was delineated was that
the dean must demonstrate his leadership behavior, as opposed to
innate capacity, to the president, the department heads, the faculty,
and student leaders. He must run a productive and efficient organi-
zation, without neglecting consideration of others. [58] This is the
dilemma that sometimes confronts the dean.

Another investigation of the academic dean's leadership
behavior is the study by Verbeke based on the perceptions and
expectations of the dean's superiors, the faculty, and the dean
himself, as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
(LBDQ). The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) uses the
term "leader behavior" rather than "leadership behavior." Twenty-
two colleges participated. Two dimensions of leader behavior were
measured: "Initiating Structure," emphasizing well-defined organi-
zational procedures and goals, and "Consideration," referring to
personal respect and warmth between the leader and his group. Each
dimension was analyzed under "real" or perceived behavior and "ideal"
or expected behavior. The general conclusions of the study showed the
greatest discrepancy on views of the dean's behavior was between the
faculty and the deans themselves. The faculty expected the dean to
score high on both dimensions of leader behavior. The faculty members'

---

[58]R. Grey Cole, Leadership of Administrators in Community
Junior Colleges. (Greensboro, North Carolina: ERIC File, September,
1972), Bibliography No. UNCG 205-3700.

perceptions and expectations of the dean's leader behavior differs

significantly from those of the deans who rated themselves higher

in all four comparisons. Seemingly a major role conflict facing

the dean lies between him and his faculty.[59] The president's per-

ceptions and expectations of the dean's leader behavior were not

significantly different from those of the deans themselves. The

presidents perceived more Consideration than Initiating Structure

in the dean's leader behavior. Also the presidents tended to des-

cribe their deans higher on both dimensions than did the faculty

members.

Quadrant analysis technique graphically illustrated that

"effective" leader behavior, as viewed by the three respondent

groups, was characterized by both high Initiating Structure and

Consideration.[60]

Roberts made a study of the perceptions and expectations

of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding leader be-

havior of elementary school principals to determine the relationship

between the elementary principal's perception of how he behaves, his

superintendent's perceptions, and the staffs' perceptions. Also he

attempted to determine the corresponding relationship between his

own beliefs concerning how he should behave as a leader and those

---

[59]Maurice G. Verbeke, "The Junior College Academic Dean's
Leadership Behavior as Viewed By Superiors and Faculty," unpublished
Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University
Park, Pennsylvania, 1966.

[60]Ibid.

of his superintendent and the staff as to how they perceived he

should behave. He used the <u>Leader Behavior Description Ques-</u>

<u>tionnaire</u> to determine the characteristics of the principals

sampled for two factors: (1) Initiating Structure and (2) Con-

sideration and to determine the "real and "ideal" behavior of

elementary school principals. In general he found that the principal

does not see himself as does his staff and his superintendent in re-

spect to either Consideration or Initiating Structure. The real

leadership behavior of the twenty-four principals differs signifi-

cantly from the ideal behavior of a principal as perceived by all

three respondent groups.[61]

In a study concerned with performance and job satisfaction

Cummings investigated the hypothesis that the effect of initiating

structure on the rated productivity and quality of work-group

performance in an industrial manufacturing plant is moderated by

considerate leader behavior. Results in the study support the

hypothesis when quality but not productivity was the criterion

measure.[62] These results are consistent with E. Fleishman's and E.

---

[61]James Nelson Roberts. "Perceptions and Expectations of Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers Regarding Leader Behavior of Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1963.

[62]Robert C. Cummings. "Relationship of Initiating Structure and Job Performance as Moderated by Consideration." <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 55:5, (October, 1971), pp. 489-490.

Harris' finding that grievances and turnover are less affected by
initiation of structure when foremen are rated high on consideration. [63]

An investigation by Robert J. House and others of leadership
style, hierarchical influence, and the satisfaction of subordinate role
expectations, examined the moderating effect of upward hierarchical in-
fluence on the relationship between supportive leader behavior and
satisfaction of subordinate expectations. Leader consideration was
found to have strong positive relationships in 11 of 16 measures of
subordinate role satisfaction while initiating structure was posi-
tively related to 10 of the 16 measures. [64]

Keys conducted a study of the expected (IDEAL) and perceived
(REAL) leader behavior of principals of senior high schools in Minne-
sota. His interest was in discovering relationships and conflicts in
leader behaviors of principals of senior high schools as seen by
teachers, superintendents, and principals themselves. He used the
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to establish a measure of
of the discrepancy in scores describing the leader behavior of
principals by teachers, principals and superintendents. Total scores
on two types of behavior made it possible to compare within group and
between group scores. Teachers and principals were found to be in
close agreement on the perceived and expected leader behavior of the
principal. Superintendents were consistently higher in their estimation

[63]E. A. Fleishman and E. F. Harris. "Patterns of Leadership
Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Psychological
Abstracts, 37:3953, (April 1963), p. 388.

[64]Robert J. House, Allan C. Filley, and Damodar N. Gujarati,
"Leadership style, hierarchical influence, and the satisfaction of
subordinate role expectations: A test of Likert's influence proposi-
tion," Psychological Abstracts, 47:7914, (April 1972), p. 860.

of actual leader behavior and expectations for desirable leader

behavior than the other two groups. However, superintendents are

in many instances more removed and have less close contact with

principals than do teachers.[65]

The study revealed that the actual behavior of principals

fell short of the expected or ideal behavior of principals. Too,

the gap between the "ideal" and "real" leader behavior of princi-

pals remained fairly consistent in all three groups, lending

credence to the basic assumptions that this was a true difference.[66]

Luckie investigated the leader behavior of the director of

instruction in the public school system. His sample consisted of

thirty-two randomly selected directors from Alabama, Florida, Georgia,

Louisiana, and Mississippi. Again the Leader Behavior Description

Questionnaire was used to determine the perceived and expected,

real and ideal, leader behavior of these individuals in a professional

framework; that is, on the job.[67]

Some of the findings relative to this study are:

> Superintendents and staff members expected the
> directors of instruction to behave on the leader di-
> mension of Initiating Structure at a higher level
> than the directors of instruction perceived they
> should behave on this dimension.

---

[65]Samuel Robert Keys. "Study of Expected and Described Leader Behavior of Principals of Senior High Schools in the State of Minnesota." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1959.

[66]Ibid.

[67]William R. Luckie. "Leader Behavior of Directors of Instruction." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1963.

> Superintendents and staff members agreed on their
> descriptions of Initiating Structure for both the Real
> and Ideal aspects of leader behavior of directors of in-
> struction.
>
> Superintendents, directors of instruction, and staff
> members agreed on their perceptions of the actual and
> expected leader behavior of the directors of instruction
> concerning Consideration.
>
> Superintendents, directors of instruction, and staff
> members agreed that Consideration was a more important
> dimension of leader behavior than was Initiating Struc-
> ture for directors of instruction.[68]

Luckie concludes that the director of instruction in this

study finds himself in a role where no conflicting expectations of

leader behavior exists between superintendents and staff members.

It was recommended, however, that superintendents and directors

of instruction work together to define the director's patterns

of organization, establish clearly channels of communications,

and improve methods of procedure.[69]

In a study similar to the one undertaken by the author,

Verbeke was concerned with the investigation of the leader behavior

of the academic dean of twenty-two junior or community colleges in

Pennsylvania and New York. Descriptions and expectations of the

leader behavior of the academic dean were provided by the presi-

dent, a sample of faculty members, and the dean himself. Twenty-two

presidents, twenty-two deans, and 175 faculty members made up

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid.

the final respondent sample. There were a number of findings rele-

vant to the descriptive research study by this author:

    1. Presidents and faculty members, as total groups,
did agree as to the perceived and expected leader be-
havior of the academic deans on both Initiating Structure
and Consideration.

    2. Presidents and faculty members did not agree with
each other in reference to the actual leader behavior of
the academic deans on both dimensions, Initiating Structure
and Consideration. However, there were no significant dif-
ferences between the expectations of these two reference
groups on both dimensions of leader behavior.

    3. The faculty members' perceptions and expectations
of the academic deans' leader behavior differ significantly
from those of the deans who rated themselves higher in all
four comparisons.

    4. The president's perceptions and expectations of
the academic deans' leader behavior were not significantly
different from those of the deans themselves.

    5. The faculty members both perceived and expected
more Consideration than Initiating Structure in the aca-
demic deans' leader behavior.

    6. The presidents perceived more Consideration than
Initiating Structure in the academic deans' leader behavior.
On the other hand, there were no significant differences
in the amount of each dimension desired by the presidents
in the leader behavior of the academic deans.

    7. The presidents tended to describe their deans
higher on both Initiating Structure and Consideration
than did the faculty members.[70]

The real and ideal leader behavior expectations of the

supervisor of instruction as perceived by the supervisors them-

selves, principals, teachers, and administrators was the focus

---

[70]Maurice G. Verbeke, "The Junior College Academic Dean's
Leadership Behavior as Viewed by Superiors and Faculty," _Disser-
tation Abstracts International_, 28:926A, 1967.

of a study by Lott in Georgia. Within and among the different

reference groups a significant difference was found regarding
[71]
both the real and ideal behaviors of the supervisors.

In a comparative study of the leader behavior of elementary

school principals, Koch obtained perceptions of the principal's

leader behavior from teachers and principals. These findings

give evidence that teachers and principals evolving from a given

school building or district are more likely to have common con-

ceptions of the role of the administrator based on their experiences
[72]
with the administration in their common environment.

In an unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Meyer investigated

relationships between selected personality traits of members of

various school groups and their perceptions of administrative be-

havior. It was observed that the success of an administrator was

related to how he perceived the demands and expectations of the

various reference groups with whom he interacted in his leadership
[73]
role.

Robinson conducted a study of the relationship between

leader behavior of secondary school principals in Georgia in cer-

tain selected variables among them race, size of school, and sex.

---

[71]Ibid.

[72]David F. Koch, Jr., "A Comparative Study of the Leader Be-
havior of Elementary School Principals," Unpublished Doctoral dis-
sertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1964.

[73]Gerhardt V. Meyer, "Role Perceptions In A Problem Situa-
tion," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University,
Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1964.

The main instrument used was the Leader Behavior Description Ques-
tionnaire. It was found that no significant relationship exists

between the size of the school and perception of leader behavior

of secondary school principals and that race and sex of the respondent

does not make or contribute to a significant difference in the leader

behavior of secondary school principals. The superintendents and

teachers observe the leader behavior of their principals in the

same way. Also, Local-Cosmopolitan orientation does not significantly
[74]
affect leader behavior.

Flocco's study of the perceived leader behavior of school

business administrators revealed that administrators who rated

themselves lower than staffs did, for both the dimensions of Con-

sideration and Initiating Structure, were perceived by their staff

to perform at a higher level than those administrators who rated
[75]
themselves higher than their staffs rated them.

A study by Kline was designed to examine and clarify

whether leader behaviors of central office curricular decision-

makers of school systems perceived by them and their teachers,

and agreements regarding these behaviors, were related to imple-

mentation of curricular plans and to the extent of change. No all-

inclusive results were obtained to establish categorical relationships

---

[74]Herbert W. Robinson, "A Study of the Relationship Between
Leader Behavior of Secondary School Principals in Georgia and Certain
Selected Variables," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of
Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1968.

[75]Edward C. Flocco, "An Examination of the Leader Behavior of
School Business Administrators," unpublished Doctoral dissertation,
New York University, New York, N. Y., 1968.

regarding this concern. However, as a result of the study, it

was established and concluded:

> . . . teacher perception of Consideration behavior
> of central office curricular decision makers of
> school systems was related significantly to teacher
> implementation of curricular plans; and it also was
> concluded that teacher-decision maker agreement re-
> garding the Initiating Structure behaviors of the
> central office curricular decision makers of school
> systems was related significantly and negatively to
> teacher perception of implementation of curricular
> plans. Central office curricular decision makers
> of school systems credit a greater amount of curricular
> plan implementation and a greater extent of curricular
> change in those plans than do their teachers. Similarly,
> central office curricular decision makers credit them-
> selves with more Initiating Structure and Consideration
> behavior than do their teachers.[76]

Carter and Thompson undertook a study of structure, con-

sideration, and classroom performance and an analysis of student

participation. In testing the concepts of structure and con-

sideration, and their relationships, they used two separate

groups of university classes, one the control group and one the

experimental group. Each group was presented the same daily

course during the same period but one group was exposed to a

highly organized lecture method in instruction and the other

group was introduced to the course in a manner that encouraged

individual participation. Attendance was required in the first

group but not in the second group, the unstructured, participative

group. The research confirms that being well-liked may not be

synonymous with being a successful teacher and that being a likeable

---

[76]Charles E. Kline, "Leader Behavior, Curricular Implemen-
tation, and Curricular Change," _Dissertation Abstracts International_,
30:293-A (1969).

instructor does not insure good results. This research confirms:

Students need and want the instructor to be one who possesses

and demonstrates basic qualities of good leadership. It is clear

that where the instructor is a good leader, the subjects will
[77]
accomplish and learn more.

A focus on the relationship between administrator per-

ceptions of teachers and pupil perceptions of teachers was

attempted by Smith and Lutz in their study of the "teacher leader

behavior and pupil respect and liking." The data collected showed

Consideration to be related significantly to respect, Initiating

Structure, to be positively related to respect. However, Initiating

Structure was negatively related to liking, that is, teachers who

were disliked tended to have higher Initiating Structure scores.

Also, there was a significant interaction between respect and liking

in relation to Initiating Structure. The High Respect and Low Like

group of teachers had the highest Initiating Structure scores as

perceived by pupils, and the Low Respect and High Like group had
[78]
the lowest Initiating Structure scores.

Maybe leaders should be cognizant of Homans' classic comment:

"You may manage to be a leader and be popular too, but you should not

_____

[77]Robert N. Carter and John R. Thompson, "Structure, Con-
sideration, and Classroom Performance," Collegiate News and Views,
(Summer, 1972).

[78]Louis M. Smith and Frank W. Lutz, "Teacher Leader Behavior
and Pupil Respect and Liking," The Journal of Educational Research,
57:8, (April, 1964).

count on having this happy condition last."[79]

In bringing this chapter to a conclusion, it might be appropriate to look at the leadership function of the academic dean as viewed by the dean himself:

> The academic dean regards his leadership function to be the encouragement and stimulation of the faculty to perform at the highest level of which it is capable in the pursuit of educational objectives set by it. He regards himself not so much as a leader but rather as a catalyst. His authority is conferred upon him by his colleagues' acceptance of him, and the measure of his success is related to the extent to which he can persuade the faculty to espouse his ideas and regard them as being essentially what they themselves wanted anyway.
>
> Recognizing that faculty consensus is essential to productive change, the dean seeks to reduce opposition to a bare minimum before taking final action.[80]

---

[79]George C. Homans, Social Behavior: It's Elementary Forms, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961), p. 310.

[80]John W. Gould, "The Leadership Function of the Academic Dean as Viewed by the Dean," Dissertation Abstract International, 23:4584, (1963).

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, developed by

the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University, is the

basic instrument used to obtain the necessary data from the respon-

dents in the study.[1] Hereafter this instrument is referred to as

LBDQ. It is chosen for this study because it incorporates two

significant dimensions of leader behavior, "Consideration" and

"Initiating Structure" and has been used extensively in previous

research in military, industrial, and educational studies as

noted in the review of related literature and research.

According to Stogdill, the LBDQ was developed for use in

securing descriptions of leader behavior in any type organization.[2]

The Leader Behavior Descriptions were developed for the purpose of

describing behavior objectively in terms of it's frequency. Shartle

and Stogdill indicate that the description items can be used by a

---

[1]A copy of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire,
REAL, IDEAL, IDEAL-SELF, is found in Appendix A.

[2]J. O. Schreiner, "An Exploratory Investigation of Leader Be-
havior of Full-Time and Part-Time Elementary School Principals."
Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Enid,
Oklahoma, 1965.

respondent to describe his own behavior, or by one or a number of

respondents to describe another person's behavior.[3] The items

simply describe the leader's behavior; they do not judge the

desirability or undesirability of the behavior. In addition,

both "Initiation of Structure" and "Consideration" have been iden-

tified as primary in the analysis of the executive function.

> Initiating Structure refers to the leader's be-
> havior in delineating the relationship between himself
> and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to
> establish well-defined patterns of organization, chan-
> nels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.
> Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friend-
> ship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relation-
> ship between the leader and members of the group.[4]

Thus, in this study, leader behavior is viewed with respect to

these two variables, as perceived and expected, or as referred

to in the LBDQ, "Real" and "Ideal" respectively.

Permission was requested and received to use the 1957 copy-

right edition of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.[5]

> Hemphill and Coons constructed the original form
> of the questionnaire; and Halpin and Winer, in reporting

---

[3]Ralph M. Stogdill and Carroll L. Shartle, Methods in the
Study of Administrative Leadership, (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of
Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1955), Research
Monograph Number 80, p. 54.

[4]Andrew W. Halpin, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description
Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The
Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1.

[5]The statement of policy concerning the Leader Behavior Des-
cription Questionnaire and related forms is found in Appendix B.

the development of an Air Force adaptation of the in-
strument, identified Initiating Structure and Considera-
tion as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior.
These dimensions were identified on the basis of a
factor analysis of the responses of 300 B-29 crew mem-
bers who described the leader behavior of their 52
aircraft commanders. Initiating Structure and Con-
sideration accounted for approximately 34 to 50 per-
cent respectively of the common variance. In a
subsequent study based upon a sample of 249 aircraft
commanders, the correlation between the scores on the
two dimensions was found to be .38.[6]

The LBDQ is composed of forty (40) items of which only

thirty (30) are scored, fifteen (15) for each of the two dimensions.

The manual states that the ten unscored items have been retained in

the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration

comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire.[7] The

score of each dimension is the sum of the scores assigned to the

responses marked on each of the fifteen items in the dimension.

The members of the respondent groups indicate the form of behavior

the leader actually exhibits (Real) and the behavior he should ex-

hibit (Ideal). The leader under study can also indicate his own

"real" and "ideal" behavior patterns by using the modified form of

the instrument (Ideal, Self). The scale used to score the items is:

4(Always), 3(Often), 2(Occasionally), 1(Seldom), and 0(Never).

---

[6]Halpin, op. cit.

[7]Ibid.

Each item is scored on a 4 to 0 scale with a theoretical range of scores for each dimension ranging from 0 to 60.[8] However, for this particular study each item can be scored on a 5 to 1 scale with a theoretical range of scores for each dimension ranging from 1 to 75. Halpin and Winer indicate that the reliabilities of staff perceptions of Initiating Structure and Consideration for fifteen item scales are usefully high. The estimated reliability, using the split-half, odd-even method of obtaining a reliability estimate for the LBDQ-Real, staff was found to measure .83 for Initiating Structure scores and .92 for Consideration scores, when corrected for attenuation with the Spearman-Brown formula.[9]

Similar estimates of the reliability for the LBDQ-Ideal, self were found to measure .69 for the Initiating Structure and .66 for Consideration.[10]

Although group members differ in their perception of the leader's behavior, Halpin comments on several studies:

[8]Ibid.

[9]Andrew W. Halpin and B. James Winer, "A Factoral Study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Research Monograph Number 88, (editors) Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1957), p. 48.

[10]Maurice G. Verbeke,"The Junior College Academic Dean's Leadership Behavior As Viewed by Superiors and Faculty." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1966.

. . .the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a "between-vs. within-group" analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly.[11]

Examples of sample items with wording to express interaction and relationship between a leader and his subordinates appear below:

Consideration dimension examples:

HE IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

HE DOES LITTLE THINGS TO MAKE IT PLEASANT
TO BE A MEMBER OF THE STAFF

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

HE GETS STAFF APPROVAL ON IMPORTANT MATTERS
BEFORE GOING AHEAD

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

HE ASKS FOR MORE THAN THE STAFF CAN GET DONE

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

Initiating Structure dimension examples:

HE MAKES HIS ATTITUDE CLEAR TO THE STAFF

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

---

[11]Halpin, op. cit.

HE SPEAKS IN A MANNER NOT TO BE QUESTIONED

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

HE MAINTAINS DEFINITE STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

HE EMPHASIZES MEETING DEADLINES

12

Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

The items of each dimension are presented below; the numbers in parentheses identify the items on the instrument:

Initiating Structure:

(2) He makes his attitudes clear to the group.
(4) He tries out his new ideas with the group.
(7) He rules with an iron hand.
(9) He criticizes poor work.
(11) He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
(14) He assigns group members to particular tasks.
(16) He schedules the work to be done.
(17) He maintains definite standards of performance.
(22) He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
(24) He encourages the use of uniform procedures.
(27) He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all group members.
(29) He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
(32) He lets group members know what is expected of them.
(35) He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.
(39) He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

Consideration:

(1) He does personal favors for group members.
(3) He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

---

[12]Carrol L. Shartle, Executive Performance and Leadership: (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1956), pp. 121-122.

(6)   He is easy to understand.
(8)   He finds time to listen to group members.
(12) He keeps to himself.**
(13) He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group
      members.
(18) He refuses to explain his actions.**
(20) He acts without consulting the group.**
(21) He backs up the members in their actions.
(23) He treats all group members as his equals.
(26) He is willing to make changes.
(28) He is friendly and approachable.
(31) He makes group members feel at ease when talking with him.
(34) He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
(38) He gets group approval on important matters before
      going ahead.[13]
**   Scored negatively

The LBDQ has been used for various research purposes in military,

industrial, and educational settings with the two dimensions of be-

havior viewed as constituting leadership styles which describe the

behavior of the leader as he operates in a given situation.

Some leaders emphasize one dimension to the exclusion of the

other in their style of leadership. However, effective and efficient

leadership apparently requires a balance or blending of Initiating

Structure and Consideration so that the needs of the institution and

of the individuals will be met in such a way as to be productive for

the institution and fulfilling for the individual. The way in which

these two dimensions of leader behavior need to be exhibited seems to

be governed by both the situation and the perceptions and expectations

of those superiors and subordinates with whom the dean of instruction

finds it necessary to interact in the institutional or hierarchical

setting. The two dimensions of leader behavior herein described

---

[13]Halpin, op. cit., pp. 4-6.

constitute the criteria of leader effectiveness and efficiency,

thus permitting the quantification of leader behavior on two rele-

vant variables. The leader behavior of a dean of instruction on

the dimensions of Initiating Structure and Consideration can be

characterized by one of the four quadrants as shown in Table I.[14]

TABLE I

INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION AS CO-ORDINATE
DIMENSIONS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR

Consideration

	+ S - C	+ S + C	
	- S - C	- S + C	

Initiating Structure

Mean of
Initiating
Structure
Scores

Mean of
Consideration
Scores

Thus, the dean of instruction may show one of four combina-

tions of leader ideology:

1. High Initiating Structure (+S) and Low Consideration (-C)

2. High Initiating Structure (+S) and High Consideration (+C)

3. Low Initiating Structure (-S) and Low Consideration (-C)

4. Low Initiating Structure (-S) and High Consideration (+C)

---

[14]Adapted from Verbeke, op. cit., p. 48.

Responses derived from the LBDQ reflect the perceptions and expectations of the presidents, faculty members, and the deans of instruction themselves regarding the deans' behavior on each behavior dimension under study. Leader behavior descriptions derived from each respondent number twelve as reflected in Table II.[15]

TABLE II

SCORES DERIVED FROM EACH RESPONDENT

Expectations	Dimension
LBDQ - Ideal, Dean	Initiating Structure
LBDQ - Ideal, Dean	Consideration
LBDQ - Ideal, Faculty Member	Initiating Structure
LBDQ - Ideal, Faculty Member	Consideration
LBDQ - Ideal, President	Initiating Structure
LBDQ - Ideal, President	Consideration

Perception	Dimension
LBDQ - Real, Dean	Initiating Structure
LBDQ - Real, Dean	Consideration
LBDQ - Real, Faculty Member	Initiating Structure
LBDQ - Real, Faculty Member	Consideration
LBDQ - Real, President	Initiating Structure
LBDQ - Real, President	Consideration

[15]Ibid., p. 49.

THE SAMPLE

The sample for this study is drawn from the 56 institutions which comprise the North Carolina Community College system, the 56 presidents, the 56 deans of instruction, and four to twelve faculty members from each institution. Each faculty respondent must have been employed at least six months in his present position at the time of the study and the president and dean of instruction must be in the second year of service in their present position. This criterion was verified from information supplied by the respondents on the background information forms.

The institutions selected to participate in the study meet the following criteria:

1. Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or the North Carolina State Board of Education

(or)

2. Seeking accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or the North Carolina State Board of Education.

3. The enrollment of the participating institution is 100 or more full-time equivalent (FTE) students.

4. The president, the dean of instruction, and at least four faculty members from each participating institution completed and returned both LBDQ and background information forms to the researcher.

Some of the information solicited on the background information

form, which is incidental to the study and bears no relation to the

findings, includes age, sex, ethnic group, highest degree held, years

in education work, years at present institution and in present posi-

tion, teaching responsibilities, years of teaching and/or administra-

tive experience at the community college level, and place of employ-
[16]
ment before assuming present position.

PROCEDURES

An initial letter was sent to the president of each institu-

tion bearing the signature of the researcher's Doctoral committee

chairman briefly explaining the study and requesting permission to
[17]
include the institution in the sample.   Also enclosed was a brief

description of the project and a statement of what was required of
[18]
those who participate.

If the president agreed to participate in the study, subject

to the wishes of the dean of instruction and the faculty, he was

asked to complete an inquiry form listing the name of the dean of

instruction, or the person who functions in this capacity, with
[19]
appropriate title.   In some institutions the designated title was

---

[16]The background information form is found in Appendix C.

[17]The initial letter to the president is found in Appendix D.

[18]The brief description of the project and requirements of those
who participated is found in Appendix E.

[19]The inquiry form is shown in Appendix F.

dean of instruction, academic dean, vice-president for instruction, director of occupational education, and the like. He was also requested to supply a list of all full-time faculty who may be assigned teaching duties, excluding department or division chairmen and other administrators. A faculty directory containing the above requested information sufficed.

All data gathering was conducted by mail, including administering the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

After the president returned his letter granting permission to include his institution in the study, furnished the researcher with the name and title of the person who functions as dean of instruction, and supplied a list of faculty members to be contacted to participate in the study, the persons so designated were contacted by letter inviting them to participate in the study.[20]

If twelve or fewer faculty names were submitted, all were included in the study. If more than twelve names were submitted, twelve were randomly selected to participate in the study.

A coded number was assigned each institution for follow-up and filing purposes, and for categorizing institutions by type.

The LBDQ and the personal characteristics form were mailed to each respondent with the request that all forms be completed and returned to the researcher by a requested date deadline. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for their convenience.

---

[20]The letter of transmittal of the LBDQ forms is found in Appendix G.

The respondents were advised that their part in the study should
require no more than thirty to forty minutes of their time.[21]

In correspondence to the presidents, deans of instruction and
faculty members it was emphasized that all data collected would be
held and treated in strict confidence, that no institution or in-
dividuals participating would be known to anyone but the researcher
in charge of the study, that no one from an institution would view
the responses of another person from that same or other institution,
that the project was a study of leader behavior, and that the re-
search was not an evaluation of the institution, but was a descrip-
tive study. The respondents were not asked to judge whether the be-
havior described is desirable or undesirable. They were only to
describe how the dean of instruction acts (Real) and how they think
he should act (Ideal). In addition, the dean of instruction was
asked to describe his own behavior on both the LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-
Ideal Self. However, no reference was made, in discussing the study
with the participants, to either dimension of behavior under study.
Each institution is to be offered a summary of the results upon
request.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

In this study the raw data was card punched and fed into the
Statistical Analysis System at the North Carolina State University

---

[21]The instructions to presidents, deans, and faculty members
are found in Appendix H.

Computing Service. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) embodies

an integrated approach to editing and statistical analysis of data.

It recognizes a simple language which users employ to specify to the

computer what they want done. Included in the language are state-

ments which present, elect, transform, generate, describe, and analyze

data.[22]

The raw data was converted into classified frequencies and a

chi square computed. The general rule for setting up chi square

categories is to have as many as possible, for the test will then

be more sensitive.[23]

The chi square is used for difference testing and is appro-

priate when testing to determine the significance of the difference

between three or more independent groups and where the data is of

only nominal strength, such as with the five response categories

in the LBDQ (Always, Often, Occasionally, Seldom, Never), or when

the criterion data appear only in classificatory rather than numerical

form.[24]

According to W. James Popham:

When the data for more than two independent samples are
only nominal in nature the chi square analysis is used
to test for differences. The observed frequencies are

[22]Anthony James Barr and James Howard Goodnight, A Users Guide
to the Statistical Analysis System. (Raleigh, N.C.: Department of
Statistics, North Carolina State University, 1972), p. 3.

[23]W. James Popham, Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation.
(New York: Harper and Rowe Publishers, 1967), p. 296.

[24]Sidney Seigel, Nonparametic Statistics: For the Behaviorial
Sciences. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp. 174-175.

contrasted with expected frequencies drawn from row and
column totals. If the disparity between expected and
observed frequencies is quite large, this reflects a
significant difference between the groups. The larger
the value of chi square, the greater the difference be-
tween the groups.[25]

When interpreting the meaning of a significant chi square
value, it is often helpful to note the contribution made by each
cell in the frequency table to the total chi square value.[26]

Chi square probably has its greatest influence in testing
for significance of differences between groups. Although there
may be any number of groups and any number of categories, apparently
that situation that arises most often in research is the one in
which there are two groups and two categories of response and the
data are expressed in a 2 x 2 table. In this particular research,
chi square, as it is used to test for significance of differences
in the perceptions and expectations of the leader behavior of the
dean himself, will be expressed in 3 x 5 and 2 x 5 tables. The
method is the same for any number of groups and categories.[27]

Suffice it to mention that a "correction for continuity" was
applied in those instances where the expected, or theoretical, fre-
quency in one or more of the cells was less than 10. It is also

[25]Popham, op. cit., p. 286.

[26]Ibid., p. 300.

[27]Janet T. Spence, et. al., Elementary Statistics. (New York:
Appleton-Century-Drofts, 1968), p. 200.

necessary to apply the "correction for continuity" when degrees of freedom equal one. However, in this research, degrees of freedom determined by the formula (c-1)(r-1), where c stands for column and r stands for rows, was already more than one so the correction was used only in reference to expected or theoretical frequency.[28]

When it is indicated that a difference was significant at the 5 per cent level, the level of confidence used in the research, this is only saying that there are five chances in 100 that the differences observed could have occurred by chance in the sample if there were no true differences between the populations from which they were drawn. Since this seems like a rather small probability of chance, one may conclude that the difference was not a chance difference but that it was a true difference. The most typical statistical rule of thumb is to reject the hypothesis of a chance difference when the probability of chance is 5 per cent or less. If the differences as stated in the hypotheses are not significant at the .05 level, the null hypothesis is accepted. If the differences are significant at the .05 level, the null hypothesis is rejected.[29]

"For nominal data, few alternatives to chi square analysis exist."[30]

---

[28]Ibid., pp. 206-206.

[29]David B. Cook, _A Guide to Educational Research_. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), pp. 110-111.

[30]Popham, _op. cit._, p. 316.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The data presented in this chapter was gathered for the purpose of determining whether or not faculty members in the North Carolina Community College System perceive and expect a style of leader behavior exhibited by the dean of instruction different from the style of leader behaviors perceived and expected by the dean's superior, the president, and by the dean himself. The question to be determined is how much difference, if any, is significant between the respondent groups.

When data are classified into categories representing distinctive characteristics, the operation of the law of probability might account for some of the cases that fall into each category. It is important to know whether their proportions merely reflect the operation of chance, or whether their appearance probably results from a significant controlling factor. If there were no really distinguishable difference between the respondent groups, a nearly equal number would be expected to choose similar responses. This result would conform to chance alone. However, if responses are unevenly distributed between the categories it is quite possible this distribution resulted from a real difference in expected and perceived leader behavior by superiors and subordinates.[1]

---

[1] John W. Best, Research in Education, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), pp. 227-228.

Since the primary concern of the study is with differences in actual role behavior (the "Real" or perceived behavior of the dean) and with differences in role expectation (the "Ideal" or expected behavior) the analysis of data follows the practice of reporting significant differences for each hypothesis.

The null hypotheses stated in this study assert there are no significant differences in the faculty's, president's, or dean's ratings or responses for each dimension when compared with each other. The chi square analysis was used to determine if there were any significant differences in the ratings between Faculty and President, between Faculty and Dean, and between President and Dean for data on the "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions of leader behavior as contained in the LBDQ. "The chi square test tells us whether the observed frequencies differ significantly from the theoretical frequencies."[2] It provided a method for comparing the observed frequencies with the theoretical frequencies that might be expected.

If the theoretical (expected) frequency of any cell was less than ten, a "correction for continuity" was used. Spence, et al., comments:

> The correction procedure is a simple one. After we determine the O-E (observed-expected, or theoretical) values, we merely reduce the absolute magnitude of each of them by .5. For example, an O-E of -1.65 would be reduced to -1.15 and an O-E of .87 to .37. We then square each of these corrected O-E values and proceed from there as usual....Introduction of the correction factor into the computational procedures results in relatively little change in X^2 unless both df and the expected frequency in one or more cells are small.[3]

---

[2]Donald R. Cook, <u>A Guide to Educational Research</u>. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 65.

[3]Janet T. Spence, et al., <u>Elementary Statistics</u>. (New York Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), p. 205.

The observed and theoretical frequencies by respondent groups for each of the forty items on both the LBDQ Real and Ideal descriptions, with chi square analysis for each question, can be found in Appendix I.

Table III is a list of the items on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire indicative of the two dimensions of leader behavior under study, Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Table IV indicates those questions where significant differences were found between presidents, faculty, and deans for "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions relative to Initiating Structure and Consideration.

TABLE III

ITEMS ON THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
INDICATIVE OF THE TWO DIMENSIONS OF LEADER
BEHAVIOR UNDER STUDY

Initiating Structure:

(2) He makes his attitudes clear to the group.
(4) He tries out his new ideas with the group.
(7) He rules with an iron hand.
(11) He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
(14) He assigns group members to particular tasks.
(16) He schedules the work to be done.
(17) He maintains definite standards of performance.
(22) He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
(24) He encourages the use of uniform procedures.
(27) He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood
     by all group members.
(29) He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
(32) He lets group members know what is expected of them.
(35) He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.
(39) He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

Consideration:

(1) He does personal favors for group members.
(3) He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of
     the group.
(6) He is easy to understand.
(8) He finds time to listen to group members.
(12) He keeps to himself.
(13) He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
(18) He refuses to explain his actions.
(20) He acts without consulting the group.
(21) He backs up the members in their actions.
(26) He is willing to make changes.
(28) He is friendly and approachable.
(31) He makes group members feel at ease when talking with him.
(34) He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
(38) He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.

    (The numbers in parentheses identify the items on the instrument.)

TABLE IV

ITEMS WHERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND BETWEEN PRESIDENTS,
FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR "REAL" AND "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS
RELATIVE TO INITIATING STRUCTURE
AND CONSIDERATION

	ITEM	"REAL" DESCRIPTIONS			"IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS		
		F : P	F : D	P : D	F : P	F : D	P : D
IS	2				*		
C	3		*				
IS	4		*				
IS	16						*
IS	17		*	*			
C	21	*	*				
C	28		*				
C	31	*					
IS	32	*	*				

F-Faculty; P-President; D-Dean; IS-Initiating Structure; C-Consideration;
*-Significant at the .05 level of confidence

The findings relative to the six basic hypotheses stated in Chapter
I are presented in the ensuing paragraphs. (See Appendix I and Table IV)

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the faculty
"Real" ratings for each dimension when compared with presidents'.

As can be seen by reference to Table IV, significant differences were
found for the "Real" ratings faculty : president on Items 21, 31, and 32, for
faculty : dean on Items 3, 4, 17, 21, 28, and 32, and for president : dean
on Item 17. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for these items.

Significant differences between faculty : president were indi-
cated on item 21 which states that "He backs up members in their actions."
This Item reflects the Consideration dimension. Responses by the presi-
dent indicate 92 per cent of them perceive the dean as "always" or "often"
backing subordinates in their actions. In comparison, the faculty re-
sponses indicate only 62 per cent of faculty perceive the dean as
"always" or "often" backing them in their actions while 26 per cent
said he "occasionally" did and close to 11 per cent responded the dean
"seldom" or "never" backed them in their actions.

In many instances, the president and the dean work very closely
in planning the instructional program and evidently the dean's activity
in these and other contacts indicates that he has concern for and supports
his subordinates. At least that is the impression the president has
indicated by his response. However, his subordinates actually see his
behavior as not as supportive as they deem appropriate.

Item 31 states "he makes group members feel at ease when talking
with them." This item is indicative of the Consideration dimension.
The president's response indicated 63 per cent "often" perceived the
dean as making group members feel at ease whereas almost 43 per cent
of the faculty apparently felt quite comfortable when talking with
the deans. This is indicative of respect and warmth in the relationship
between the dean and his subordinates.

Item 32 states "he lets group members know what is expected
of them." None of the responses fell in the "never" category. Sixty-three
per cent of the presidents perceived the dean as often letting his
subordinates know what is expected of them. However, the subordinates,

who probably have more direct contact with the dean in reference to their daily chores and other assignments, evidently perceive the dean's behavior as not advising subordinates what is expected of them. Even though the faculty had no responses in the "never" category, the responses were rather evenly distributed between "always," "often," or "occasionally." The implication as seen by the investigator is that the dean should give more than casual attention to letting his subordinates know what is actually expected of them if it is within his power to do so. This item is indicative of Initiating Structure and seems to further indicate that subordinates like structure in an organization to the degree they know what is expected of them so they can order their actions to help achieve organization and personal goals.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the faculty "Ideal" ratings for each dimension when compared with the presidents' ratings.

Only as regards one item was a significant difference found in faculty : president, "Ideal." This was item 2, indicative of Initiating Structure. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Seventy-four per cent of faculty responses indicated they felt the dean should "always" make his attitudes clear to the group. Fifty-one per cent of the presidents felt likewise. Furthermore, 100 per cent of the president responses and 96 per cent of the faculty responses indicated the dean should make clear his attitudes to the group an overwhelming majority of the time.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the faculty "Real" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instruction's ratings of their own behavior for each dimension.

Significant differences were found as regards the dimension Consideration, faculty : dean "Real," for items 3, 21, 28 and for the dimension Initiating Structure, items 4, 17, and 32. The null hypothesis was rejected in these instances.

Item 3 states "he does little things that make it pleasant to be a member of the group." The deans by a 70 per cent response apparently felt they did little things to make it more pleasant for their subordinates. However, the subordinates (the faculty in this instance) did not perceive the dean doing little things in the same light as the deans themselves. Around 50 per cent of the subordinates perceived the dean as "occasionally," "seldom," or "never" doing things to make life more pleasant for the group.

Item 21 states "he backs up members in their actions." As with the presidents, the deans by the same percentage—70 per cent— perceived themselves as actually backing their subordinates in their actions. Subordinates' responses indicate better than 60 per cent feel the dean does back them only "often" or "occasionally" while 10 per cent perceived the dean as supportive "seldom" or "never."

Item 28 states "he is friendly and approachable." Faculty responses indicate they actually perceive the dean as friendly and approachable 50 per cent of the time. Evidently the deans do not perceive themselves in the same light as 59 per cent of their responses fell in the often category. However, it should be noted that even though there were differences in responses in the various categories, overall the responses indicate both the deans and faculty as perceiving the dean as friendly and easy to approach the majority of the time.

Items relating to Initiating Structure, faculty : dean, "Real,"
found significant were numbers 4, 17, and 32. Item 4 states "he tries
out his new ideas with the group." The majority of the deans, 88 per
cent, perceived themselves as "always" or "often" sharing or trying
out new ideas with the faculty, or quite possibly using the faculty
as a sounding board for new ideas. The faculty did not perceive the
dean as trying out new ideas with them in quite the same ratio. The
majority of the responses indicated the dean, "occasionally" 33 per cent
of the time and "often" 42 per cent of the time, tried out his new ideas
with the group.

Item 17 states "he maintains definite standards of performance."
Fifty-seven per cent of the deans felt they maintained definite standards
of performance while 30 per cent responded they did "occasionally."
There were no responses in the "seldom" or "never" categories for the
deans. However, the faculty recorded responses in each category with
the majority of the responses falling in the "always" and "often"
categories, 35 per cent and 33 per cent respectively. The faculty
actually perceives the dean's behavior as indicating concern more for
initiating structure than do the deans themselves.

Item 32 states "he lets group members know what is expected of
them." Again the deans perceive themselves as exhibiting concern for
Initiating Structure. According to their responses, 96 per cent indi-
cate they actually feel that the majority of the time they let their
subordinates know what is expected of them. However, only 62 per
cent of the subordinates feel the same way. Twenty-seven per cent
of the subordinates' responses indicate the deans only "occasionally"

or "seldom" let them know what is expected of them. Neither respondent group indicated the deans "never" informed them what they were expected to do.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the faculty "Ideal" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instruction's ratings of their own behavior on each dimension.

No significant differences were found for either dimension so the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the president's "Real" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instruction's ratings of their own behavior in the president : dean.

A significant difference was found for the dimension Initiating Structure for item 17 which states "he maintains definite standards of performance." The null hypothesis was rejected. Fifty-seven per cent of the deans felt they "often" maintained definite standards of performance, a behavior indicative of Initiating Structure. Only 40 per cent of the presidents felt likewise. However, 33 per cent of the presidents felt their dean "always" maintained definite standards of performance whereas the deans themselves felt they did by only 11 per cent response in this category. Thirty per cent responses by the deans indicated they felt they only "occasionally" maintained definite standards of performance whereas 14 per cent of the presidents felt this way for this particular response category. It is interesting to note that 11 per cent of the president's responses fell in the "seldom" category. No responses from the deans fell in this category.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in the president's "Ideal" ratings for each dimension when compared with the dean of instructions' rating of their own behavior.

A significant difference was found for the dimension Initiating Structure for question 16, president : dean "Ideal," which states "he should schedule the work to be done." The null hypothesis was rejected.

Both the presidents and the deans felt the dean should "always," "often," or "occasionally" schedule the work to be done. The deans felt they should do this in 74 per cent of the responses as compared to the presidents' 43 per cent response in this category. However, 38 per cent of the presidents' responses indicated he should "always" whereas the deans felt this way in only 11 per cent of their responses. According to the data, 26 per cent of the presidents responded "occasionally" compared to the deans' 14 per cent response in this category. Neither the presidents nor the deans felt he should "seldom" or "never" schedule the work to be done.

Other significant differences were found in some of the items not relative to Initiating Structure or Consideration, the two leader behavior dimensions under study in this research. These were items 5, 15, 25, 33, and 36.

A significant difference was found in item 4, faculty : dean, Real, which states "he acts as a real leader of the group." Eighty-eight per cent of deans indicated they perceived themselves as "often" acting as the real leader. The faculty response indicated for this category was only 40 per cent. This might be indicative of role conflict for the dean as far as perceptions of the leader behavior of the dean is concerned.

Quite possibly there could be a number of leaders in a group influenced
by the situation and the task at hand. Some faculty responses fell in
the category of "seldom" or "never" does the dean act as the real leader.
In comparison, none of the dean responses fell in these categories. The
dean definitely does not perceive his behavior in the same light as the
faculty for this particular question.

A significant difference was also found for item 5 faculty :
president, Ideal, which states "he should act as the real leader of the
group." Responses by the presidents indicate 77 per cent feel the
dean should act as the real leader of the group whereas 92 per cent
of the deans feel they should act as the real leader of the group.
Interestingly enough, 22 per cent of the president's responses fell
in the "occasionally" response category. The investigator assumes
the presidents feel the dean should encourage others in the group to
assume leadership roles at various times and in different situations.
This might possibly be one way of assuring an organization a cadre of
leaders with group leadership experience.

A significant difference was found in item 15 faculty :
president, Ideal, which states "he should be spokesman of the group."
Faculty responses indicate 84 per cent feel the dean "always" or
"often" should be spokesman for the group whereas only 62 per cent
of the presidents' responses indicated they felt this way. Interest-
ingly enough 29 per cent of the presidents felt the dean should only
"occasionally" be spokesman for the group. Herein lies a source of
possible conflict for the dean in his dealings with the faculty. The
dean of instruction has the major task of implementing policy for

academic outstandingness. It is the investigator's opinion that in his dealings with the president and significant others, the dean should be the spokesman of the group. If the president does not expect him to be spokesman, there could conceivably be room for dis-agreement and conflict.

Significant differences were also found in item 25 for both faculty : president, Real, and faculty : dean, Real, which states "he gets what he asks for from his superiors." The presidents felt that the deans get what they request. Seventy-seven per cent of the presidents indicated they felt he "often" did get what was requested of them. Only 52 per cent of the faculty felt the same with 33 per cent indicating they felt he only "occasionally" received what he asked for from his superior, the president. For the same question the dean's response indicated 92 per cent felt they "often" got what they asked for from the president, with the remaining responses falling in the category "occasionally." No responses were recorded for "always," "seldom," or "never."

For item 33 a significant difference was found in the faculty : president, Ideal. This item states "he should speak as representative of the group." Faculty members indicated in 87 per cent of their responses that they felt the dean should speak as representative of the group. Only 74 per cent of the presidents felt likewise. Interestingly enough, 22 per cent of the presidents felt the dean should only "occasion-ally" speak as representative of the group opposed to faculty responses of 12 per cent in this category. Why the difference in expectations is subject to an assumption that the president feels he himself should act

as representative of the group or that various members of the group in different situations should speak as representative of the group.

A significant difference was found in item 36, faculty : dean, Real, which states "he lets other people take away his leadership in the group." Faculty responses indicate they perceived the dean 72 per cent of the time as "seldom" or "never" letting people take away his leadership in the group. The dean's response, comparatively speaking, was 59 per cent of the time for the same categories of response. But in the response category "occasionally," 17 per cent of faculty response were accounted for. However, 40 per cent of the deans evidently felt they actually on occasion let other people take away their leadership in the group. Now whether this was intentional or not, again only assumptions can be made by the investigator. One assumption would be that the dean was interested in various faculty members assuming more leadership roles to assure the organization of experienced leaders to fill vacancies as they occur. Another assumption would be that the faculty do not perceive this as a technique employed by the dean to assure the cadre of experienced leaders but rather they quite possibly perceive this as acquiescent leadership behavior on the part of the dean. A very interesting point was that faculty members who participated in the study felt the dean "often" or "always" 10 per cent of the time actually let other people take away his leadership in the group.

An assumption by the investigator would be that the dean quite possibly should inform group members of his plan to let various faculty members assume leadership roles from time to time. Thus the faculty members should see this as planned action by the dean rather than an abdication of his leader role.

For item 36, faculty : president and faculty : dean, Ideal, a significant difference was found. This item states "he should let other people take away his leadership in the group." For the presidents, 65 per cent of the responses fell in the "seldom" or "never" categories while for the faculty 89 per cent of the responses were recorded for the same categories. The presidents felt the dean should "occasionally" let other people take away his leadership role in 30 per cent of the responses as opposed to an 8 per cent response for the faculty. The deans' responses for this same question as compared with the faculty indicate 42 per cent felt the dean should "occasionally" let the people take away his leadership in the group as opposed to the 8 per cent response in this category for the faculty. Correspondingly, the dean responses indicated 56 per cent as compared to 26 per cent for faculty in the "never" category, and 32 per cent as compared to 19 per cent for faculty in the "seldom" category. Faculty responses indicate the faculty feels more strongly than the dean that the dean should "seldom" or "never" let other people take away his leadership in the group.

Research cited earlier has indicated that leaders vary considerably in their style of leader behavior and that "desirable" leader behavior is characterized by high Initiating Structure and Consideration. Some leaders emphasize one dimension to the exclusion of the other in their style of leader behavior. Various combinations are undoubtedly found when individual leaders are characterized as exhibiting one or a combination of behaviors indicative of these two dimensions.

However, in this study the deans of instruction as a group, have been rated according to the frequency of responses of the

respondent groups describing the dean's behavior which falls in each

of the descriptive categories (1) Always, (2) Often, (3) Occasionally,

(4) Seldom, (5) Never. (Table V).

TABLE V

EXAMPLE OF FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY THE RESPONDENT GROUPS
IN EACH OF THE DESCRIPTIVE CATEGORIES

		(Always)	(Often)	(Occasionally)	(Seldom)	(Never)
		1	2	3	4	5
P						
	#	4	4	9	7	3
	%	14.81	14.81	33.33	25.93	11.11
F						
	#	33	28	58	41	34
	%	17.01	14.43	29.90	21.13	17.53
D						
	#	3	6	7	8	3
	%	11.11	22.22	25.93	29.63	11.11
		40	38	74	56	40
		16.13	15.32	29.84	22.58	16.13

Mean Scores of Respondent Groups

The mean scores for the respondent groups for "Real" and "Ideal"

descriptions for both Initiating Structure and Consideration are found

in Table VI.

Total mean scores are listed at the bottom of this table so that

mean scores between respondent groups can be readily observed and compared.

Low mean scores indicate high expectations or perceptions. For example,

the total mean score for presidents on the "Real" descriptions, Initiating

Structure, was 2.2. This simply means that the majority of the presidents

as respondents fell between (2) Often and (3) Occasionally, thus indicating

they actually perceived the dean of instruction as "often" or "occasionally"

exhibiting leader behavior indicative of Initiating Structure. The total mean score on "Ideal" descriptions, Initiating Structure was 1.8 for this same respondent group. This means that the majority of the president's responses indicated they expected the dean of instruction to (1) Always or (2) Often exhibit leader behavior indicative of Initiating Structure. Similar comparisons can be made with other respondent groups and other mean scores.

The deans of instruction perceived themselves as actually exhibiting more Initiating Structure in their leader behavior than did either the presidents or the faculty members as total groups. However, the mean scores of all three respondent groups were identical, 1.8, indicating all three groups expect the dean "always" to "often" initiate structure in the organization; that is, he should delineate the relationships between himself and members of the organization and endeavor to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting things done.

An interesting observation is the faculty as a group actually perceived less Initiating Structure in the dean's leader behavior than did either the presidents or the deans themselves as a total group.

For the dimension Consideration, the faculty as a total group perceived the leader behavior of the dean of instruction as less indicative of Consideration than did either the presidents or the deans themselves as total groups.

Both the presidents' and the faculty members' total mean score as a group was identical, 2.3, for Consideration, "Real," whereas the deans' score was 2.5 indicating these two respondent groups actually

perceived more of the Consideration dimension in the deans' leader behavior than did the deans themselves as a total group.

All three respondent groups expected (Ideal) more Consideration than perceived (Real). The presidents, as a total group, expected more Consideration behavior than did the faculty members or the deans themselves. Too, the faculty members expected more Consideration than the deans felt they should exhibit.

In other words, the implication for the dean, as the investigator views it, is that in his relationships with both superiors and subordinates, it is expected that he should exhibit leader behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth.

TABLE VI

MEAN SCORES OF RESPONDENT GROUPS FOR "REAL"
AND "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS

Initiating Structure | | | | | | Consideration | | | | |

	P	F	D	Mean Score			P	F	D	Mean Score	
I2	2.1	2.1	1.9	(R)	2.0	I1	2.6	3.0	2.7	(R)	2.9
	1.4	1.2	1.2	(I)	1.3 *		2.7	3.1	2.7	(I)	3.0
I4	2.2	2.6	1.9	(R)	2.4	I3	2.2	3.1	2.7	(R)	2.5
	1.8	1.9	1.7	(I)	1.9 *		1.8	1.8	1.7	(I)	1.8*
I7	3.5	3.4	3.5	(R)	3.4	I6	2.0	2.0	2.1	(R)	2.0
	3.7	3.6	3.8	(I)	3.6		1.2	1.2	1.1	(I)	1.2
I9	2.6	2.8	2.5	(R)	2.7	I8	1.5	1.8	1.6	(R)	1.8
	2.2	2.1	2.3	(I)	2.2		1.2	1.4	1.2	(I)	1.3
I11	2.8	2.8	2.8	(R)	2.8	I12	3.4	3.3	3.5	(R)	3.3
	3.0	3.0	3.0	(I)	3.0		3.7	3.7	3.9	(I)	3.9
I14	2.1	2.2	1.9	(R)	2.1	I13	2.1	2.4	2.1	(R)	2.4
	1.8	2.0	1.7	(I)	1.9		1.7	2.0	1.8	(I)	1.9
I16	2.4	2.3	2.2	(R)	2.3	I18	4.1	4.0	3.9	(R)	3.9
	1.9	1.9	2.0	(I)	1.9*		4.2	4.5	4.4	(I)	4.4
I17	2.0	2.0	2.1	(R)	2.0	I20	3.3	3.2	3.4	(R)	3.2
	1.4	1.3	1.3	(I)	1.3*		3.9	3.7	4.0	(I)	3.8
I22	2.0	1.8	1.7	(R)	1.8	I21	1.9	2.2	1.8	(R)	2.1*
	1.4	1.6	1.5	(I)	1.6		1.7	1.7	1.6	(I)	1.6
I24	1.8	2.0	2.0	(R)	2.0	I23	2.2	2.4	1.8	(R)	2.3
	1.6	1.7	1.7	(I)	1.7		1.6	1.8	1.5	(I)	1.8
I27	2.3	2.1	2.0	(R)	2.1	I26	2.1	2.1	1.7	(R)	2.1
	1.4	1.2	1.4	(I)	1.3		1.5	1.6	1.4	(I)	1.6
I29	1.8	1.7	1.7	(R)	1.7	I28	1.7	1.7	1.8	(R)	1.7*
	1.6	1.6	1.7	(I)	1.6		1.2	1.2	1.2	(I)	1.2
I32	2.0	1.9	1.7	(R)	1.9*	I31	1.9	1.9	1.8	(R)	1.9*
	1.2	1.2	1.1	(I)	1.2		1.2	1.1	1.2	(I)	1.2
I35	2.2	2.4	2.1	(R)	2.3	I34	2.1	2.4	2.0	(R)	2.3
	1.4	1.7	1.5	(I)	1.6		1.9	1.9	1.8	(I)	1.9
I39	2.0	2.3	2.0	(R)	2.2	I38	1.9	2.5	1.9	(R)	2.3
	1.3	1.4	1.3	(I)	1.r		1.7	1.8	1.6	(I)	1.8
TOTAL	2.2	2.3	2.1	(R)		TOTAL	2.3	2.5	2.3	(R)	
MEAN	1.8	1.8	1.8	(I)		MEAN	2.0	2.1	2.2	(I)	
SCORES						SCORES					

(*Indicates items where significant differences were found in either
"Real" or "Ideal" descriptions, or both.)

P-President; F-Faculty; D-Dean; (R) - Real or perceived behavior
(I) - Ideal or expected behavior

Selected Characteristics of Participating
Faculty, Deans, and Presidents

The general personal characteristics of the faculty members,[*] deans of instruction,[**] and presidents[**] were obtained through short background information forms mailed to the respondents at the time they were sent the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The information was used only to classify the characteristics of the participants in the study.

Faculty Members (Table VII) in the total sample tended to be younger than either the presidents or deans. Male faculty members outnumber their female counterparts by almost two to one. Sixty-nine per cent of the faculty had masters' degrees or higher. Three faculty members held doctorates. Three faculty members held the Associate in Arts degree.

The ethnic group of the faculty was comprised of 90 per cent American Caucasian. The remaining 10 per cent represented American Indian, American Negro, and other (three, German).

The majority of faculty members were employed as instructors in public school before assuming their present position but some were retired Navy or Army personnel, some taught in private schools or military academies, and some were employed in industry, manufacturing, and retail trade.

---

[*]A copy of the faculty background information form is found in Appendix C, as previously mentioned.

[**]A copy of the president and dean background information form is found in Appendix J.

The average number of years at their present institution was four and the average number of years in their present position was four also. No faculty respondents were functioning as department heads at the time of the study. The average number of years of community college or technical institute teaching experience was four years with five years the average number of "other" teaching experience. Thus the total faculty had an average of nine years experience in the teaching field.

Seventy-one per cent of the "other" teaching experience was at the secondary level. Ten per cent was at the junior college level, and 11 per cent at the four year college or university level. The remaining percentages were divided between elementary level teaching responsibility and teaching experience in military academies.

Deans of Instruction (Table VIII) were generally older than faculty members but in the same age range of presidents. Seven of the twenty-seven were less than thirty-six years of age. Three were more than fifty years of age. All of the deans were males and all held master's or doctor's degrees. Sixty per cent held doctorates. All were of the ethnic group American Caucasian.

The deans' sample averaged thirteen years in education work with four years the average number of years at their present institution. The deans averaged three years in their present position but averaged five years at their present institution which indicated they held other positions at the institution. Fifty-five per cent had actually held other positions in their present institution. Some of the titles of positions held were Administrative Assistant to the President, Director

of Occupational Education, Dean of Technical-Vocational, Dean, or

Associate Dean of Continuing Education, Director of Evening Programs,

Director of Extension, Dean of Liberal Arts, Director of Special

Programs, Business Manager, and Instructor.

Of the twenty-seven deans, only four indicated they had teaching

responsibilities. Of the four, one indicated his teaching responsi-

bility was irregular while the others taught only one course a year.

The deans averaged two years of teaching experience at the community

college level with eight years being the average years of administra-

tive experience at the community college level.

The deans were employed at a variety of places before they

assumed their present position (not listed on table). Five of the

deans were employed at their present institution, six held positions

at another community college or technical institute, seven came from

the public school area below college level, two came directly from

industry, one from business, two from government related positions,

one from service as a university professor, and three had been enrolled

as graduate students, either in master's or doctoral programs.

Presidents (Table IX) were found to have 60 per cent of their

group in the thirty-six to fifty age bracket. None of the presidents

were female. Only one of the respondents had less than a masters'

degree with the highest degree held almost evenly split between masters'

and doctor's degrees. The mean years of education work was more than

either the faculty or deans' group. The average number of years in

education work was twenty-five years ranging from eight to forty

years of service to the profession of education. The presidents' group

averaged eight years in their present position with an average of eight years in their present institution. However, some had held another or other positions in their present institution. Some had held titles of Associate Director, Director of Student Personnel, Instructor, Evening Director, and Dean of Instruction.

Only three of the presidents had teaching responsibilities, one which was irregular, one three hours a week, and one indicated he taught only one course a year. Undoubtedly the teaching of courses was a personal choice.

The presidents averaged three years of teaching experience at the community college level, one more than the deans and one less than faculty members. The range was from zero to fifteen years for the presidents' group and from zero to five for the deans' group.

The presidents averaged eight years of administrative experience at the community college level as did the deans. The range was from three to fourteen years for the presidents and one to fifteen years for the deans.

When asked where they were employed before assuming their present position (not listed in table) two indicated at their present institution, eight indicated another community college or technical institute, nine were from the public school area below college level, one came from industry, one was employed by a private school, one came from business, and one from government. Of the remaining four, one was from the university level, one came from the Ford Foundation, one was a former State Director of Vocational Education and one was a graduate student immediately before he assumed his present position.

TABLE VII

TOTAL RESPONSES WITH AVERAGES, WHERE APPROPRIATE, FOR THE
FACULTY MEMBERS' BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age group   110   21 - 35   2.   Sex   125   Male
     70   36 - 50   74   Female
     19   51 or more

3. Highest degree held   65   Bachelor's   24   Specialist
     104   Master's   3   Doctorate
     3   Associate in Arts

4. Ethnic group   180   American Caucasian   0   Spanish Surnamed American
     1   American Indian
     15   American Negro   0   Oriental American
     3   Other (German)

5. Type of work done before assuming present position
(Job Title)   See Faculty Summary, pp. 100-101

6. Average years at present institution   4   years

7. Average years in present position   4   years
     0   months

8. Average years of community college or
technical institute teaching experience   4   years

9. Average years of other teaching experience   5   years

10. Level(s) of "other" teaching experience
See Faculty Summary, pp. 100-101

TABLE VIII

TOTAL RESPONSES WITH AVERAGES, WHERE APPROPRIATE, FOR THE
DEANS OF INSTRUCTION BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age group   7   21-35   2.   Sex   27   Male
                    17   36 - 50   Female
                     3   51 or more

3. Highest degree held   Bachelor's   Specialist
                     11   Master's   16   Doctorate

4. Ethnic group   27   American Caucasian   0   Spanish
                    0   American Indian   Surnamed
                    0   American Negro   American
                                         0   Oriental
                                           American
                                           0   Other (____)

5. Average years in education work   13   years

6. Average years at present institution   5   years

7. Average years in present position   3   years

8. Other position(s) held in present institutions-List   15
       See Dean's Summary, pp. 101-102

9. Teaching responsibilities   4   yes
                                 23   no

10. Average years of teaching experience at community
       college level   2   years
                              (Range 0 - 5)

11. Average years of administrative experience at   8   years
       community college level   (Range 1 - 15)

12. Place of employment *immediately before* assuming present position

          5   Present institution   Private
          6   Another community college/   School
              Technical institute   Military
          7   Public School   (Including persons retired)
          2   Industry   1   Business
          4   Other   2   Government

       See Dean's Summary, pp. 101-102

TABLE IX

TOTAL RESPONSES WITH AVERAGES, WHERE APPROPRIATE, FOR THE
PRESIDENT'S BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age group   <u>3</u> 21 - 35   2. Sex   <u>27</u> Male
                     <u>19</u> 36 - 50   <u>   </u> Female
                     <u>5</u> 51 or more

3. Highest degree held   <u>1</u> Bachelor's   <u>0</u> Specialist
                          <u>14</u> Master's   <u>12</u> Doctorate

4. Ethnic group   <u>27</u> American Caucasian   <u>0</u> Spanish Surnamed
                     <u>0</u> American Indian   American
                     <u>0</u> American Negro   <u>0</u> Oriental American
                                              <u>0</u> Other (_____)

5. Average years in education work   <u>22</u> years

6. Average years at present institution   <u>8</u> years

7. Average years in present position   <u>9</u> years

8. Other positions held in present institution   <u>7</u> yes
                                                   <u>20</u> no

     List: <u>See President's Summary, pp. 102-103</u>

9. Teaching responsibilities   <u>3</u> yes
                                            <u>24</u> no

10. Average total years of teaching experience   <u>3</u> yes
     at community college level   (Range 0 - 15)

11. Average total years of administrative   <u>8</u> years
     experience at community college level   (Range 3 - 14)

12. Where were you employed immediately before you assumed your
     present position?
       <u>2</u>   Present institution   <u>1</u> Private school
       <u>8</u>   Another community college/   <u>   </u> Military (including
           technical institute   retired persons)
       <u>9</u> Public school   <u>1</u> Business
       <u>1</u> Industry   <u>1</u> Government
       <u>4</u> Other

     <u>See Presdient's Summary, pp. 102-103</u>

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The concern of this investigation was chiefly with a description of faculty perceptions of and expectations for the dean of instruction's leader behavior as compared with similar ratings by the president and the dean himself. In this study the faculty were referred to as subordinates and the presidents were referred to as superiors.

Perceptions of leader behavior reflect the different styles of leader behavior in which educational administrators engage in interacting with and relating to their various reference groups.

Expectations of leader behavior reflect the different roles which administrators must seek to fulfill in the course of their duties. Previous studies suggest that educational administrators adopt different styles of leader behavior in dealing with different groups, and that they experience role conflict stemming from conflicting perceptions and expectations of superiors and subordinates.

The investigation was designed as a study of the leader behavior of the dean of instruction in the community college setting. The dean, as appointed head of the instructional program, is confronted with a dual leadership role. The dean's role behavior is his behavior as perceived by others with whom he interacts and himself. The dean's role expectation is the pattern of behavior considered ideal by others with whom he interacts and by himself. Role behavior is perceived

differently by different groups and at times differently by the same group under other circumstances. Role expectations also change or vary with changing situations.

The focus of the study was on the influence the dean of instruction as a leader exerts in his interaction with superiors and subordinates, his behavior as he exerts this influence, and how his behavior is perceived by himself, his superiors, and subordinates as he endeavors to establish well-defined patterns for achieving organizational goals while maintaining personal relations indicative of friendship, mutual trust, and respect.

In a formal organization the leader is provided feedback or stimulus in the form of individual and group reactions to his behavior as a leader. This enables him to form personal perceptions about his own behavior. Thus the leader develops knowledge of his own behavior either by being told how he behaves or by observing the reactions of others to his behavior.

If the dean of instruction is receptive to differences between the perceptions of the superiors and subordinates, and those he holds about his own behavior, then he should synthesize these perceptions to form leader behavior more appropriate to the needs of the group and the organization. He thus tends to integrate knowledge about the difference in perceptions.

The study centered on the leader behavior of the dean of instruction and his interpersonal relations and interactions with other superior and subordinate members of the hierarchical organization. Two dimensions of leader behavior were examined: Initiating Structure,

in which well-defined organizational goals and procedures are emphasized, and Consideration, which refers to behavior indicative of personal respect and warmth between the leader and group members. These two dimensions were analyzed under both actually perceived or "Real" behavior, and expected or "Ideal" behavior.

In order for the dean to perform effectively he should be able to adapt his behavior to the needs of faculty members. Effective operation permits the realization of organizational goals. For this to occur efficiently, the dean should be able to perceive accurately feedback from superiors and subordinates about his own behavior. Efficiency is concerned with the satisfaction of individual needs.

No attempt was made to evaluate the effectiveness or efficiency of a particular administrator involved in the study. Comparisons were made of total groups. A methodological weakness in the analysis and reporting of data collected known as the "good-bad" syndrome was avoided.

In response to the initial letter to the president, replies were received from forty of the fifty-six institutions in the North Carolina Community College System. Out of these forty replies, one was not acceptable for the study because the president was also serving as dean of instruction. Twelve other institutions declining to participate had good and sufficient reasons. For example, some of the staff and faculty were involved in institutional self-studies, meeting requirements for accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation, and bond referendums. Twenty-seven of the fifty-six institutions yielded sufficient response from the faculty, deans, and presidents to be included in the final institutional sample.

A random selection of faculty members resulted in three hundred
and five being invited to participate in the study. Responses were
received from one hundred and ninety-nine faculty which represents a
65 per cent return. Each of the twenty-seven presidents and twenty-
seven deans in the final sample returned their questionnaires which
represents a 100 per cent return. The distribution of useable replies
among the faculty was such that there were no institutions with fewer
than four faculty observations of the dean's behavior. The maximum
number of replies which could be expected from any one institution
was twelve. The minimum replies received from any one faculty group
was four (two institutions) and the maximum was ten. The average number
of replies received from the faculty group was seven. The leader be-
havior of the dean of instruction as perceived (Real) and as expected
(Ideal) was described by the president, a sample of faculty members,
and the dean himself.

. The null hypothesis stated in this study asserted that there
are no significant differences in the facultys', presidents', or
deans' ratings, or responses, for each dimension when compared with
each other.

The chi square analysis was used to determine if there were
significant differences in the frequency of responses or ratings
between faculty and presidents, between faculty and deans, and be-
tween presidents and deans for data on the "Real" and "Ideal" des-
criptions of leader behavior as contained in the forty items on the
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. As stated previously, the
.05 level of confidence was selected as an acceptable level to denote
significance. (p. 80).

This questionnaire was developed by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University. The instrument focuses upon a "description" of what a leader does rather than upon an "evaluation" of what he does. The two dimensions of leader behavior identified by this questionnaire are Initiating Structure and Consideration.

The respondents were asked to describe the dean of instruction's leader behavior as they actually perceived it and as they thought it should be. They were not asked to judge whether the behavior was desirable or undesirable. Each item on the LBDQ describes a specific kind of behavior and the respondents were simply asked to describe the dean's leader behavior as accurately as they could. On the LBDQ "Real" the respondent presidents, faculty, and the deans themselves were asked to think how frequently the dean engages in the behavior described by the item (forty items) and then decide whether he (1) always, (2) often, (3) occasionally, (4) seldom, or (5) never, acts as described by the item. After making the decision, each of the respondents was asked to draw a circle around one of the five letters to show the answer they selected. On the LBDQ "Ideal" the same group of respondents were asked to decide how frequently the dean "should" act as described by the item (forty items).

Significant differences were found on a number of items between ratings by faculty members and presidents, between faculty members and deans, and between presidents and deans for "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions relative to Initiating Structure and Consideration. (Table IV, p. 85).

Mean scores of faculty members, presidents, and deans as total groups were tabulated for "Real" and "Ideal" descriptions for both Initiating Structure and Consideration items on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Low mean scores in this study were indicative of high expectations or perceptions. (Table VI, p. 99).

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions in the ensuing paragraphs are derived from the hypotheses (p. 22-23) and are based on the data compiled from twenty-seven of the fifty-six institutions in the North Carolina Community College System. Keeping this in mind the conclusions are thus limited by the sample used. It is not intended that these inferences or conclusions be projected beyond these limitations.

From this investigation it is concluded that:

1. Faculty members as a total group did not agree with the presidents as a total group as to the "Real" leader behavior of the dean of instruction on the dimension Initiating Structure. (Table VI, p. 99).

The presidents felt more strongly than the faculty that the dean's leader behavior in the actual situation was indicative of Initiating Structure. Quite possibly the dean's behavior when around the president is not the same as when with faculty members.

A significant difference was found in faculty members' and presidents' perceptions on the item which states "he lets group members know what was expected of them." The majority of their responses indicating they felt likewise in many instances, also indicating the dean only "occasionally" or "seldom" let them know what was expected of them. These findings indicate an apparent conflict between the

perceptions of these two groups. Implications are that the dean

should give more attention to establishing well-defined patterns of

organization and channels of communication so that faculty members

can be better informed about what is expected of them.

> 2. Faculty members as a total group did agree with the
> presidents as a total group as to the "Ideal" leader
> behavior of the dean of instruction on Initiating
> Structure. (Table VI, p. 99).

The total mean scores of both groups were identical indicating

they are in agreement that the dean should, in his role as leader,

delineate the relationship between himself and members of the faculty

as he endeavors to establish the patterns of organization and ways of

communication necessary to get the job done. However, a significant

difference was found for one item on the "Ideal" descriptions.

The presidents, as a group, felt the dean should "always" or "often"

make his attitudes clear to the group. Most of the faculty responses

indicated the same feeling, but a small percentage of the faculty

members indicated they felt the dean should only "occasionally" or

"never" make his attitudes clear to the group. It is possible the

question was not clear to the respondents as to an interpretation

of the term "attitudes."

> 3. Faculty members as a total group did not agree
> with the presidents as a total group as to the "Real"
> leader behavior of the dean of instruction on Con-
> sideration. (Table VI, p. 99).

The presidents perceived more of the dimension Consideration

in the dean's leader behavior than did faculty members. The larger

majority of the presidents, more than 90 per cent, felt the dean

backed up members in their action while slightly more than half of

the faculty as a group felt likewise. Twenty-five per cent indicated they perceived the dean as only "occasionally" backing them while some indicated he "seldom" or "never" backed them in their actions. The dean conceivably could be trying to please two masters at once. A significant difference was found for this particular item. Since the deans interact more with the president than they do with individual faculty members, perhaps they plan their behavior towards the presidents in light of anticipated reaction from their superior.

4. Faculty members as a total group did not agree with the presidents as a total group as to the "Ideal" leader behavior of the dean of instruction on the dimension Consideration. (Table VI, p. 99).

The presidents as a group felt more strongly than did faculty members as a group that the dean should exhibit more leader behavior indicative of the dimensions Consideration. However, differences in the expectations between the group were not significant.

5. Faculty members as a total group did not agree with the deans of instruction as a total group as to the "Real" leader behavior of the dean of instruction on the dimension Initiating Structure. (Table VI, p. 99).

The faculty members as a group perceived the dean as exhibiting behavior less indicative of Initiating Structure than they expected it to be. A significant difference between faculty members and deans of instruction were found on each of three items. Close to 90 per cent of the dean's responses indicated they perceived themselves "always" to "often" trying out new ideas with the group or perhaps using the group as a sounding board. Only 50 per cent of faculty responses indicated they perceived the dean in the same light. In fact, 46 per cent of the faculty indicated they actually perceived the dean as

"occasionally" to "seldom" trying out his new ideas with them. A

smaller percentage indicated he never tried out new ideas with them.

This should be an area of legitimate concern for the dean of instruc-

tion and could be an area where disagreement and misunderstanding are

generated.

A significant difference between faculty members and deans of

instruction as total groups was also found for the item which has

reference to the leader maintaining definite standards of performance.

Most of the responses from both groups indicated they actually felt

the dean did maintain definite standards of performance. However, 30

per cent felt otherwise. This leaves room for relevant concern for

the dean of instruction because even if he does feel he is trying to

maintain these standards of performance this is evidently not getting

through to the faculty as they perceive his behavior.

Again a significant difference was found between faculty and

deans regarding their perceptions as to whether or not the dean of

instruction lets group members know what is expected of them. In

comparison with the presidents, faculty members also felt that the

dean did not let them know what was expected of them. The presidents

thus concur with the faculty that their perception of the deans'

leader behavior indicates that he does not let the faculty know what

is expected of them the majority of the time. Even though the deans

themselves feel they let subordinates know what is expected of them,

neither the dean's subordinates nor superiors view this in the same

light. An assumption by the investigator is that the majority of

people, faculty members especially, seem to prefer structure in their

work environment to the degree they know what is expected of them so that they can order their actions or behaviors to help achieve organizational and personal goals.

    6. Faculty members as a total group did agree with
       the deans of instruction as a total group as to
       the "Ideal" leader behavior of the deans on the
       dimension Initiating Structure. (Table VI, p. 99).

There were no significant differences found. Both groups felt rather strongly, as indicated by their responses, that ideally the dean should exhibit behaviors indicative of this dimension in his relation with various groups within the institution.

    7. Faculty members as a total group did not agree with
       the deans of instruction as a total group as to the
       "Real" leader behavior of the deans on the dimension
       Consideration. (Table VI, p. 99).

The faculty members' perceptions of the dean's behavior differ significantly in reference to three items which describe the dean's actual behavior. The deans themselves felt their behaviors were indicative of warmth, friendship, respect, and mutual trust. Faculty members indicated by their responses to these three items that they felt the deans only "occasionally," "seldom," and in some instances "never" did little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group, backed them up in their actions, or were friendly and approachable. The total faculty sample apparently felt that the deans of instruction were not meeting their personal needs to the extent the deans perceived themselves as meeting these needs.

    8. Faculty members as a total group did not agree
       with the deans of instruction as a total group
       as to the "Ideal" leader behavior of the deans
       on the dimension Consideration. (Table VI,
       p. 99).

Even though the mean scores indicated a slight difference in the perceptions of the two respondent groups, no significant difference was found.

9.   Presidents as a total group did not agree with the deans of instruction as a total group as to the "Real" leader behavior of the deans on the dimension Initiating Structure. (Table VI, p. 99).

Again there was a significant difference in reference to an item on the LBDQ between these two respondent groups in the manner each group perceived the deans' behavior in maintaining definite standards of performance.

The deans felt they actually maintained definite standards of performance. The presidents as a group did not feel quite as strongly that the deans actually maintained these standards. Some of the presidents indicated the deans "seldom" maintained definite standards of performance. Even though there was disagreement between presidents and deans in perceptions of the deans' actual behavior for this particular item, both the presidents and the deans themselves felt the dean should maintain definite standards of performance. There could have been misunderstanding of the term "definite" in the behavior description. However, neither the faculty members nor the presidents felt the deans were actually maintaining these standards.

The fact that the president, on the average, rated this dimension slightly higher than the faculty (although slightly lower than the deans themselves) indicates that presidents highly value evidence of this dimension in the behavior of another administrator and particularly that of a subordinate.

10. Presidents as a total group did agree with the deans of instruction as a total group as to the "Ideal" leader behavior of the deans on the dimension Initiating Structure. (Table VI, p. 99).

Even though the mean scores are identical, the analysis showed there was one item where a significant difference was found. The deans felt they should schedule the work to be done the majority of the time. None of them felt they should "seldom" or "never" perform this task. However, the presidents' responses indicate they did not feel quite as strongly about this item. In essence, they indicated they felt the deans quite possibly should only "occasionally" schedule the work. Again there might have been a misinterpretation of the descriptive item. The assumption is that "scheduling the work to be done" is primarily in reference to the instructional program within the institution.

11. Presidents as a total group did agree with deans of instruction as a total group as to the "Real" leader behavior of the deans on the dimension Consideration. (Table VI, p. 99).

12. Presidents, as a total group, did not agree with deans of instruction as a total group as to the "Ideal" leader behavior of the dean on the dimension Consideration. (Table VI, p. 99).

Although the mean scores indicated a slight difference in the expectations of the two groups, the difference was not significant.

The foregoing conclusions should afford deans of instruction valuable information regarding the perceptions and expectations of the two reference groups with whom they relate and interact. Thus they can plan their behavior accordingly to more nearly meet the needs of the organization while at the same time meeting the personal needs of the group members.

It is interesting to note that the presidents, the faculty, and the deans themselves expected much more Initiating Structure behavior from the dean than was perceived by the three respondent groups. Responses indicated that all three groups expected more behavior indicative of Initiating Structure from the dean than they did Consideration. This indicates all three groups desire leader behavior which emphasizes well-defined patterns of organization and standard procedures deemed necessary to getting the jobs done.

These findings are consistent with Verbeke's study of the junior college academic dean which showed the greatest discrepancy in views of the dean's behavior was between the faculty and the deans themselves. Seemingly a major role conflict lies between the dean and his faculty. The dean must demonstrate his leader behavior to his superior, the president, and to his subordinates, the faculty. He must run an efficient organization, delineating the relationship between himself and members of the group and getting the job done, without neglecting consideration of others. This is the dilemma that sometimes confronts the dean.

These findings are not consistent with Luckie's study of the leader behavior of directors of instruction in the public school system in which superiors and subordinates, in this case superintendents and staff members, expected the directors of instruction to behave on the leader dimension of Initiating Structure at a higher level than the directors of instruction believed they should behave on this dimension. In this study the mean scores of all the respondent groups were identical and high, indicating no discrepancy in expectations.

The findings of this study are also consistent with Verbeke's study in that the presidential sample viewed the leader behavior of the dean of instruction as actually (Real) exhibiting more Initiating Structure and Consideration than did faculty groups.

The deans saw themselves as actually (Real) exhibiting more Consideration and Structure than did either the presidents or the faculty members when comparing the two dimensions of leader behavior. However, the presidents and the faculty members expected (Ideal) more of the behavior dimension Consideration than the deans thought they should exhibit (Table VI, p. 99).

Thus it seems the deans regard their own "Real" and "Ideal" behaviors as meeting the needs of the organization and the needs of the individuals within the organization more so than either the presidents or the faculty members actually perceive or expect it.

Therefore, it appears the major role conflict facing the dean lies in differences between faculty members' perceptions and expectations, and the dean's perceptions and expectations of his behavior. Not only did the faculty see him as actually exhibiting less Initiating Structure and Consideration than he did himself, but they also expected him to increase both dimensions, especially with regards to the dimension Initiating Structure.

Previous research by Carson, in his study of the leader behavior of junior college deans, confirms that superiors tend to expect higher ratings on Initiating Structure than do subordinates. An interesting finding in the present study, as indicated by the high mean scores of the respondent groups, shows that superiors, subordinates, and the

deans themselves rated the dean high on the behavior dimension Initiating Structure "Ideal" (Table VI, p. 99).

Carson's findings also show there is great similarity in the roles expected (Ideal) by presidents and faculty members as groups, and between these groups and the self expectations of the deans themselves. The investigator in the present study found that even though there is great similarity in expected (Ideal) role behavior of the dean in regards to Initiating Structure, there was less similarity by the respondent groups in this study as regards the behavior dimension Consideration.

The presidents felt more strongly than faculty members or deans, and the faculty members more strongly than the deans, that the dean should ideally exhibit behaviors indicative of warmth, respect, and mutual trust in his relations with his superior and subordinates (Table VI, p. 99).

These findings are consistent with those of Carson's previous research on the leader behavior of junior college academic deans in which he found that discrepancies do exist between the views of superiors and subordinates in describing the leader behavior of administrators in intermediate positions such as the dean of instruction occupies.

In summary, it appears that faculty members and presidents constitute reference groups to which the dean should attempt to relate and interact with as he attempts to build a strong and viable instructional program and at the same time create a learning climate conducive to free inquiry and development of the individual's talents.

In this role the dean should use his influence to carry out the

wishes of his superiors but at the same time he should be responsive to subordinates and receptive to their wishes and needs.

It is further concluded that the <u>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire</u> instrument is a useful tool for ascertaining perceived leader behavior of deans of instruction in the community college setting. The instrument is capable of securing self perception of behaviors of a dean of instruction as well as perceptions of other reference groups regarding such behavior. The instrument is capable of being employed to produce data which disclose that differences exist in an institutional setting as leader behaviors of a dean of instruction are perceived by himself and his superiors and subordinates.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Since the faculty members perceive less and expect more Consideration in the dean of instruction's leader behavior, it is recommended that deans accentuate this dimension of personal trust, respect, and warmth in their association with faculty members.

2. In as much as presidents perceive the importance of deans of instruction exhibiting behaviors indicative of Consideration similar to the dean's own perception of this importance but expect more Consideration than the deans, it is recommended that deans engage more in this kind of behavior in their contacts with their superior and subordinates.

3. In view of the fact that faculty members and presidents expect more Initiating Structure in the deans' leader behavior than they actually perceive, it is recommended that greater emphasis on this dimension by the deans in their interpersonal relations with their superior and subordinates should contribute to creating a climate conducive to the accomplishment of organizational goals and satisfaction of personal needs.

4. It is recommended that deans of instruction use an approach of balancing or blending of the two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration, as the situation and reference groups demand.

5. It is recommended that deans of instruction refrain from forming preconceived conceptions about emphasizing one dimension or the other in each and every situation. Situational determinants call for flexible appraisal when considering either dimension.

6. It is recommended that future investigators, where possible, visit the institutions and administer the questionnaire to the participants. This approach quite possibly could result in a larger number of observations and might conceivably enhance relations between the investigator, his institution or agency, and the participants.

7. It is further recommended that those who select administrative personnel for educational institutions give attention to and be cognizant of these two important dimensions of leader behavior.

8. It is recommended that similar studies be made of other personnel in the North Carolina Community College System, in particular, such as Dean of Student Services, Dean of Administrative Services, Dean of Continuing Education, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Dewey A. "The Philosophy of the Comprehensive Community
     College and A Challenge to the Adult Education Instructor."
     A speech delivered to a Faculty Workshop, College of The
     Albemarle, Elizabeth City, North Carolina, April 27, (1971).

Alport, Floyd H. Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure.
     New York: John Wiley, 1955.

Bailey, Thomas D. "Social and Economic Necessity of Community Junior
     Colleges." The Community College in the South: Progress and
     Prospect. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern States Work Conference,
     (1962), 122.

Barr, Anthony James, and Goodnight, James Howard. A Users Guide to
     the Statistical Analysis System. Raleigh, N.C.: Department
     of Statistics, North Carolina State University, 1972.

Bellows, Roger. Creative Leadership. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.:
     Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
     Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Bernard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge,
     Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf
     Publishing Company, 1964.

Blau, Peter M. and Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San
     Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

Boocock, Sarane S. An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning.
     New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Carson, Jr., Joseph O. "An Analysis of the Leader Behavior of Junior
     College Deans as Viewed By Student Leaders." Unpublished
     Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee,
     Florida, 1962.

_____. "A Comparative Analysis of the Junior College Dean's
     Leadership Behavior." The Journal of Experimental Education,
     32:4 (Summer, 1964), 360.

Carter, Robert N. and John R. Thompson. "Structure, Consideration, and Classroom Performance." Collegiate News and Views, (Summer, 1972).

Coladarci, Arthur P. and Jacob W. Getzels. The Use of Theory in Educational Administration. (Educational Administration Monograph No. 5, Stanford: School of Education, Stanford University, (1955).

Cole, R. Grey. Leadership of Administrators in Community Junior Colleges. Greensboro, North Carolina: ERIC File, (September 1972), Bibliography No. UNCG 205-3700.

Congreve, William J. "Administrative Behavior and Staff Relations." Administrator's Notebook, VI, (October, 1957), 1-4.

Cook, David R. A Guide to Educational Research. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Culbertson, Jack A., Paul B. Jacobson, and Theodore L. Reller. Administrative Relationship: A Casebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Cummings, Robert C. "Relationship of Initiating Structure Job Performance As Moderated By Consideration." Journal of Applied Psychology, 55:5 (October, 1971), 489-490.

Davis, R. C. Leadership. Edited by C. A. Gibb. Baltimore Maryland: Penquin Books, 1969.

Doi, James I. "Organization, Administration, Finance, Facilities." Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXV, (October, 1965), 32.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Fleishman, E. A. and E. F. Harris. "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover." Psychological Abstracts, 37:3953, (April, 1963), 388.

Flocco, Edward C. "An Examination of the Leader Behavior of School Business Administrators." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, N. Y., 1968.

Fountain, Ben E. "The Citizen and His Community." North Carolina Education, (September, 1969), 13.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Egon G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review. (Winter, 1957), 423-441.

Gibb, C. A. Leadership. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1969.

_____. "Leadership," in Gardner Lindzey, ed., Handbook of Social Psychology. (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Vol. II, (1954)), 901.

Gould, John W. The Academic Deanship. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1964.

_____. "The Leadership Function Of The Academic Dean As Viewed By The Dean." Dissertation Abstracts International, 23:4584, 1963.

Gouldner, Alvin W. Studies in Leadership. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Guetzkow, Harold. Groups, Leadership, Men. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Carnegie Press, 1951.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. London: The MacMillan Company, 1969.

_____. "The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders," Harvard Educational Review, (Winter, 1955), 19-30.

_____. "The Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44 (1954), 22

_____. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administrative Center, The University of Chicago, 1959.

_____ and James B. Winer. "A Factoral Study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions." Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Eds. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1957. Research Monograph Number 88.

Harper, William A. 1970 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Hemphill, J. K. "The Leader and His Group." in C. A. Gibb, Leadership. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1969.

_____. "Leadership Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputation of College Departments." _Journal of Educational Psychology_, 46:7 (November, 1955), 399.

_____. _Situational Factors in Leadership_. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1949.

_____ and Alvin E. Coons. _Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire_. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1950.

Herring, Dallas W. "Open the Door--All The Way," Proceedings . . . An Orientation Conference . . . Community Colleges, Technical Institutes, Industrial Education Centers, Chapel Hill, N. C., June 7 and 8 (1964).

Hollander, E. P. _Leadership_. Edited by C. A. Gibb. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1969, 294.

Homans, George C. _Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms_. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

House, Robert J., Allan C. Filley, and Damodar N. Gujarati. "Leadership style, hierarchical influence, and the satisfaction of subordinate role expectations: A test of Likert's influence proposition." _Psychological Abstracts_. 47:7914, (April, 1972), 860.

Ideal Leader Behavior. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, 1957.

Ideal Leader Behavior-Ideal Self. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, 1957.

Jacobs, T. O. _Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations_. Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization (Hum RRO), 1971.

Johnson, Howard W. "Education for Leadership," in _A Symposium--The Requirements for Leadership in the 1980's_. School of Business Administration, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1968.

Keys, Samuel Robert. "A Study of Expected and Described Leader Behavior of Principals of Senior High Schools In The State of Minnesota." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1959.

Kline, Charles E. "Leader Behavior, Curricular Implementation, And Curricular Change." _Dissertation Abstracts International_ 30:293-A, 1969.

Koch, Jr., David F. "A Comparative Study of the Leader Behavior of Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1964.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, 1957.

Lipham, James M. "The Role of The Principal: Search and Research." National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLIV, (April, 1969), 28-33.

Luckie, William R. "Leader Behavior of Directors of Instruction." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1963.

Meyer, Gerhardt V. "Role Perceptions In A Problem Situation." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1964.

Moser, Robert P. "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals." Administrator's Notebook, VI, (September, 1957), 2.

Office of Strategic Service Assessment Staff. The Assessment of Men. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1948, p. 301. in Andrew W. Halpin (ed.), Theory and Research in Administration, London: The MacMillan Company, 1969, p. 37.

Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Robb, Felix C. "Introduction," in The Deanship of the Liberal Arts College. Ed. by David G. Mobberly and Myron F. Wicke. Nashville, Tennessee: The Methodist Church Board of Education, 1962.

Roberts, James Nelson. "Perceptions and Expectations of Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers Regarding Leader Behavior of Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1963.

Robinson, Herbert W. "A Study of the Relationship Between Leader Behavior of Secondary School Principals in Georgia and Certain Selected Variables." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1968.

Ross, Murray G. and Charles E. Hendry. New Understandings of Leadership. New York: Association Press, 1957.

Rustow, Dankwart A. Philosophers and Kings. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970.

Sanford, Fillmore H. "Leadership Identification and Acceptance."
Groups, Leadership and Men. Edited by Harold Guetzkow.
Pittsburg: Carnegie Press, 1951.

Schneider, J. "The Cultural Situation as a Condition for the Achieve-
ment of Fame." American Sociological Review, Volume 2, (1937),
480-491.

Schreiner, J. O. "An Exploratory Investigation of Leader Behavior
Of Full-Time and Part-Time Elementary School Principals."
Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University,
Enid, Oklahoma, 1965.

Seigel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics: For the Behavioral Sciences.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Selznick, Phillip. Leadership in Administration. White Plains, New
York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

Shartle, Carroll L. Executive Performance and Leadership. Englewood
Cliffs, N.J., 1956.

Smith, Louis and Frank W. Lutz, "Teacher Leader Behavior and Pupil
Respect and Liking." The Journal of Educational Research,
57:8 (April, 1964).

Spence, Janet T., et al. Elementary Statistics. New York: Appleton-
Century-Crofts, 1968.

Stogdill, Ralph M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New
York: Oxford University Press, 1959, Chapter VI.

_____.and Alvin E. Coons, Leader Behavior: Its Description
and Measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research,
The Ohio State University Press, 1957, Monograph No. 88.

_____. "Leadership, Membership and Organization." Psychological
Bulletin, XLVII, (January, 1950), p. 3.

_____ and Carroll L. Shartle. Methods in the Study of Admini-
strative Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business
Research, The Ohio State University, 1955, Research Monograph
Number 80, p. 54.

_____. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey
of the Literature." Journal of Psychology, Vol. XXV, (1948),
35-71.

Verbeke, Maurice G. "The Junior College Academic Dean's Leadership Behavior As Viewed by Superiors and Faculty." Dissertation Abstracts International, 28:926A, (1967).

_____. "The Junior College Academic Dean's Leadership Behavior As Viewed by Superiors and Faculty." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Pittsburgh, The Pennsylvania State University, 1966.

Wiggam, E. A. "The Biology of Leadership," in H. C. Metcalf, Business Leadership. New York: Pitman, 1931.

APPENDIX A

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by Staff Members of

The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Permission for publication granted by

copyright holder in a letter dated

August 16, 1972

Published by

Bureau of Business Research

College of Commerce and Administration

The Ohio State University

Columbus, Ohio

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Name of Leader Being Described_____

Name of Group Which He Leads_____

Your Name_____

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "*group,*" as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "*members,*" refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

DIRECTIONS:

    a. READ each item carefully.

    b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

    c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.

    d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A—Always
B—Often
C—Occasionally
D—Seldom
E—Never

1. He does personal favors for group members.	A	B	C	D	E
2. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.	A	B	C	D	E
3. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
4. He tries out his new ideas with the group.	A	B	C	D	E
5. He acts as the real leader of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
6. He is easy to understand.	A	B	C	D	E
7. He rules with an iron hand.	A	B	C	D	E
8. He finds time to listen to group members.	A	B	C	D	E
9. He criticizes poor work.	A	B	C	D	E
10. He gives advance notice of changes.	A	B	C	D	E
11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.	A	B	C	D	E
12. He keeps to himself.	A	B	C	D	E
13. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.	A	B	C	D	E
14. He assigns group members to particular tasks.	A	B	C	D	E
15. He is the spokesman of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
16. He schedules the work to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
17. He maintains definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
18. He refuses to explain his actions.	A	B	C	D	E

19. He keeps the group informed.	A	B	C	D	E
20. He acts without consulting the group.	A	B	C	D	E
21. He backs up the members in their actions.	A	B	C	D	E
22. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.	A	B	C	D	E
23. He treats all group members as his equals.	A	B	C	D	E
24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
25. He gets what he asks for from his superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
26. He is willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E
27. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members.	A	B	C	D	E
28. He is friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E
29. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.	A	B	C	D	E
30. He fails to take necessary action.	A	B	C	D	E
31. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.	A	B	C	D	E
32. He lets group members know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E
33. He speaks as the representative of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
34. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.	A	B	C	D	E
35. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.	A	B	C	D	E
36. He lets other people take away his leadership in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
37. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
38. He gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.	A	B	C	D	E
39. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E
40. He keeps the group working together as a team.	A	B	C	D	E

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR
(What You Expect of Your Leader)
Developed by Staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor, as you think he *should* act. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe what an ideal leader *ought to do* in supervising his group.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the leader.

DIRECTIONS:

    a. READ each item carefully.

    b. THINK about how frequently the leader *SHOULD* engage in the behavior described by the item.

    c. DECIDE whether he *SHOULD* always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item.

    d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A — Always
B — Often
C — Occasionally
D — Seldom
E — Never

What the IDEAL leader SHOULD do:

1. Do personal favors for group members...............................	A	B	C	D	E
2. Make his attitudes clear to the group..................................	A	B	C	D	E
3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group..........	A	B	C	D	E
4. Try out his new ideas with the group..................................	A	B	C	D	E
5. Act as the real leader of the group.....................................	A	B	C	D	E
6. Be easy to understand..	A	B	C	D	E
7. Rule with an iron hand...	A	B	C	D	E
8. Find time to listen to group members.................................	A	B	C	D	E
9. Criticize poor work..	A	B	C	D	E
10. Give advance notice of changes..	A	B	C	D	E
11. Speak in a manner not to be questioned................................	A	B	C	D	E
12. Keep to himself..	A	B	C	D	E
13. Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members...........	A	B	C	D	E
14. Assign group members to particular tasks..............................	A	B	C	D	E
15. Be the spokesman of the group..	A	B	C	D	E

16. Schedule the work to be done...	A	B	C	D	E
17. Maintain definite standards of performance.............................	A	B	C	D	E
18. Refuse to explain his actions..	A	B	C	D	E
19. Keep the group informed...	A	B	C	D	E
20. Act without consulting the group.......................................	A	B	C	D	E
21. Back up the members in their actions...................................	A	B	C	D	E
22. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines.....................................	A	B	C	D	E
23. Treat all group members as his equals...................................	A	B	C	D	E
24. Encourage the use of uniform procedures...............................	A	B	C	D	E
25. Get what he asks for from his superiors.................................	A	B	C	D	E
26. Be willing to make changes...	A	B	C	D	E
27. Make sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members...	A	B	C	D	E
28. Be friendly and approachable...	A	B	C	D	E
29. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations...........	A	B	C	D	E
30. Fail to take necessary action..	A	B	C	D	E
31. Make group members feel at ease when talking with them...............	A	B	C	D	E
32. Let group members know what is expected of them.......................	A	B	C	D	E
33. Speak as the representative of the group.................................	A	B	C	D	E
34. Put suggestions made by the group into operation........................	A	B	C	D	E
35. See to it that group members are working up to capacity.................	A	B	C	D	E
36. Let other people take away his leadership in the group..................	A	B	C	D	E
37. Get his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members............	A	B	C	D	E
38. Get group approval in important matters before going ahead.............	A	B	C	D	E
39. See to it that the work of group members is coordinated.................	A	B	C	D	E
40. Keep the group working together as a team.............................	A	B	C	D	E

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR - Ideal Self
(What You Expect of Yourself as a Leader)

Developed by Staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to
describe your behavior as you think you should act. This is not a
test of ability. It simply asks you to describe how you believe you
ought to act as a leader of your group.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers
to a department, division, or other unit of organization which
you supervise.

Published by

Center for Business and Economic Research
Division of Research
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

DIRECTIONS:

    a.   READ each item carefully.

    b.   THINK about how frequently you **SHOULD** engage in the behavior described by the item.

    c.   DECIDE whether you SHOULD <u>always</u>, <u>often</u>, <u>occasionally</u>, <u>seldom</u> or <u>never</u> act as described by the item.

    d.   DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

<u>When acting as a leader, I OUGHT to</u>:

1. Do personal favors for group members .... A B C D E

2. Make my attitudes clear to the group .... A B C D E

3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group .... A B C D E

4. Try out my new ideas with the group .... A B C D E

5. Act as the real leader of the group .... A B C D E

6. Be easy to understand .... A B C D E

7. Rule with an iron hand .... A B C D E

8. Find time to listen to group members .... A B C D E

9. Criticize poor work .... A B C D E

10. Give advance notice of changes .... A B C D E

11. Speak in a manner not to be questioned .... A B C D E

12. Keep to myself .... A B C D E

13. Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members.. A B C D E

14. Assign group members to particular tasks .... A B C D E

15. Be the spokesman of the group .... A B C D E

16. Schedule the work to be done .... A B C D E

17. Maintain definite standards of performance .... A B C D E

18. Refuse to explain my actions .... A B C D E

19. Keep the group informed .... A B C D E

20. Act without consulting the group .... A B C D E

21. Back up the members in their actions .... A B C D E

22. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines .... A B C D E

23. Treat all group members as my equals .... A B C D E

24. Encourage the use of uniform procedures .... A B C D E

25. Get what I ask for from my superiors .... A B C D E

26. Be willing to make changes .... A B C D E

27. Make sure that my part in the organization is
    understood by group members .... A B C D E

28. Be friendly and approachable .... A B C D E

29. Ask that group members follow standard rules and
    regulations .... A B C D E

30. Fail to take necessary action .... A B C D E

31. Make group members feel at ease when talking with
    them .... A B C D E

32. Let group members know what is expected of them ...... A B C D E

33. Speak as the representative of the group .... A B C D E

34. Put suggestions made by the group into operation ..... A B C D E

35. See to it that group members are working up to
    capacity .... A B C D E

36. Let other people take away my leadership in the
    group .... A B C D E

37. Get my superiors to act for the welfare of the
    group members .... A B C D E

38. Get group approval in important matters before
    going ahead .... A B C D E

39. See to it that the work of group members is
    coordinated .... A B C D E

40. Keep the group working together as a team .... A B C D E

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. Use: The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than The Ohio State University.

2. Adaptation and Revision: The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.

3. Duplication: Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. Inclusion in dissertations: Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. Copyright: In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--, by The Ohio State University."

6. Inquiries: Communications should be addressed to:

     Center for Business and Economic Research
     The Ohio State University
     1775 College Road
     Columbus, Ohio 43210 U.S.A.

April, 1972

APPENDIX C

FACULTY MEMBERS

Respondent Code

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following background information is needed to classify the respondent for this study. No participant's name will be used at any time and no information will be used by any person other than the researcher.

1. Age?   _____ 21 - 35   2. Sex?   _____ MALE
             _____ 36 - 50   _____ FEMALE
             _____ 51 or more

3. Highest degree you hold?

              _____ Bachelor's   _____ Specialist
              _____ Master's   _____ Doctorate

4. Ethnic group? _____ American Caucasian   _____ Spanish Surnamed
                  _____ American Indian   American
                  _____ American Negro   _____ Oriental American
                                              _____ Other (_____)

5. What type of work did you do before you assumed your present position? (Job title) _____

6. How many years at present institution? _____ years

7. How many years and/or months in present position?   _____ years
                                                                              _____ months

8. Are you also functioning as a department head at this time?   _____ YES
                                                                              _____ NO

9. Total years of community college or technical institute teaching experience? _____ years

10. Total years of other teaching experience _____ years

11. What level(s) was "other" teaching experience?   _____ years _____
                                                                                          (level)

                                                                              _____ years _____
                                                                                          (level)

APPENDIX D

INITIAL LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

     As an adjunct of The Leadership Development Program at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro we are engaging in research on leader behavior which focuses on the community college. This letter is to request the participation of your institution in a study which focuses on leader behavior of the dean of instruction, or similar person of authority, as perceived by the president, faculty, and the dean himself.

     The title of the person in this intermediate administrative position varies from institution to institution within the North Carolina Community College system. In some institutions he is most commonly designated as "dean of instruction" while in other institutions he carries another title such as "director of instruction," "vice-president for instruction," or "academic dean." Regardless of title, he has broad supervisory authority and responsibility for the instructional program of the institution.

     Edward W. Cox, a doctoral student at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and himself an administrator in the North Carolina Community College system, has become interested in this particular area of administrative behavior and wishes to include your institution in his study. Participation by your institution would involve approximately 30 - 40 minutes of your time, your dean's time, and the faculty's time to complete and return the questionnaire and background information forms.

APPENDIX E

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AND WHAT
WILL BE REQUIRED OF THOSE WHO PARTICIPATE

Superiors and Subordinates Perceptions and Expectations
of the Leader Behavior of the Dean of Instruction: A
Survey of the North Carolina Community College System.

The dean of instruction in this community college has dual
leadership responsibility. He is responsive to his president and
he is responsive to the faculty. It has been hypothesized that the
perceptions and expectations of the leader's behavior by individuals
and/or groups with whom the leader interacts influence his behavior.
Thus, the dean of instruction interacts, influences, and is influenced
by his associates. To enable him to more adroitly plan the nature and
inclination of his own work a resolute understanding of these inter-
personal relationships is useful.

This study is not designed to determine whether the dean of
instruction's behavior is exemplary or nefarious. This study is the
influence the dean of instruction as a leader exerts in his interaction
with superiors and subordinates, his behavior as he exerts this in-
fluence, and how his behavior is perceived by himself, his superiors,
and his subordinates as he endeavors to establish well-defined patterns
for achieving organizational goals while maintaining personal relations
indicative of friendship, mutual trust, and respect. Hopefully the
findings will add to existing knowledge of leader behavior, revealing
areas where disagreement and misunderstanding are generated, and have
implications useful to practicing administrators. The study is con-
cerned with the following questions:

(1) Does effective and efficient leader behavior require a
blending or balancing of the behavior dimensions under study,
(2) do the perceptions and expectations of the dean of in-
struction's leader behavior by his superiors and subordinates
differ, (3) is it essential for the dean of instruction to be
rated similarly on the behavior dimensions by his superiors and
subordinates, (4) what are the implications from the findings
as regards the dean of instruction modifying his leader behavior
with reference to the behavior dimensions under study, that is,
should he adopt different styles of leader behavior when dealing
with different groups of individuals within the institution,
and (5) are there implications from the findings for institutions
training administrators?

What does your participation entail and how much time is involved? Each respondent will be asked to complete two forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and one Background Information form. All forms can be completed in 30 to 40 minutes. The two forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to be administered are the LBDQ-Real on which the respondent describes how the leader really behaves and the LBDQ-Ideal on which the respondents describe how they believe he should behave.

In summary, your participation will require the following:

1. Signing the enclosed statement of acceptance to participate and granting your permission and the dean of instruction's permission to conduct this study at your institution.

2. Your approval to send the questionnaire to a group of your faculty members.

3. Providing the researcher with the name of your dean of instruction or the person who functions in this capacity plus the names of all full-time faculty members, exclusive of department or division chairmen and other administrators who are assigned teaching duties. A faculty directory indicating exclusions with names and addresses would suffice.

4. Thirty to forty minutes of your time in completing the questionnaire and background information form.

You and your dean of instruction will be furnished a summary of the findings. All faculty members who participate in the study will be furnished a summary of the findings, upon request.

NO RESPONDENT IN THE STUDY WILL BE IDENTIFIED AND ALL DATA WILL BE TREATED WITH STRICT CONFIDENCE SO THAT THE NAMES OF NO INDIVIDUALS NOR INSTITUTION WILL BE KNOWN TO ANYONE BUT THE PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE STUDY. THIS IS A STUDY OF LEADER BEHAVIOR - NOT AN EVALUATION OF THIS PARTICULAR ADMINISTRATOR NOR OF THIS PARTICULAR INSTITUTION.

APPENDIX F

INQUIRY AND ACCEPTANCE FORM

The Leadership Development Program of The
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

I hereby accept your invitation to participate in the study of

Superiors and Subordinates Perceptions and Expectations of The Leader

Behavior of The Dean of Instruction: A Survey of the North Carolina

Community College System.

(Signed) _____

(Title) _____

(Institution) _____

1. Please list the name of your dean of instruction or the person who
   functions at this level, even though his title may be different.
   (Name) _____
   (Title) _____

2. Please list below the names of all your full time faculty members
   who might be available as respondents, excluding department or
   division chairmen and other administrators who are assigned teaching
   duties. (A faculty directory with requested exclusions indicated
   in some manner would suffice, if you care to send it instead.

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

(If additional space is needed, please use the other side of this form.)

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF LBDQ FORMS

As an adjunct of The Leadership Development Program at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro we are engaging in research on leader behavior which concentrates on the community college/ technical institute.

This letter is an invitation for you to participate in this research project which focuses on the leader behavior of the dean of instruction, or similar person of authority, as perceived by the president, faculty, and the dean himself. The study involves obtaining descriptions of how this administrator handles leadership situations.

The administrator whose name appears on your questionnaire has agreed to participate in this study and your president has given me permission to contact you regarding your participation. <u>Neither administrator has had any part in selecting you as a participant.</u>

Your part in the study should require no more than thirty minutes of your time to answer two forms of the enclosed questionnaire. This questionnaire does not ask you to judge the desirability or undesirability of the administrator's acts. You are only to describe how he <u>actually</u> acts in a leadership situation and then how you believe he <u>should</u> act. YOUR REPORT WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE.

May I thank you at this time for your kind cooperation with this research project. Please complete both forms of this questionnaire and the background information sheet and return them to me in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope by April 10, 1973.

Very truly yours,

Edward W. Cox (Ed)

bb

APPENDIX H

INSTRUCTIONS TO PRESIDENTS AND FACULTY MEMBERS

Respondent Code

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL - IDEAL

On the pages within the enclosed questionnaires is a list of
items that may be used to describe the leader behavior of a person in
a supervisory position. Each item describes a specific kind of be-
havior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable
or undesirable. THIS IS NOT A TEST OF ABILITY. The questionnaire asks
you to describe, as accurately as you can, the leader behavior of your
dean of instruction.

The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers
to the unit of organization which is supervised by the dean of in-
struction.

The term, "members," refers to all the people in the unit of
organization which is supervised by the dean of instruction.

DIRECTIONS

1. READ each item carefully.

2. THINK how frequently the dean of instruction engages in the behavior
    described by the item.

3. DECIDE whether he actually does, or ideally should always, often,
    occasionally, seldom, or never act in the manner described by
    the item.

4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item
    to show the answer you have selected.

                    A - Always
                    B - Often
                    C - Occasionally
                    D - Seldom
                    E - Never

INSTRUCTIONS TO DEANS

Respondent Code ☐☐☐☐☐☐

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL - IDEAL, SELF

On the pages within the enclosed questionnaires is a list of items that may be used to describe the leader behavior of a person in a supervisory position. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior. The questionnaires ask you to describe, as accurately as you can, how you feel that you actually do, or should ideally, engage in each kind of leader behavior.

The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to the unit of organization which is supervised by you.

The term, "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by you.

DIRECTIONS

1. READ each item carefully.

2. THINK how frequently you actually do, or should, behave in the manner described by the item.

3. DECIDE whether you actually do, or should ideally always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never act in the manner described by the item.

4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D- Seldom
E - Never

APPENDIX I

FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON

"REAL" DESCRIPTIONS AND ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS ON

THE <u>LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE</u>

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q1: He does personal favors for group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	1	12	10	4	0
	%	3.7	44.4	37.0	14.8	0.0
FACULTY	#	6	48	88	30	17
	%	3.2	25.4	46.6	15.9	9.0
DEAN	#	0	8	18	1	0
	%	0.0	29.6	66.7	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __9.3__ (_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	4.34	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.77	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	3.00	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q1: He should do personal favors for group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	1	10	12	3	1
	%	3.7	37.0	44.4	11.1	3.7
FACULTY	#	7	38	93	32	25
	%	3.6	19.5	47.7	16.4	12.8
DEAN	#	1	7	17	2	0
	%	3.7	25.9	63.0	7.4	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __8.2__ (_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	5.54	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.46	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	1.29	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q2: He makes his attitudes clear to the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	3	19	3	2	0
	%	11.1	70.4	11.1	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	60	79	40	13	5
	%	30.5	40.1	20.3	6.6	2.5
DEAN	#	6	16	5	0	0
	%	22.2	59.2	18.5	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	7.52	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.78	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.18	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q2: He should make his attitudes clear to the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	14	13	0	0	
	%	51.9	48.2	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	146	44	5	1	
	%	74.5	22.5	2.6	0.5	
DEAN	#	20	6	1	0	
	%	72.0	25.2	2.4	0.4	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.7 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	7.93	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	3	1.48	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	2.63	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q3: He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	5	12	8	2	0
	%	18.5	44.4	29.6	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	29	63	65	26	12
	%	14.9	32.3	33.3	13.3	6.2
DEAN	#	1	19	7	0	0
	%	3.7	70.4	25.9	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 14.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.75	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	13.22	.05	S
President: Dean	3	3.16	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q3: He should do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	8	14	5	0	0
	%	29.6	51.9	18.5	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	72	89	31	3	2
	%	36.6	45.2	15.7	1.5	1.0
DEAN	#	11	13	3	0	0
	%	40.7	48.2	11.1	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 1.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	0.65	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	0.51	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	1.01	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q4: He tries out his new ideas with the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	4	16	5	1	1
	%	14.8	59.3	18.5	3.7	3.7
FACULTY	#	16	81	64	25	6
	%	8.3	42.2	33.3	13.0	3.1
DEAN	#	4	20	3	0	0
	%	14.8	74.1	11.1	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __13.7__ (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	6.05	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	10.73	.05	S
President: Dean	4	0.50	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q4: He should try out his new ideas with the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	8	16	3	0	
	%	29.6	59.3	11.1	0.0	
FACULTY	#	52	97	45	2	
	%	26.5	49.5	23.0	1.0	
DEAN	#	12	11	4	0	
	%	44.4	40.7	14.8	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __6__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __4.8__ (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.64	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	2.98	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	1.86	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q5:   He acts as the real leader of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	8	14	3	1	1
	%	29.6	51.9	11.1	3.7	3.7
FACULTY	#	66	78	26	20	5
	%	33.9	40.0	13.3	10.3	2.6
DEAN	#	2	24	1	0	0
	%	7.4	88.9	3.7	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 19.3(S)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.21	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	18.75	.05	S
President: Dean	4	4.88	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q5:   He should act as the real leader of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	16	5	6		
	%	59.3	18.5	22.2		
FACULTY	#	122	62	13		
	%	61.9	31.5	6.6		
DEAN	#	15	9	3		
	%	61.0	30.3	8.8		

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 4 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 8.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	2	8.19	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	2	0.86	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	2.18	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q6: He is easy to understand.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	9	12	4	1	1
	%	33.3	44.4	14.8	3.7	3.7
FACULTY	#	67	69	39	20	22
	%	34.0	35.0	19.8	10.2	1.0
DEAN	#	5	15	6	1	0
	%	18.5	55.6	22.2	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.23	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.27	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	1.39	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q6: He should be easy to understand.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	21	6	0	0	
	%	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	151	40	5	1	
	%	76.7	20.3	2.5	0.5	
DEAN	#	24	2	1	0	
	%	88.9	7.4	3.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.8(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.38	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	3.22	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	1.21	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q7: He rules with an iron hand.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	1	9	11	14
	%	7.4	3.7	33.3	40.7	14.8
FACULTY	#	13	17	72	58	37
	%	6.6	8.6	36.6	29.4	18.8
DEAN	#	0	3	10	9	5
	%	0.0	11.1	37.0	33.3	18.5

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 1.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.00	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	0.92	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	0.80	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q7: He should rule with an iron hand.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	0	2	13	7	5
	%	0.0	7.4	25.9	48.2	18.5
FACULTY	#	3	25	63	61	45
	%	1.5	12.7	32.0	31.0	22.9
DEAN	#	0	0	10	10	7
	%	0.0	0.0	37.0	37.0	25.9

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.7 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.06	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.64	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.99	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q8: He finds time to listen to group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	13	12	2	0	0
	%	48.2	44.4	7.41	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	84	69	33	9	2
	%	42.6	35.0	16.8	4.6	1.0
DEAN	#	13	10	4	0	0
	%	48.2	37.0	14.8	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 2.8 (NS)

TEST		DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty:	President	4	1.89	.05	NS
Faculty:	Dean	4	0.74	.05	NS
President:	Dean	2	0.85	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q8: He should find time to listen to group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	19	8	0	0	
	%	70.4	29.6	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	125	66	5	1	
	%	63.5	33.5	2.5	0.5	
DEAN	#	20	7	0	0	
	%	74.1	25.9	0.0	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.6 (NS)

TEST		DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty:	President	3	1.11	.05	NS
Faculty:	Dean	3	1.86	.05	NS
President:	Dean	1	0.0	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q9: He criticizes poor work.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	8	14	3	0
	%	7.4	29.6	51.9	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	21	45	78	34	11
	%	11.1	23.8	41.3	18.0	5.8
DEAN	#	2	10	13	1	1
	%	7.4	37.0	48.2	3.7	3.7

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.53	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	5.36	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	0.56	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q9: He should criticize poor work.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	7	10	5	5	
	%	25.9	37.0	18.5	18.5	
FACULTY	#	62	51	65	17	
	%	31.8	26.2	33.3	8.7	
DEAN	#	7	6	11	3	
	%	25.9	22.2	40.7	11.1	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 6.3 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	5.23	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	0.94	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	3.75	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q10: He gives advance notice of changes.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	8	12	4	3	0
	%	29.6	44.4	14.8	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	54	68	50	16	8
	%	27.6	34.7	25.5	8.2	4.1
DEAN	#	5	15	5	2	0
	%	18.5	55.6	18.5	7.4	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.3 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.39	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.21	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.34	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q10: He should give advance notice of changes.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	16	9	2	0	0
	%	59.2	33.3	7.4	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	155	36	3	2	1
	%	76.7	18.3	1.5	1.0	0.5
DEAN	#	22	5	0	0	0
	%	81.2	18.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 8.5(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	6.11	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	1.78	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	1.80	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q11: He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	1	11	7	8	0
	%	3.7	40.1	25.9	29.6	0.0
FACULTY	#	22	51	62	38	18
	%	11.5	26.7	32.5	19.9	9.4
DEAN	#	1	9	11	5	1
	%	3.7	33.3	40.7	18.5	3.7

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __5.7__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	4.24	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.14	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	1.36	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q11: He should speak in a manner not to be questioned.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	4	4	9	7	3
	%	14.8	14.8	33.3	25.9	11.1
FACULTY	#	33	28	58	41	34
	%	17.1	14.4	29.9	21.1	17.5
DEANS	#	3	6	7	8	3
	%	11.1	22.2	25.9	29.7	11.1

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __3.7__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.00	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.92	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	0.86	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q12: He keeps to himself.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	2	8	12	3
	%	7.4	7.4	29.6	44.4	11.1
FACULTY	#	11	29	60	67	27
	%	5.6	15.0	30.9	34.5	13.9
DEAN	#	0	3	7	16	1
	%	0.0	11.1	25.9	59.3	3.7

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _5.8_ (_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.88	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	5.17	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	1.07	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q12: He should keep to himself.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	1	2	5	13	6
	%	3.7	7.4	18.5	48.2	22.2
FACULTY	#	0	8	51	72	66
	%	0.0	4.1	25.9	36.6	33.5
DEAN	#	0	0	8	12	7
	%	0.0	0.0	29.6	44.4	25.9

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _5.3_ (_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.89	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	0.71	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	0.81	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q13: He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	6	14	3	4	0
	%	22.2	51.9	11.1	14.8	0.0
FACULTY	#	37	69	54	25	8
	%	19.1	35.8	28.0	13.0	4.2
DEAN	#	3	17	7	0	0
	%	11.1	63.0	25.9	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.50	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	7.00	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	3.72	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q13: He should look out for the personal welfare of individual group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	11	12	4	0	0
	%	40.7	44.4	14.8	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	78	62	36	12	7
	%	40.0	31.8	18.5	6.2	3.6
DEAN	#	13	7	6	1	0
	%	48.2	25.9	22.2	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8   DEGREES FREEDOM IS 2.5 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.72	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.04	.05	NS
President; Dean	3	0.98	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q14: He assigns group members to particular tasks.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	4	15	7	1	0
	%	14.8	55.6	25.9	3.7	0.0
FACULTY	#	25	107	48	8	1
	%	13.2	56.6	25.4	4.2	0.5
DEAN	#	4	21	2	0	0
	%	14.8	77.8	7.4	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH _8_ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _7.4_ (_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President:	4	1.46	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	5.59	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.60	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION

Q14: He should assign group members to particular tasks.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	8	15	4	0	
	%	29.6	55.6	14.8	0.0	
FACULTY	#	42	107	46	2	
	%	21.3	54.3	23.4	1.0	
DEAN	#	11	13	3	0	
	%	40.7	48.2	11.1	0.0	

CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH _6_ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _5.4_(_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.17	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	4.51	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.76	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q15:   He is the spokesman of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	4	11	10	2	0
	%	14.8	40.7	37.0	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	36	89	46	23	2
	%	18.4	45.4	23.5	11.7	1.0
DEAN	#	5	14	7	1	0
	%	18.5	51.9	25.9	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.1 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.72	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	1.23	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.33	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q15:   He should be the spokesman of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	7	10	8	2	
	%	25.9	37.0	29.6	7.4	
FACULTY	#	78	88	29	2	
	%	39.6	44.7	14.7	1.0	
DEAN	#	5	15	7	0	
	%	18.5	55.6	25.9	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH   6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.5 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	10.11	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	3	4.24	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.22	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q16: He schedules the work to be done.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	3	12	9	3	0
	%	11.1	44.4	33.3	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	41	73	48	22	7
	%	21.5	38.2	25.1	11.5	3.7
DEAN	#	2	18	5	2	0
	%	7.4	66.7	18.5	7.4	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 7.5 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.47	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	6.10	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.74	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q16: He should schedule the work to be done.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	8	11	7	0	0
	%	30.8	43. 3	26.9	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	70	87	30	7	3
	%	35.5	44.2	15.2	3.6	1.5
DEAN	#	3	20	4	0	0
	%	11.1	74. 1	14.8	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.51	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	7.74	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	5.69	.05	S

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q17: He maintains definite standards of performance.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	9	11	4	3	0
	%	33.3	40.7	14.8	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	70	65	36	23	2
	%	35.7	33.2	18.4	11.7	1.0
DEAN	#	3	15	8	0	0
	%	11.5	57.7	30.8	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 10.8 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	0.60	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	10.14	.05	S
President: Dean	3	7.93	.05	S

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q17: He should maintain definite standards of performance.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	16	11	0		
	%	59.3	40.8	0.0		
FACULTY	#	142	48	7		
	%	72.1	24.4	3.6		
DEAN	#	17	10	0		
	%	63.0	37.0	0.0		

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 4 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.3 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	2	2.38	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	2	1.35	.05	NS
President: Dean	1	0.0	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q18: He refuses to explain his actions.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	0	1	3	14	9
	%	0.0	3.7	11.1	51.9	33.3
FACULTY	#	4	20	31	65	74
	%	2.1	10.3	16.0	33.5	38.1
DEAN	#	0	1	3	17	6
	%	0.0	3.7	11.1	63.0	22.2

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __8.1__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	4.39	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	6.65	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.89	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q18: He should refuse to explain his actions.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	1	4	10	12	
	%	3.7	14.8	37.0	44.4	
FACULTY	#	0	15	60	122	
	%	0.0	7.6	30.5	61.9	
DEAN	#	0	3	9	15	
	%	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __6__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __4.8__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	3.18	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	2	0.58	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.15	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q19: He keeps the group informed.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	10	11	4	2	0
	%	37.0	40.7	14.8	7. 4	0.0
FACULTY	#	61	75	40	18	2
	%	31.1	38.3	20.4	9.2	1.0
DEAN	#	6	19	2	0	0
	%	22.2	70.4	7.4	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.5 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	0.57	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	8.71	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.86	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q19: He should keep the group informed.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	21	6	0	0	
	%	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	156	37	3	1	
	%	79.2	18.8	1.5	0.5	
DEAN	#	23	4	0	0	
	%	85.2	14.8	0.0	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH   6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.3 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.44	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.51	.05	NS
President: Dean	1	0.12	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q20: He acts without consulting the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	1	10	13	1
	%	7.4	3.7	37.0	48.2	3.7
FACULTY	#	4	42	69	66	16
	%	2.0	21.3	35.0	33.5	8.1
DEAN	#	0	1	13	12	1
	%	0.0	3.7	48.2	44.4	3.7

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.5(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	8.48	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.46	.05	NS
President: Dean	4	1.67	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q20: He should act without consulting the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	1	4	17	5	
	%	3.7	14.8	63.0	18.5	
FACULTY	#	8	65	84	39	
	%	4.1	33.2	42.9	19.9	
DEAN	#	0	7	11	9	
	%	0.0	25.9	40.7	33.3	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 5.8 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	4.73	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.87	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.90	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION).

Q21: He backs up the members in their actions.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	6	19	0	2	0
	%	22.2	70.4	0.0	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	46	75	51	17	4
	%	23.8	38.9	26.4	8.8	2.1
DEAN	#	6	19	1	1	0
	%	22.2	70.4	3.7	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH _8_ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _18.6_ (_S_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	10.85	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	4	9.31	.05	S
President: Dean	3	0.11	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q21: He should back up the members in their actions.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	7	20	0	0	
	%	25.9	74.1	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	83	96	16	1	
	%	42.4	49.0	8.2	0.5	
DEAN	#	11	15	1	0	
	%	40.7	55.6	3.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH _6_ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _8.0_ (_NS_)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	6.18	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.62	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.96	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q22: He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	9	8	9	1	0
	%	33.3	29.6	33. 3	3.7	0.0
FACULTY	#	84	66	33	8	4
	%	43.0	33.9	16.9	4.1	2.1
DEAN	#	11	13	3	0	0
	%	40.7	48.1	11.1	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 5.2 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.10	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	1.45	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.90	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q22: He should emphasize the meeting of deadlines.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	15	11	1	0	0
	%	55.6	40.7	3.7	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	112	53	24	7	1
	%	56.6	26.9	12.2	3.6	0.5
DEANS	#	14	12	1	0	0
	%	51.9	44.4	3.7	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 7.7 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.52	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.37	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.08	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q23: He treats all group members as his equals.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	10	7	3	7	0
	%	37.0	25.9	11.1	25.9	0.0
FACULTY	#	55	62	39	23	16
	%	28.2	31.8	20.0	11.8	8.2
DEAN	#	10	10	7	0	0
	%	37.0	37.0	25.9	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.8 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	4.81	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.98	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	6.33	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q23: He should treat all group members as his equals.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	14	9	3	1	0
	%	51.9	33.3	11.1	3.7	0.0
FACULTY	#	97	43	46	6	4
	%	49.5	21.9	23.5	3.1	2.0
DEAN	#	16	8	3	0	0
	%	59.3	29.6	11.1	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.7 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.18	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	1.81	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.20	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q24: He encourages the use of uniform procedures.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	7	16	4	0	0
	%	25.9	59.3	14.8	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	61	87	30	15	2
	%	31.2	44.6	15.4	7.7	1.0
DEAN	#	5	17	4	1	0
	%	18.5	63.0	14.8	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.8 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.32	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.70	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.21	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q24: He should encourage the use of uniform procedures.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	11	15	0	1	0
	%	40.7	55.6	0.0	3.7	0.0
FACULTY	#	97	64	29	6	1
	%	49.2	32.5	14.7	3.1	0.5
DEAN	#	10	14	2	1	0
	%	37.0	51.9	7.4	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VLUAE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 11.5 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	7.60	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.52	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.00	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q25: He gets what he asks for from his superiors.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	21	1	3	0
	%	7.4	77.8	3.7	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	13	98	63	12	2
	%	6.9	52.1	33.5	6.4	1.1
DEAN	#	0	25	2	0	0
	%	0.0	92.6	7.4	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __20.4__ (__S__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	9.04	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	4	12.51	.05	S
President: Dean	3	2.03	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q25: He should get what he asks for from his superiors.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	20	4	1	
	%	7.4	74.1	14.8	3.7	
FACULTY	#	31	123	39	3	
	%	15.8	62.8	19.9	1.5	
DEAN	#	1	23	2	0	
	%	3.9	88.5	7.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __6__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __5.5__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	2.55	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	4.78	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.32	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q26: He is willing to make changes.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	5	16	4	2	0
	%	18.5	59.3	14.8	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	46	91	43	14	2
	%	23.5	46.4	21.9	7.1	1.0
DEAN	#	9	17	1	0	0
	%	33.3	63.0	3.7	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 7.2 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.36	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	5.99	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.94	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q26: He should be willing to make changes.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	12	14	1		
	%	44.4	51.6	3.7		
FACULTY	#	93	83	21		
	%	47.2	42.1	10.7		
DEAN	#	15	12	0		
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0		

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 4 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 2.9(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	2	1.73	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	2	2.05	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.19	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q27:   He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by
group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	5	13	4	5	0
	%	18.5	48.2	14.8	18.5	0.0
FACULTY	#	62	74	40	17	3
	%	31.6	37.8	20.4	8.7	1.4
DEAN	#	5	16	5	1	0
	%	28.8	41.2	19.6	9.2	1.2

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8_ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __6.6(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.02	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.47	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	3.09	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q27:   He should make sure that his part in the organization is understood
by group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	18	6	2	1	
	%	66.7	22.2	7.4	3.7	
FACULTY	#	153	35	4	4	
	%	78.1	17.9	2.0	2.0	
DEAN	#	18	7	0	2	
	%	66.7	25.9	0.0	7.4	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH _6_ DEGREES FREEDOM IS _3.1 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	3.48	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.65	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.53	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q28: He is friendly and approachable.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	12	10	4	1	
	%	44.4	37.0	14.8	3.7	
FACULTY	#	108	52	25	13	
	%	54.6	26.3	12.6	6.6	
DEAN	#	8	16	3	0	
	%	29.6	59.3	11.1	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 11.0 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.86	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	10.73	.05	S
President: Dean	3	1.41	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q28: He should be friendly and approachable.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	21	6	0	0	
	%	77.7	22.2	-0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	159	34	3	1	
	%	80.7	17.3	1.5	0.5	
DEAN	#	21	5	1	0	
	%	77.8	18.5	3.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.2 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.53	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.37	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.02	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q29: He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	10	12	3	2	0
	%	37.0	44.0	11.1	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	86	77	26	6	1
	%	43.9	39.3	13.3	3.1	0.5
DEAN	#	8	17	2	0	0
	%	29.6	63.0	7.4	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH   8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 7.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.86	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	5.14	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.11	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q29: He should ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	11	15	1	0	0
	%	40.1	55.6	3.7	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	101	71	19	3	2
	%	51.5	36.2	9.7	1.5	1.0
DEAN	#	10	14	3	0	0
	%	37.0	51.9	11.1	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8   DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.95	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.25	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	1.08	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q30: He fails to take necessary action.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	0	3	4	15	5
	%	0.0	11.1	14.8	55.6	18.5
FACULTY	#	4	24	53	75	38
	%	2.1	12.4	27.3	38.7	19.6
DEAN	#	0	1	8	14	4
	%	0.0	3.7	29.6	51.9	14.8

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.70	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	1.71	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.48	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q30: He should fail to take necessary action.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	0	1	0	8	18
	%	0.0	3.7	0.0	29.6	66.7
FACULTY	#	1	2	8	51	135
	%	0.5	1.0	4.1	25.9	68.5
DEAN	#	0	0	0	9	18
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.0 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.70	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	2.18	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.03	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q31: He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	6	17	3	1	0
	%	22.2	63.0	11.1	3.7	0.0
FACULTY	#	84	55	38	14	5
	%	42.9	28.1	19.4	7.1	2.6
DEAN	#	7	16	4	0	0
	%	25.9	59.3	14.8	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 16.3 (S)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	10.5	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	4	8.64	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.0	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q31: He should make group members feel at ease when talking with them.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	22	5	0		
	%	81.5	18.5	0.0		
FACULTY	#	147	47	3		
	%	74.6	23.9	1.5		
DEAN	#	23	3	1		
	%	85.2	11.1	3.7		

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 4 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 1.6 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	2	0.24	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	2	2.71	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.13	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q32: He lets group members know what is expected of them.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	5	17	3	2	
	%	18.5	63.0	11.1	7.4	
FACULTY	#	74	69	40	14	
	%	37.6	35.0	20.3	7.1	
DEAN	#	7	19	1	0	
	%	25.9	70.4	3.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 15.6(S)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	8.32	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	3	10.95	.05	S
President: Dean	3	0.86	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q32: He should let group members know what is expected of them.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	20	7	0	0	
	%	74.1	25.9	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	154	36	4	2	
	%	78.6	18.4	2.0	1.0	
DEAN	#	23	4	0	0	
	%	85.2	14.8	0.0	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 1.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	0.69	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	0.40	.05	NS
President: Dean	1	0.45	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q33: He speaks as the representative of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	4	14	7	2	0
	%	14.8	51.9	25.9	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	45	86	42	20	3
	%	23.0	43.9	21.4	10.2	1.4
DEAN	#	4	19	3	1	0
	%	14.8	70.4	11.1	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 5.4 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	0.71	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	4.73	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.69	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q33: He should speak as the representative of the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	5	15	6	1	
	%	18.5	55.6	22.2	3.7	
FACULTY	#	76	96	24	1	
	%	38.6	48.7	12.2	0.5	
DEAN	#	7	16	4	0	
	%	25.9	59.3	14.8	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.9 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	7.37	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	3	2.41	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.18	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q34: He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	4	17	3	3	0
	%	14.8	63.0	11.1	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	16	91	68	18	1
	%	8.3	46.9	35.1	9.3	0.5
DEAN	#	3	20	4	0	0
	%	11.1	74.1	14.8	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH __8__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __14.0__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	6.31	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	8.20	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.44	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q34: He should put suggestions made by the group into operation.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	3	23	0	1	
	%	11.1	85.2	0.0	3.7	
FACULTY	#	33	132	30	1	
	%	16.8	67.4	15.3	0.5	
DEAN	#	4	22	1	0	
	%	14.8	81.5	3.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VLUAE WITH __6__ DEGREES FREEDOM IS __6.7__ (__NS__)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	4.42	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	3.39	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.0	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q35: He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.

Response:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	2	17	6	2	0
	%	7.4	63.0	22.2	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	24	93	54	20	4
	%	12.3	47.7	27.7	10.3	2.1
DEAN	#	2	18	7	0	0
	%	7.4	66.6	25.9	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 4.2 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	1.10	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.25	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.75	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q35: He should see to it that group members are working up to capacity.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	16	11	0	0	
	%	59.3	40.7	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	84	83	28	2	
	%	42.6	42.1	14.2	1.0	
DEAN	#	12	13	1	0	
	%	46.2	50.0	3.9	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 6.0   (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	4.22	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.71	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.31	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q36: He lets other people take away his leadership in the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	0	1	9	10	6
	%	0.0	3.9	34.6	38.5	23.1
FACULTY	#	3	17	34	75	67
	%	1.5	8.7	17.4	38.3	34.2
DEAN	#	0	0	11	13	3
	%	0.0	0.0	40.7	48.2	11.1

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 12.5 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	5.45	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	10.42	.05	S
President: Dean	3	0.65	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL" DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q36: He should let other people take away his leadership in the group.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	0	1	8	5	12
	%	0.0	3.9	30.8	19.2	46.2
FACULTY	#	1	3	17	63	111
	%	0.5	1.5	8.7	32.3	56.9
DEAN	#	0	3	11	5	7
	%	0.0	11.5	42.3	19.2	26.9

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 33.0 (S)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	10.61	.05	S
Faculty: Dean	4	28.65	.05	S
President: Dean	3	2.79	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q37: He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	3	17	3	4	0
	%	11.1	63.0	11.1	14.8	0.0
FACULTY	#	17	82	57	27	9
	%	8.9	42.7	29.7	14.1	4.7
DEAN	#	3	20	3	1	0
	%	11.1	74.1	11.1	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 11.8(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	4.48	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	8.33	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	2.04	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q 37: He should get his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	5	19	2	1	0
	%	18.5	70.4	7.4	3.7	0.0
FACULTY	#	75	79	31	6	5
	%	38.3	40.3	15.8	3.1	2.6
DEAN	#	8	17	2	0	0
	%	29.6	62.3	7.4	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.3(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	7.10	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.34	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.59	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q38: He gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	9	12	4	2	0
	%	33.3	44.4	14.8	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	33	69	62	22	9
	%	16.9	35.4	31.8	11.3	4.6
DEAN	#	7	16	3	1	0
	%	25.9	59.3	11.1	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 11.6(NS))

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	5.08	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	7.41	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.30	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q38: He should get group approval in important matters before going ahead.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	9	16	2	0	
	%	33.3	59.3	7.4	0.0	
FACULTY	#	63	103	24	5	
	%	32.3	52.8	12.3	2.6	
DEAN	#	10	16	1	0	
	%	37.0	59.3	3.7	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 1.3 (NS))

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	0.27	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.04	.05	NS
President: Dean	2	0.39	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q39: He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	7	15	2	3	0
	%	25.9	55.6	7.4	11.1	0.0
FACULTY	#	36	90	45	18	6
	%	18.5	46.2	23.1	9.2	3.1
DEAN	#	5	18	3	1	0
	%	18.5	66.7	11.1	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 5.7 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	2.76	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	3.18	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	1.81	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q39: He should see to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	18	9	0	0	
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	
FACULTY	#	110	82	4	1	
	%	55.8	41. 6	2.0	0.5	
DEAN	#	17	10	0	0	
	%	63.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 6 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 3.7 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	3	1.90	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	3	1.50	.05	NS
President: Dean	1	0.0	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENTS, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "REAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q40: He keeps the group working together as a team.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	6	17	2	2	0
	%	22.2	63.0	7.4	7.4	0.0
FACULTY	#	39	83	43	25	6
	%	19.9	42.4	21.9	12.8	3.1
DEAN	#	5	19	2	1	0
	%	18.5	70.4	7.4	3.7	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 9.4(NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	3.92	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	6.37	.05	NS
President: Dean	3	0.54	.05	NS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT, FACULTY, AND DEANS FOR DATA ON "IDEAL"
DESCRIPTIONS (FREQUENCY AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR THE QUESTION)

Q40: He should keep the group working together as a team.

Responses:		ALWAYS	OFTEN	OCCASIONALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
PRESIDENT	#	21	6	0	0	0
	%	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
FACULTY	#	153	41	1	1	1
	%	77.7	20.8	0.5	0.5	0.5
DEAN	#	18	9	0	0	0
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

(CHI SQUARE VALUE WITH 8 DEGREES FREEDOM IS 10.3 (NS)

TEST	DF	CHI SQUARE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL	VALUE
Faculty: President	4	4.09	.05	NS
Faculty: Dean	4	5.48	.05	NS
President: Dean	1	0.37	.05	NS

APPENDIX J

PRESIDENTS AND DEANS

Respondent Code ☐☐☐☐☐☐

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following background information is needed to classify the respondent for this study. No participant's name will be used at any time and no information will be used by any person other than the researcher.

1. Age?   _____ 21 - 35   2. Sex? _____ Male
                   _____ 36 - 50   _____ Female
                   _____ 51 or more

3. Highest degree you hold?
                   _____ Bachelor's   _____ Specialist
                   _____ Master's   _____ Doctorate
4. Ethnic Group?   _____ American Caucasian _____ Spanish Surnamed
                   _____ American Indian   American
                   _____ American Negro   _____ Oriental American
                                             _____ Other (_____)

5. How many years in education work?   _____ years

6. How many years at present institution?   _____ years

7. How many years in present position?   _____ years

8. Have you held other position(s) in   _____ YES List _____
   present institution?   _____ NO _____

9. Do you have teaching responsibilities?   _____ YES How often____
                                                 _____ NO _____

10. Total years of teaching experience at
    community college level?   _____ years

11. Total years of administrative experience   _____ years
    at community college level?

12. Where were you employed immediately before
    you assumed your present position?
    _____ Present institution   _____ Private school
    _____ Another community college/ _____ Military (including
          technical institute   retired persons)
    _____ Public school   _____ Business
    _____ Industry   _____ Government
    _____ Other (specify) _____