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This study concerns the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the four public universities of Kenya and their constituent colleges. Both the real and ideal versions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the demographic questionnaire developed under the auspices of faculty advisors were used to collect data from 10 deans of students, 55 student affairs staff members, and 130 student leaders—who constituted the sample of 195 who responded from the chosen population.

Data were analyzed using a series of one-way analyses of variance utilizing the $f$ test of statistical difference. Fisher's least significant difference test, a multiple comparison procedure, was utilized to make all pairwise comparisons which were detected by the ANOVA to differ significantly from one-another among the respective mean ratings of the three groups surveyed.

Twelve hypotheses were developed and tested, and the major findings included: There were significant differences among the perceptions of the deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders
regarding the real and ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students concerning initiating structure and consideration—the two leadership dimensions surveyed on the questionnaire.

Some conclusions based on the findings included:

1. Deans of students and student affairs members view the leadership behavior differently on the real consideration dimension.

2. Deans of students and student leaders view the leadership behavior differently on the real initiating structure dimension.

3. Student affairs staff members and student leaders had the same views regarding the ideal leadership behavior of deans of students on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

The study, compared with Chen's 1988 findings for similar universities in China, indicates a probable need to reexamine the role of the deans of students in order to be better able to meet the needs.

The dissertation includes a historical as well as a contemporary background of Kenyan university education.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Many theories concerning the purpose of education, the role of the university, and the responsibilities of its leaders have been delineated. Four of these theories form the basis for this study:

1. The purpose of education should be to develop well-rounded, well-informed, productive citizens who, having been given the opportunity to achieve their full potential, can operate effectively in their society.

2. To accomplish this, the university needs to provide an environment with leadership conducive to the full development of the whole individual.

3. The responsibility of the dean of students at such a university should be to promote and facilitate the student's educational experience, particularly in nonacademic matters. The dean of students' most important role seems to be to take active and aggressive leadership in assisting students to develop their full potential—both as scholars and as citizens. The dean's position of formal leadership provides the opportunity to "improve the quality of life for students and enhance the
students' competencies as productive citizens" (Eddy & Sharma, 1986, p. 42).

4. "In the broadest sense, leadership refers to that process whereby an individual directs, guides, influences, or controls the thoughts, feelings, or behavior of other human beings" (Haiman, 1951, p. 4). The best leadership depends on: (a) the individual personality of the leader, (b) the individual followers and the type of work they perform, and (c) the particular situation and circumstances on a given day or at a particular hour. To be effective, leaders must possess leadership styles natural to them and appropriate to their particular situations.

This study will investigate the manner in which these theories, particularly that of the leadership role of the dean of students, are applied in the public universities of Kenya.

Background and Significance of the Study

The concept of higher education had already been deeply founded in the minds of Kenyans long before 1947, the historic year when the idea of establishing an institution of higher learning was first voiced. The development of a university education in Kenya started with the establishment of the Royal Technical College in
Nairobi in 1956. In 1961, the Royal Technical College was renamed the University College of Nairobi—designated as a constituent college of the University of East Africa. In 1970, the University College of Nairobi, by an act of the Kenyan Parliament, was established as the University of Nairobi, thereby becoming Kenya's first university. Three more public universities were established in the 1980s, each by an act of the Kenyan Parliament (Education and manpower . . ., 1988, p. 69). In 1984, after the government had commissioned a report on the establishment of a second national university, Moi University was created. (Moi University calendar 1988-89 & 1989-90; Moi University in brief, 1992; Moi University general information for students, 1990/1991). In 1990, Siriba Teachers' College and the Government Training Institute (GTI) at Maseno merged to form Maseno University College, a constituent College of Moi University (Brief history of Maseno, 1991, Moi University in brief, 1992). In 1985, the former Kenyatta University College, a constituent college of the University of Nairobi, became the third university and changed its name, becoming Kenyatta University (Kenyatta University calendar 1988-89).

Egerton College was first established as an agricultural school with a grant of 320 hectares by Lord Egerton. The initial mission was to train young men of European ancestry to become farmers in Kenya. In 1963,
Egerton underwent a major change when it attained university college status through an Act of the Kenyan Parliament. In 1986, Egerton became a university college, a constituent college of the University of Nairobi (Egerton University, 1991). In 1987, the college acquired full university status (Egerton University catalogue 1989-1990). The vice-chancellor of Egerton University stated that "Egerton University has moved from college status with a student population of about 1600 students in the early 1980s to full university status with a student population of over 7,000 in the early 1990s" (Changes as the university, 1992). With these changes, Kenya now had four universities with their constituent colleges.

The academic purpose of the University of Nairobi has been essentially the same as that of universities the world over: To teach and advance knowledge by research and to maintain standards of teaching at a level that could be clearly related to those established in other countries (Kuria, 1988). Among the main objectives of the University in Kenya has been "to participate in the discovery, transmission, and preservation of knowledge and to stimulate the intellectual life and cultural development of Kenya" (University of Nairobi calendar 1989-1990, p. 14). The need to promote culture has been expressed by the government through setting up a ministry charged with the responsibility of the promotion and
preservation of culture. The University has been set up as a center where creative activities promoting cultural values could and should take place (University education in Kenya, 1981, p. 43). Bogonko (1992) noted that African universities had actively participated in ideo-cultural regeneration, social transformation, economic modernization, and the production of skilled high level manpower. According to Bogonko, the pursuit, promotion, creation, and dissemination of knowledge meant "knowledge which could be used immediately in solving societal problems and provide leadership in various aspects of national development" (p. 146).

Kuria (1988) has emphasized that the Kenyan University --without necessarily compromising scholarly tradition-- has undertaken extramural responsibilities, has revised some courses of study to reflect African situations, and has shown a willingness to make innovations in the planning of courses, the subjects of study, and the standards of admission. For these reasons, Kuria has written that the role of the Kenyan University might appear to be significantly different from that of many universities in Europe. It is probably against this image that its development should be judged, rather than against that of universities whose histories and relations with the societies they serve are very different.
Thus, it has become evident that to be an effective student personnel administrator, the dean of students—in Kenya as elsewhere—has had to deal with and accommodate to the changing climate in the university in an appropriate and timely manner. Currently, no research has been done on the role of the deans of students in the Republic of Kenya. To help the dean of students keep abreast of current developments and trends in student personnel and related fields, a study of the leadership behavior of the deans of students has become necessary. Such a study could help deans in adjusting their behavior in the management of the vastly changing environment. As has been the tradition of most universities in the world, academic affairs and nonacademic affairs have been differentiated in the Kenyan University. The dean of students, whose office has been the focus of this study, has been charged with the responsibility of nonacademic affairs (University of Nairobi calendar 1989-90). This study focused on the deans of students at the four public universities in the Republic of Kenya—as expected and as perceived by student personnel staffs, student leaders, and the deans of students themselves.

Statement of the Problem

This study concerned the perceptions of deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student
leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students.

Purpose of the Study

This study proposed to determine whether:

1. Differences exist between the perceptions of the deans of students and the perceptions of the student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

2. Differences exist between the perceptions of the deans of students and the perceptions of student affairs staff regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

3. Differences exist between the perceptions of the student affairs staff members and the perceptions of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

4. Differences exist between the expectations of the deans of students and the expectations of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

5. Differences exist between the expectations of the dean of students and the student affairs staff regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students; and

6. Differences exist between the expectations of student affairs staff and the expectations of student
leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of the study, these hypotheses were tested using data collected by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ):

1. There will be a difference among the respective ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration;

2. There will be a difference among the respective ratings of deans of students and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration;

3. There will be a difference among the respective ratings of student affairs staff and of student leaders regarding leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration;

4. There will be a difference among the respective ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration;

5. There will be a difference among the respective ratings of deans of students and the student leaders
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration;

6. There will be a difference among the respective
ratings of student affairs staff and of student leaders
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration;

7. There will be a difference among the respective
ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure;

8. There will be a difference among the respective
ratings of deans of students and the student leaders
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure;

9. There will be a difference among the respective
ratings of student affairs staff and of student leaders
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure;

10. There will be a difference among the respective
ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure;

11. There will be a difference among the respective
ratings of student affairs staff and of student leaders
regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in
the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure; and
12. There will be a difference among the respective ratings of student affairs staff and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure.

Definitions

**Consideration orientation:** leader behavior that is characterized by warm friendly relations with group members and concern with group member welfare.

**Dean of students:** one who is responsible for nonacademic aspects of the student life, in particular, matters relating to student welfare and conduct (University of Nairobi calendar 1989-90).

**Expectation:** the desirable or appropriate behavior associated with a certain role.

**Games officer:** faculty staff member who is in charge of (director) of games.

**Harambee:** Swahili word meaning "pull together" for the purpose of accomplishing self-help projects.

**In loco parentis** (Latin, 'in place of'): refers to the legal nature of the rights and responsibilities of a teacher towards his pupils. He could be expected to act as a caring and responsible parent would reasonably be expected to act.

**Initiating structure:** leader activities that introduce organization, new ways of doing things, and new procedures for solving group problems.
**Leadership:** the ability and readiness to inspire, guide, direct, or manage others.

**Patron:** faculty staff member who is an advisor to the students' clubs or societies.

**Perception:** an immediate or intuitive cognition or judgment.

**Role:** the social behavior expected of, and usually exhibited by, people occupying certain positions in society.

**Student affairs staff:** student affairs staff refers to those who work in the office of the dean of students, to those in charge of residence halls, as well as to club patrons, to student counselors, and to game officers.

**Student leaders:** leaders (chairmen) of student unions and various clubs.

**Terms of reference:** refers to objectives or functions.

**University Senate:** committee consisting of administrators and academic staff whose purpose is to oversee academic matters of the university.

**Warden:** member of teaching staff of college or university with special administrative or pastoral responsibilities. Used especially for the staff member responsible for a hall of residence.

---

**Summary**

The perceptions of deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders regarding the
leadership behavior of the deans of students have formed the basis for this study. Specific educational theories, background and significance of the study, and definition of terms have been briefly presented.
CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

For purposes of this investigation, the related literature and research has been concerned with: (a) definitions of leadership, (b) theoretical framework of leadership, (c) styles of leadership, (d) functions of the dean of students, (e) role of the dean of students, and (f) qualities of the dean of students.

Concepts of Leadership

Leadership, a fascinating and elusive concept, has been investigated in a number of contexts. Although leadership has been a favorite topic for study, researchers have disagreed as to its precise definition. The term leadership has meant different things to different people (Yukl, 1981). Studies in the field have shown that definitions tend to vary depending upon the orientation of the researcher or the purpose of the research. For this reason, the term leadership has been accused of a multitude of scientifically reprehensible crimes: excessive ambiguity (Pfeffer, 1977), an overbroad scope (Katz & Kahn, 1978), significant overlap with other
descriptive terms (Grimes, 1978), and doubtful theoretical utility (Miner, 1975). Stogdill (1974) has noted that "There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 7).

Few scientific terms have been defined in as many ways as leader and leadership. In his major study, Stogdill (1974) has identified eleven conceptions of leadership:

1. A focus of group process,
2. Personality and its efforts,
3. The art of inducing compliance,
4. The exercise of influence,
5. An act of behavior,
6. A form of persuasion,
7. A power relation,
8. An instrument of goal achievement,
9. An effect of interaction,
10. A differentiated role, and
11. An initiation of structure.

According to Hemphill (1949a), actions that initiate structure and interaction as part of the process of solving a problem can be termed leadership. Koontz and O'Donnell (1972) have viewed leadership along that same line as inducement of subordinates toward accomplishment. Fiedler (1967) has defined leadership as "an interpersonal
relation in which power and influence are unevenly distributed so that one person is able to direct and control the actions and behaviors of others to a greater extent than they direct and control his" (p. 11). Homans (1965) has written of a leader as a man whose orders, whether implicit or explicit, were obeyed by those to whom he directed them.

Leadership has also been viewed as a process of influencing. Tannenbaum, Waschler, and Massarik (1961) have defined leadership as "interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals" (p. 24). Haiman (1951) has commented that "leadership is an effort on [the leader's] part to direct the behavior of others toward a particular end" (p. 5). Hodgetts (1981) has indicated that "leadership is the process of influencing people to direct their efforts toward the achievement of some particular goal(s)" (p. 233). According to Wess (1989) leadership has meant "the privilege to have the responsibility to direct the actions of others in carrying out the purposes of the organization, at varying levels of authority and with accountability for both successful and failed endeavors" (p. xiv).

Fleishman (1973) has come up with a provisional definition which has been found useful: Leadership
attempts "interpersonal influence, directed through the communication process, toward the attainment of some goal or goals" (p. 3). This definition implied that leadership always involved attempts to influence and that all interpersonal relationships could involve elements of leadership.

Seeman and Morris (1950), in an early report of the Ohio State University leadership series, have posited a tentative adaptable definition of leadership emphasizing its influence aspect: Leadership acts were acts by persons which influenced other persons in a shared direction. This definition has implied a positional relationship between the leader and other persons. The leader's position has been defined in terms of relative status or relative degrees of influence. Tead (1935) has defined leadership as the "activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goals which they come to find desirable" (p. 20). Hollander and Julian (1968) have stated that leadership in the broadest sense implies the presence of a particular influence relationship between two or more persons.

Many researchers have defined leadership with regard to the behavior or actions of a leader. According to this view, leadership has been a dynamic process in which an individual behaved in a certain manner, thereby influencing others in their behavior. In Tagiuri's (1952)
words, "Behavior . . . does not consist of response to the properties of the stimulus field objectively or consensually specified but, rather, of the reactions to what is perceived by the subject" (p. 91). Selznick's 1957 definition of leadership referred to the ability to infuse daily behavior with meaning, to create an "institutional embodiment of purpose" (p. 62). Pigors (1935) has indicated that leadership has been a concept applied to the personality-environment relation to describe the situation when a personality was so placed in the environment that others joined in pursuit of a common cause.

In summary, a review of the literature of leadership has revealed that it has been unlikely that any definition of leadership could be suggested that all researchers and theorists would accept. However, leadership has had a role that led toward achievement, involved interaction and influence, and usually resulted in some form of changed structure or modified behavior of groups, organizations, or communities. Strength of personality and ability to induce compliance, or to persuade, have been critical variables in the effectiveness of leaders, but their relative influence has depended on time and circumstance. (Lassey & Fernandez, 1976).

Theoretical Approaches to Leadership

Four theoretical approaches to leadership have been posited: (a) great man, (b) trait, (c) behavior, and (d)

Great Man Approach

Much of the early literature on leadership was characterized by analyses of the lives of great men. Many biographical analyses and autobiographical memoirs dealt extensively with leadership phenomena. The philosophy underlying these works has been oriented toward the viewpoint that leaders were born and not made, that nature was more important than nurture, and that instinct was more important than training (Cunningham & Gephart, 1971).

Trait Theory

The traitist approach to the study of leadership, initially derived from the great man approach, was concerned with the identification of key traits or personality characteristics of those in leadership positions. The assumption of this approach has been that effective leaders had a finite number of identifiable traits or characteristics that have distinguished effective from ineffective leaders (Dessler, 1980).

During the period of the traitist approach to the study of leadership, Bower (1951) has concluded that
leadership could be accounted for by the personal traits of the leader. In one of Bower's studies involving 1,313 gangs of boys in Chicago, he has noted that physical prowess, speed, and finality in decision-making were traits which most often determined leadership in gang situations.

After World War II, Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 studies of psychological traits related to leaders; the purpose being to determine what precise psychological traits have distinguished leaders from followers. He has made these observations:

The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of his group in the following respects: (1) intelligence, (2) scholarship, (3) dependability in exercising responsibility, (4) activity and social participation, and (5) socioeconomic status. The following are supported by uniformly positive evidence from 10 or more studies surveyed: The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of this group to some degree in the following respects: (1) sociability, (2) initiative, (3) persistence, (4) knowing how to get things done, (5) self-confidence, (6) alertness to and insight into situations, (7) cooperativeness, (8) popularity, (9) adaptability, and (10) verbal facility. (p. 63)

Despite the evidence that leaders tend to differ from nonleaders with respect to certain traits, Stogdill (1974) has found that the results varied considerably from situation to situation. Thus, Stogdill has concluded: "A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits . . . the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some
relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers" (p. 64).

In general, leadership effectiveness has been determined by applying different trait combinations under different situations. Stogdill (1974) has stated his agreement with this line of thought:

Strong evidence indicates that different leadership skills and traits are required in different situations. The behaviors and traits enabling a mobster to gain and maintain control over a criminal gang are not the same as those enabling a religious leader to gain and maintain a large following. Yet certain general qualities—such as courage, fortitude and conviction—appear to characterize both. (p. 72)

Yukl (1981) has contended that the relative importance of different traits was dependent on the nature of the leadership situation.

**Behavioral Approach**

The extreme reaction to the so-called failure of the traitist approach has given way to the analysis of the behavior of leaders. Many psychologists who have conducted studies which utilized the behavioral approach have contributed greatly to the understanding of the nature of leadership (Bales, 1953, Brown, 1967, Halpin, 1966; Hemphill, 1950; Fiedler, 1967, Getzels & Guba, 1957; and Parsons, 1951). Behavioral leadership theories have focused on the leaders' actions and behavior in carrying out their leadership functions, rather than on
intelligence or initiative traits (Dessler, 1980).

Behavior theory has attempted to explain leadership on the basis of what the leader does and not on what the leader is.

Most of these behavioral studies have noted two key elements in leadership orientation: (a) initiating structure, and (b) consideration. For example, researchers at the Personnel Research Board of Ohio State University have isolated these two dimensions as significant for describing leader behavior (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

These dimensions have been delineated from a factor analysis of data obtained by the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which has assessed the behavior of leaders in social systems. Initiating structure on the part of the leader has included actions that were intended to clarify roles of group participants, establish patterns of interaction among participants, and delineate the tasks to be accomplished. Initiating structure also indicated that the leader's behavior tended to emphasize: production, structure, representation, or persuasiveness. On the other hand, the consideration dimension behaviors were directed primarily toward satisfying the needs and preferences of individuals within the organization; the leader's behavior tended to emphasize tolerance,
uncertainty, freedom, consideration, and integration (Stogdill, 1963).

The LBDQ contained fifteen items pertaining to consideration and an equal number of items for initiating structure. Respondents judged the frequency with which the leader engaged in each form of behavior. In reality, consideration and initiating structure were dimensions of observed behavior as perceived by others.

**Situational Approach**

General dissatisfaction with the failure to isolate leadership traits has caused some investigators to turn to a study of sociological factors. Basically, the situational approach has maintained that leadership was determined not so much by the characteristics of individuals as by the requirements of social systems. According to this reasoning, there were situational factors or dimensions that were finite in number and that varied widely. These included the leader's personality, task requirements, follower expectations, needs, and attitudes, as well as the environment in which these factors operated. Vernon (1965) has defined situation not only by the characteristics of the environment or the life space in which it took place (objective reality), but also by the perceptions of the situation provided by those interacting within it (subjective reality).
Filley, House, and Kerr (1976) found that certain factors have had an impact on leadership effectiveness:

1. History of the agency,
2. Age of the previous incumbent in the leader position,
3. Age of the leader and his previous experience,
4. Community in which the agency operates,
5. Particular work requirements of the group,
6. Psychological climate of the group led,
7. Kind of job the leader holds,
8. Size of the group led,
9. Degree to which the leader needs group-member cooperation,
10. Cultural expectations of subordinates,
11. Group member personalities, and
12. Time required and allowed for decisions.

Investigators have appeared to accept the conclusion that leader behavior was effective in only certain kinds of situations depending on the factors focused upon.

Bowditch and Anthony (1985) have stated their opinion that there was not one best way to lead in all situations, and that the most effective style of leadership was contingent, or dependent, on the situations. Situation oriented research has assumed that it is unreasonable to expect one leader to always be able to do everything better than anyone else. In short, the situation has had
much to do with determining what leadership skills would be required at a given time.

Contingency Model

The contingency model for the study of leadership has been one of the outgrowths of the situational approach that occurred about 25 years ago (Clark & Clark, 1990). Contingency theorists have suggested the criticality of discrete factors in the situation in which individual leaders operated. These factors have impacted on behavior and need to be part of a theory of leadership. Either leadership had to change with the situation, or the situation had to change to suit the kind of leadership exercised (Fairholm, 1991).

The first major contingency model was Fiedler's (1964, 1967) least preferred coworker (LPC) model, followed by the Evans (1970, 1974) and House (1971) path-goal model, and the Vroom and Yetton (1973) leadership and decision-making model. These and other contingency models have shown that the most effective leaders have been individuals who could adapt leadership styles to the demands of a particular situation, group, and personal value (Fiedler, 1967). According to Fiedler, there were three major situational variables which determine the leader's effectiveness:

1. Leader-member relations—how well the leader was accepted by followers,
2. Task structure—the degree to which follower tasks were programmable, and

3. Position powers—the formal authority the leader held.

Fiedler has viewed behavior as a single dimension ranging from task-oriented (low LPC) to relationship oriented (high LPC), using the LPC measure obtained by asking respondents to make ratings of the person with whom they were least able to work well. He has contended that task-oriented leaders performed best in either very favorable or very unfavorable situations, but that relationship-oriented leaders worked well in a mixed situation.

Fiedler's model has been severely criticized in the last few years. Schriesheim and Kerr (1976) have raised serious questions concerning the LPC scale's construct validity, content validity, and predictive validity. Ashour (1973) has asserted that the model was not really a theory since the model did not explain how a leader's LPC score had a causal effect on group performance. Fiedler (1973, 1979) has responded to some of these criticism, but the controversy has continued.

Fiedler's contingency model has added both conceptually and empirically to the understanding of the complexities of leadership. He was the first to suggest that the situation (contingency theory) was important.
Fielder's research has contributed greatly to the knowledge of leadership effectiveness.

**Path-goal Theory**

The path-goal theory has been another model dealing with different contingencies that have affected leader-follower relations. Path-goal theory has been based on the leader's effectiveness in increasing followers' motivation along a path leading to a goal. The theory was grounded in the expectancy theory, which says that people were more highly motivated if they had large expectancies regarding their ability (a) to perform, and (b) to achieve the reward, and if the value of the reward was sufficiently tempting.

House and Mitchell (1974) have suggested four styles of leadership which could be successful depending on the given situation: (a) directive—for ambiguous tasks and unclear paths, (b), supportive—for stressful tasks, (c) achievement-oriented—for nonrepetitive tasks, (d) participative—if subordinates participate in the determination of the path and goal. Selection of the style has depended upon the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and upon how structured the task. Style of leadership has also reflected the two Ohio State leadership dimensions: (a) initiating structure, and (b) consideration orientation.
The Vroom-Yetton Decision-process Theory

The Vroom-Yetton decision-process theory has been concerned with increasing follower involvement—ranging from leader autocratic, consultative, and group decision styles depending upon various situational factors (Vroom, 1984; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The authors have concluded that leaders should be directive when they were confident that they knew what to do and followers did not know; however, leaders should be participative when followers had information and were skilled, confident, and committed.

This model has lacked parsimony (Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976). The main limitation has been its narrow focus upon decision-making as the central context in which leadership has been displayed. However, a very useful feature of studying this model has been to provide leaders with an awareness of how they make decisions, what goes into decision-making, and how that process could be improved (Baker, 1980).

Several definitions of leadership have been given with no one universally acceptable as the best. Major historical approaches to the analysis of leadership have been traced, including the great man, traitist, behavioral, and situational approaches. Each of these approaches has had its shortcomings, but all of them have added to the understanding of the complexities of leadership.
Leadership Styles

There are endless taxonomies—almost laundry lists—of styles which leaders have adopted and pursued. However, most research regarding leadership has come to focus around three styles: (a) democratic, (b) autocratic, and (c) laissez-faire.

Fiedler (1967) has defined leadership style as "the underlying need structure of the individual which motivates behavior in various leadership situations" (p. 36).

Probably the most widely known investigations of leadership style were those of Lewin, Lippet, and White (1939) at the University of Iowa. During their elaborate researches, four hobby clubs were organized among selected ten-year-old boys who were as similar as possible in relevant physical, social, and intellectual characteristics. The adult leader of each group, a collaborator of the experimenters, was instructed to behave either in an autocratic, a democratic, or a laissez-faire manner; the behavior of the boys was then carefully observed and recorded. Observed differences in the boys' behavior were attributed to the prescribed actions of the leaders rather than to such factors as the personalities of the leaders or events external to the experimental groups.

Observed differences included a greater amount of aggressiveness in the autocratic groups, both in reacting to the leader and in interacting with other boys, and
greater attention to group-minded suggestions and work-minded conversations in the laissez-faire and democratic groups. The laissez-faire and democratic leadership also turned out to differ significantly: A lower level of psychological involvement in the laissez-faire groups resulted in less work and poorer work than in the democratic groups.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) have described a range of leadership styles. At one end of the continuum was the autocratic (or boss-oriented) style; a democratic (or subordinate-centered) style was at the other end. There were four rules, the authors have noted, which a successful leader using any style has followed:

1. You cannot "pass the buck" of responsibility by delegating it.

2. You should always remain involved in subordinates' discussions.

3. Subordinates should be able to recognize the style of leadership you are using.

4. Democratic leaders allow subordinates to make more significant decisions.

According to Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973), three primary areas of evaluation determine which leadership style to use:

1. Manager-oriented--values, inclinations, self-confidence,
2. Subordinate-orientation—tolerance of ambiguity, willing to allow others' decisions, and


The researchers have suggested that leadership styles located on the subordinate-centered part of the continuum had increased the subordinates' ability to perform more effectively. They have emphasized a flexible leadership style and have stressed the importance of assessing the relevant forces affecting a particular style.

Davis (1977) has pointed out that leadership styles have described a leader's predominant way of acting with the group. Leaders have used different leadership styles, and the styles have tended to build different organizational climates. Davis has divided leadership into three styles: (a) motivational styles ranging along a continuum from strongly positive to strongly negative, (b) power styles ranged from autocratic through participative to free-rein, (c) orientation styles including consideration and initiating structure.

Carlisle (1982) has used substitute terminology in order to avoid the value connotations associated with the political terms that were originally adopted. He has noted these leadership styles: (a) directive (autocratic), (b) participative (democratic), and (c) free-rein (laissez-
Owens (1979) has suggested five leader styles: (a) the autocratic leader, (b) the bureaucratic leader, (c) the diplomatic leader, (d) the participative leader, and (e) the free-rein leader. Owens has never advocated any one style as best or ideal. Rather, he has suggested that the best leadership style would depend on: (a) the individual personality of the leader, (b) the individual followers—the class of people—and the type of work they performed, and (c) the particular situation and circumstances on a given day or at a particular hour.

In summary, researchers have identified numerous leadership styles. They have seemed to be in agreement that no one particular style was the best. Since leadership style has been a function of the leader's personality, effective leaders have had to possess leadership styles natural to them and appropriate to their particular situations.

The Dean of Students

The dean of students, sometimes referred to as the chief student personnel officer (Blue, 1972), has been directly responsible for the personnel services provided in the institution. Williamson (1961) has written that the main function of the student personnel administrator was the coordination and administration of personnel programs. He has also found that the personnel services provided in
the institutions have been fairly uniform and have included housing, placement, extracurricular activities, financial aid, health services, orientation, counseling, testing, and maintenance of student records. Functions of the majority of personnel deans have included admission and screening of prospective students, students' orientation, counseling, student activities and government, student housing, health services, scholarships, financial aid, and student discipline (Swan, 1959)

Researchers such as Arend (1974), Bursch (1962), Dutton (1963), Lilley (1974), and Stanbury (1965) have written about heterogeneous functions for the dean of students. However, they have been in agreement that it has been the responsibility of the dean of students to promote and facilitate the students' educational experiences, particularly in the nonacademic matters.

The Role of the Dean of Students

According to Carlisle (1982), a role has been a set of expectations about the behavior of some one occupying a given position in a social unit. The Chief Student Affairs Officer has been expected to assume several roles. The most important were manager, mediator, leader, and educator. With many services and programs as part of the division of student affairs, effective personnel and fiscal management has become essential (Sandeen, 1991). The role
of the student affairs personnel administrator has not always been clear to others on the college campus. Koltai and Wolf (1984) have stated that the role of student affairs on many campuses was both not clear and not well communicated. This has appeared to be so because of: (a) historical identification of the position as the administrative control agent of the president; (b) separation of student affairs from academic affairs; (c) conflicting role expectations, particularly during periods of crisis; (d) disagreement about students, faculty, and administration on the decision-making process for university policy; and (e) lack of identifiable professional status (Rickard, 1972).

According to Rickard, opposing expectations have contributed to the ambiguous role of the chief student affairs administrator. The combination of adversary advocacy roles in relationship to students have illustrated the dilemma. The adversary relationship of student affairs staff and students has involved many levels of interaction and several types of problems: (a) the dean of students serving as university prosecutor, (b) the expectations that residential staff was responsible for policing illegal drug use, (c) the involvement of the staff in the identification of students who have violated university regulations, and (d) the general expectation that student affairs has existed to "keep the lid on."
Rickard (1972) has observed that as universities began to adapt routine procedural due process safeguards and to move toward an adversarial judicial system, the traditional practice of combining the counselor and disciplinarian roles in one staff member has become increasingly more difficult. This duality of function has created role ambiguities, bred mistrust among students and staff, and stifled effective communication. Caught in the crossfire between administrative expectations to control behavior and student demands for increased control over the conditions of student life, student affairs staff have found the continued lack of clarity in roles detrimental to the development of relationships of trust with the students.

Many university presidents have expected the dean to forestall student complaints and to handle them, giving the president time to prepare when student violence seemed to be imminent (Hodgkinson, 1970). In studying presidents' perception of chief student affairs officers, Harway (1977) and Rickard (1972) have found that presidents perceived student affairs chiefs' roles much differently than did chief student affairs officers themselves.

According to Hodgkinson's 1970 study, faculty, administrators, department chairpersons, and students on college campuses across the country have expressed
considerable animosity toward deans of students who, like business managers, have been perceived as heads of service areas. Hodgkinson has concluded that student personnel has been a "never-never land," that faculty have viewed student personnel as administration, and that the administration has viewed student personnel as faculty. Thus, perception of the dean's role has been plagued with misconceptions.

Eddy, Chen, and Ball (1988) have noted that the traditional role of the dean of students has evolved to meet societal demands and has been changing significantly to expect the dean to possess crucial managerial skills. Chen (1987) has conducted a study on the role of the dean of students at selected universities in the Republic of China and has confirmed a growing emphasis on the dean of students' having managerial skills. This line of thought has been in agreement with Sandeen (1991), who contended that student affairs leaders must have (a) a good understanding of the university as an organization, (b) a sensitivity to the needs of others, (c) sound fiscal skills, and (d) a familiarity with effective management skills.

According to this review of literature, the role of the dean of students has been perceived as ambiguous, confusing, and sometimes conflicting. Despite the ambiguous nature of the position, the dean's most
important role has been to take active and aggressive leadership in assisting students to develop their full potential--both as scholars and as citizens. Sandeen (1991) has emphasized that deans of students hold important leadership positions and as such have been expected to be good managers, delivering timely services to students while being effective mediators, resolving difficult disputes and campus conflicts, as well as being sound educators--planning and putting into effect successful co-curricular programs for students.

Qualities of the Dean of Students

The qualities and training needed to fulfill the role of the dean of students have been those required of any successful leader. According to Stogdill, these have included:

1. A strong desire for responsibility and task completion,
2. Vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals,
3. Venturesomeness,
4. Originality,
5. Drive to exercise initiative in social situations,
6. Self-confidence,
7. A sense of personal identity,
8. Willingness to accept the consequences of one's decisions,
9. Readiness to absorb interpersonal stress,
10. A willingness to take role frustration and delay,
11. The ability to influence behavior, and
12. The capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand.

The prospective dean should be a person of high character, capable of doing advanced graduate study, whose experience in life should be broad, enabling that person to possess a comprehensive philosophy of life. In short, the dean should be endowed with favorable personality attributes, a knowledge of self, an aptitude to work with students, and a better than average intellect (Bailey, 1968).

Mueller (1961) has suggested that personnel workers had to understand what leadership was and to recognize the special relationships which existed between a leader and the group. Bailey (1968) has emphasized that personnel workers should understand the motivations and dynamics of groups, be able to conduct a group discussion, and know how to help a group define objectives and work toward them. Lunsford (1984) has noted that most student affairs officers have now earned the doctoral degree, and most advertisements for vice-presidents of student affairs positions now specify this degree as a minimum qualification.
Dutton (1973) has summarized the role of student affairs administrators:

1. They must acquire knowledge of research methodology so that they can assess student needs and environmental factors that impinge on learning and program effectiveness,

2. They must learn how to maximize utilization of human resources to involve people meaningfully in decision making and policy execution. Basically, they must become experts in human development educators—educators whose special insights, knowledge and skills permit them to contribute in unique ways to the development of learning situations,

3. To perform the roles of policy strategists, learning environmentalists, facilitators, educator, and administrator, great knowledge and skill are required but there are also some essential personal qualities, that is, personal commitment, loyalty, a clean sense of values and philosophy, judgment, integrity, consistency, courage, toughness when necessary, and great sensitivity.

4. To be effective, student affairs administrators also must have the capacity to withstand extreme pressure, to make decisions, to live with loneliness and misperceptions of effectiveness and values by others, and to accept failure and criticism,

5. They must have the stamina to meet heavy workload requirements, that is, they must be able to handle all the administrative details and also be creative, bright, alert, incisive, considerate, and nice to students, alumni, parents, trustees, and presidents, and after 60 hours of such behavior, to still find time for family, church, community, research, writing, professional development, and NASPA conferences.

6. They must have the qualities of Moses, Solomon, Hercules, and Jesus Christ. . . .

7. Student affairs administrators can play a vital role as institutions change and respond to new conditions—a role that possibly no one else can perform or will perform. (pp. 11-12)

In short, the qualities required of the dean of students have related both to training experience and professional effectiveness. Student personnel administra-
tors have had to attend professional seminars in order to keep abreast of the current developments in the field and to adjust appropriately so that they can help students most effectively. A training program for student personnel administrators would have to be based upon the role which these deans fulfill (Burnett, 1955).

The Role of the University

Chen (1987), whose model was used in this research, has written that in Taiwan university education emphasized not only academic education but also moral education. Implementing moral education was the main responsibility of the dean of students who played the role of guidance and discipline. The responsibility of every university has been to provide a setting for and a stimulus to the total growth and development of students.

Boyer, in his 1987 Carnegie Foundation report, has written:

What students do in dining halls, on the playing fields, and in the rathskeller late at night all combine to influence the outcome of the college education, and the challenge, in the building of community, is to extend their sources for learning on the campus and to see academic and nonacademic life as interlocked. (p. 177)

According to Shaffer and Martison (1966), a college or university has been basically a collection of resources available to students. One major function of the student personnel worker has been to motivate, stimulate, and
enable students to make effective use of resources available in the university. Further, these authors have stated that the student who profited most from his university experience was the one who took advantage of the many opportunities to learn new ideas, to weigh and consider facts, to discuss and debate issues, and to utilize his or her personal skills. These opportunities might occur outside of the classroom or within it.

Shaffer and Martison (1966) have concluded that student personnel services, being concerned with the whole student in his total environment, should recognize that what the student learns and experiences in his out-of-class life has a direct bearing upon his aspirations, motives, and achievements in class.

In their statement entitled "The student personnel point of view," the committee on college personnel of the American Council on Education (1949) has stated:

The student personnel point encompasses the student as a whole. The concept of education is broadened to include attention to the student's well-rounded development--physically, socially, emotionally, and spiritually as well as intellectually. The student is thought of as a responsible participant in his own development and not as a passive recipient of an imprinted economic, political, or religious doctrine or vocational skill. As a responsible participant in the societal processes of our American democracy, his full and balanced maturity is viewed as a major end-goal of education and, as well, a necessary means to the fullest development of his fellow citizens. (p. I)

This point of view has considered each student as an individual with a unique constellation of traits to be
treated as an indivisible personality functioning and reacting to the environment as a whole (Shaffer, 1967). As Wrenn (1951) has pointed out, the student personnel point of view has been a pervasive philosophy which has affected or should affect the entire program of the institution including the curriculum, teaching procedures, administrative policies, selection of faculty, and regulation of student conduct.

O'Bannion (1969) has emphasized that the student personnel point of view was best represented by a program focused on humanitarian-democratic ideals in which it was believed that all human beings could live richer, fuller lives, and that each should be provided opportunities to become all he or she was capable of becoming. Hook (1952) has stated his philosophy relevant to personnel work and identified it with the progressive education movement:

The philosophy of progressive education had from the outset been committed to the belief that only in a democracy, and in a continuously expanding social democracy, can the end of individual growth be achieved. This follows from the concern with which the needs of every child were to be considered, the necessity of harmonizing these needs to permit their fruitful expansion, and the recognition that genuine equality of educational opportunity demands social democracy at one end and industrial democracy at the other. (p. 103)

In 1947, the [United States] President's Commission on Higher Education stated:

The first goal in education for democracy is the full-rounded and continuing development of the person. The discovery, training, and utilization of individual talents is of fundamental importance in a
free society. To liberate and perfect the intrinsic powers of every citizen is the central purpose of democracy and its furtherance of individual self-realization is its greatest glory. (p. 5)

Thus, it is evident from the literature that personnel work is related to, or extends from, that philosophy of education which concerns itself with the total development of the individual student.

As Bailey (1968) has pointed out, the major philosophies in student personnel history continued to affect the kind of help being provided to students by their personnel workers. The use of strict discipline as a means of social control of students had been a source of interference with the accomplishment of student growth.

Eddy, Dameron, and Borland (1980) have contended that the dean of students has been the chief administrator responsible for providing services geared at improving the quality of life for the students as well as the enhancement of their overall development. O'Bannion (1969) has described the role of the dean of students as that of the human development facilitator, meaning one who reaches out to others and engages them in the fulfillment of their emerging potential. Other roles for the dean of students has been to run interference for his staff, and to represent the student personnel program in the administrative council, to the rest of the college, and to the community as well as to the profession at large.
During the colonial period, the teaching faculty and college presidents had been the persons concerned with the students' welfare (Mueller 1961). Their purpose had been to cultivate good manners in these students through rigid discipline. Today, however, concern about the welfare of students has become a function of the dean of students.

Although written in a time when sexist language and sexist behavior was considered acceptable, the 1934 delineation of the role of dean by the policy committee of the National Association of Deans and Advisors of Men [Women] has broader ramifications and has become equally applicable to both sexes today:

A dean or advisor of men [women] is an administrative officer of an educational institution possessing the training, the authority, and the means to aid the individual male [female] student in the solution of his [her] personal problems, and to direct his [her] group activities in such a way as to further the student's development and the general educational program of the institution. . . . The dean or advisor of men [women] reaches his [her] objectives through dealing with such matters as housing and boarding health, financial assistance, part-time employment, vocational motivation, extracurricular activities, moral and social life and the like. (Gardener, 1934, p. 196)

In terms of administrative structure of the universities, deans of students have occupied leadership positions. It has been an exposed position with specific roles that could easily reveal the strengths and weaknesses of character as no job of less responsibility would do (Silva, 1986). Deans of students have needed to
understand this so that they would be better prepared to serve the students. Deans' of students reference groups with which they have been in constant contact have included student affairs staff and student leaders (Chen, 1987). There could have been a lack of understanding between the deans of students and their reference groups; therefore, an analysis of the deans' of students role might help bridge the misconceptions.

Major administrative functions of the dean of students have included providing creative leadership for students development and coordinating student programs. Included in the leadership role has been the responsibility for frequent evaluation of the total impact of the student development program to ensure that it has remained in keeping with the changing needs of students and with the institution's objectives (Eddy, Dameron, & Borland, 1980).

Because the deans of students have had so essential a role in influencing the reference groups to work effectively, deans have had to possess good leadership and administrative skills. Leadership has been a key process in the administration of a university. The success or failure of student development programs has been attributed to its leadership. As leaders, deans of students have always made an important difference in the continuing and successful operation of the student personnel services on their campuses. Therefore,
A comprehensive understanding of the perceptions and expectations of the dean of students that have been held by those reference groups in the institutions would help deans to make the necessary adjustments in their own leader behavior and to become more effective leaders.

The office of the dean of students in the public university in Kenya has catered to certain nonacademic aspects of the student life, in particular to matters relating to student welfare and conduct (University of Nairobi calendar 1989-90). The office of the dean of students has coordinated all students' welfare matters on campus, including: accommodation, games and sports, students' activities, counseling services, and health services (Moi University calendar, 1988-89 and 1989-90). Simply said, the deans' of students office coordinates various student services and functions while seeking to improve the overall quality of student life.

The office of the dean of students, in a sense, has played the in loco parentis role. The conduct of student residences as well as most of the student life in the university has been regulated through this office. The university has required that all students swear to adhere to the rules and regulations for their conduct and behavior while at the university (Varsity registers . . ., 1990, p. 3). Rigid and strict discipline has been used as a means of social control of the students. While rigid
and strict rules might have worked very well in the 1970s when the university was still young, it has become doubtful that it will continue to work in the modern day Kenyan University with big campuses and large enrollments of students from varying ethnic and subethnic communities. Times have changed and today's university students in Kenya simply have not been willing to take passive roles on campus. Those days have long been gone when students were content to be merely recipients of the knowledge and acquirers of diplomas provided by the universities.

As evidenced by reports in the Kenyan press, today's university students have desired to be actively involved in national and academic affairs, rather than being passive observers. As a result, there have been student riots, protests, and campus closures (Mourning students . . ., 1990; Expelled varsity students recalled, 1988; Crisis time . . ., 1991).

Kenya has become a modern society. One amenity that has come with modernization has been the increased consciousness and political mobilization of citizens, especially university students, who have charged that their role has become to protect and defend their society against social and political ills (Students tell Kimotho . . ., 1990). With the accelerating turn of behavior and the increasing ideologies of university students in Kenya,
student personnel workers might need to adjust to these changes, both in their personal roles and in their student roles.

Since independence, Kenya has made dramatic quantitative and qualitative progress in higher education. Quantitatively, university enrollment has jumped from 300 students in 1963 to 5,000 in 1978 and to 41,000 in 1990 (Toward a more educated Kenya, 1992; KANU manifesto, 1992). During the 1990-91 academic year, the four public universities and their constituent colleges have admitted over 20,800 undergraduate students (Economic survey, 1991). The number of graduates leaving universities in 1990 was approximately 9,000 compared to 2,000 a decade ago (Varsity discovers . . ., 1990). Currently, over 15,000 Kenyan students have been studying in foreign universities (Riotous students . . ., 1991). Current statistics indicate that Kenya has almost 100,000 students taking some form of higher education—the highest number in Central and Eastern Africa (Varsity discovers . . ., 1990).

Qualitative improvements have been significant. Kenya has taken the inherited educational system (British)—originally intended to train a class of persons black in color but foreign in thought, culture, outlook, and behavior—and has adapted that system to fit its needs (Kenya Institute of Education, 1968). Despite its
expansion, the university has maintained the staff-student ratio set by UNESCO: one lecturer for 15 students, which safeguards standards (Why 'food riots' . . . , 1992). The introduction of the 8-4-4 (Figure 1) educational system in the mid-eighties was a result of demand for relevant quality education (Waweru, 1991). The 8-4-4 was a major milestone in the development of the country's educational system. Not only did the reorganization change the number of years spent at each of the three levels of education, but it also brought a major shift in the philosophy and structure of education—from purely academic to practical, production oriented (Crisis time: Education . . ., 1991). The 8-4-4 education system has been aimed at preparing the youth for various occupations through a continuous process of interdependent phases of skill development from the lower levels of awareness and exploration to specialized training (Education and manpower training, 1988).

The education system in Kenya has also been charged with the formidable task of facilitating national unity. This has been partly achieved through the removal of racial segregation from the school system and the localization of syllabi at all levels of education (Educational objectives and policies, 1976).

The objectives of the new system of education (8-4-4) have included:
STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION SYSTEM IN KENYA

Source:

Figure 1. Structure of Education System in Kenya
1. Education must serve to foster national unity on the adaptation of the rich cultural heritage of the people of Kenya.

2. Education must serve the needs of National Development through production of skilled manpower, dissemination of knowledge, and the inculcation of the right attitudes and relating attributes of learning to the real problems of society.

3. Education must prepare and equip the youth of Kenya with the knowledge, skills, and expertise necessary to enable them to collectively play an effective role in the life of the nation, and to enable them to engage in activities that enhance the quality of life, while ensuring that opportunities are provided for the full development of the individual talents and personality.

4. Education must promote social justice and morality by instilling the right attitudes necessary for training in social obligations and responsibilities.

5. Education must foster, develop, and communicate the rich and varied cultures of Kenya.

6. As Kenya is a member of the international community, its education system must foster positive attitudes and consciousness towards other nations.

(Second university in Kenya, 1981, p. 6)
University institutions in Kenya have seemed to be geared toward solving developmental, social, and environmental problems (University education in Kenya, 1981). This has seemed to indicate that higher education in Kenya was trying very hard to meet the needs of society.

As mentioned earlier, one of the objectives of university education in the 8-4-4 education system in Kenya has been to develop and transmit knowledge and skills through research and training at undergraduate and post graduate levels. This has been very important because in developing countries, such as Kenya, university research has been vital due to the formidable and complex problems facing these countries (University education in Kenya, 1981). Research has not only become a necessary tool for solving all the pressing technological and socioeconomic problems in the society, but also for opening up new frontiers of knowledge.

The University of Nairobi has had an excellent research program. However, inadequate halls of residence have been a persistent problem in the universities, and this overcrowding has been named as one of the major sources of students' discontent. The universities have tried to provide catering facilities to all students resident in the halls, yet some dining halls have had a seating capacity of 1,728 to service 4,732 resident students. The congestion of so many students in one place
has generated an atmosphere conducive to riotous behavior (Second university in Kenya, 1981). Lack of foreign exchange has also limited the universities' capacities to acquire international scholastic publications (University academic . . ., 1991).

Kenyan universities have been faced with a population explosion (Numbers crunch, 1990). This has translated into congestion in lecture theaters, laboratories, and halls of residence as well as shortage of academic staff and limited facilities such as transport and equipment. As is the case elsewhere in the developing world, sporadic student protests have been a recurring feature of Kenya's university life (Mwiria, 1991). Student unrest in most Kenyan public universities has usually been sparked by failure of students to heed government demands and vice versa. The consequences have sometimes been disastrous: long closures of universities, expulsions, jailing, fining, and deaths of students, damage to property, loss of natural resources through lost man-hours as well as unutilized university facilities (Bogonko, 1992).

Despite the problems attendant upon this unrest, there have been important advances. The University of Nairobi's vice-chancellor has announced several new discoveries, including: (a) a pill for men being developed by the Department of Biochemistry, (b) the development of the
Nyayo-Pioneer cars that has already been commissioned, and (c) the development of industrial plastics by the Department of Chemistry (Varsity discovers . . ., 1990).

Despite this impressive and encouraging progress, Kenya has suffered from the same financial and political constraints which have hindered other developing countries. Numerous articles portraying this sad state of affair have been published in both national and international newspapers and magazines (Anderson, 1990; Crisis time: Higher . . ., 1991; Kenya: The surprising holdout, 1990; Lion's den . . ., 1990; Painful adjustments . . ., 1991; Riotous students . . ., 1991; Student shot on 'boom' . . ., 1991; Sturken, 1990; Varsity discovers . . ., 1990).

A related problem has been that Kenya's educational achievements have required considerable reliance on outside aid. Because of the political situation in Kenya, some of these donor countries have been withholding their aid (Donors condemn . . ., 1990; Donors countdown . . ., 1992). As a result, universities have been forced to operate on very tight budgets at a time when they were being required to provide new and extended services to a variety of students. Without the funds, universities could not build adequate facilities to keep up with the high student enrollment.
To meet these challenges, the office of the dean of students has been charged with the responsibility of promoting and facilitating the students' educational experience, particularly in nonacademic matters. Due to these conditions in Kenya, students have needed the deans' support more than ever. The dean of students' office has the duty of arranging orientation for all first-year students. Counseling has been conducted by the dean of students, or by a specific office of Guidance and Counseling (Hughes, 1990). Even if student welfare services in Kenyan universities have been much more decentralized than those at most institutions in United States (Hughes, 1990), the dean of students has been charged with the responsibility of coordinating all student personnel services (University of Nairobi calendar 1990-91).

The deans' of students office in the Kenyan Public Universities have coordinated all university activities that affect health, catering, residence, sports, and student welfare—including guidance and counseling, academic advising and career assistance. This office has handled all matters related to student conduct, university student organizations, and the wardenship department. The deans' of students office liaises with the general public on matters affecting individuals or groups of students and acts as the link between the university administration and
students (Moi University general information for students, 1990/1991). Bailey (1968), has asserted that the dean has had to accomplish his task through the cooperation and support of the academic department and according to the educational objectives of the institution.

According to Owako (1991), each public university in Kenya has been headed by the chancellor, who has also been the president of the Republic of Kenya. The management of the universities has been vested in the governing councils consisting of laymen appointed by the government and academic staff appointed by the university senate—the ultimate authority on all academic matters of the university (University education in Kenya, 1981). Owako (1991) has pointed out that the president of the republic in consultation with the governing council, has appointed vice-chancellors who oversee the day-to-day management of the universities. The deputy vice-chancellors, registrars, chief academic, and other administrative officers have helped the vice-chancellor in his day-to-day running of the university.

Nonacademic matters have been the specific responsibility of the office of the dean of students (Moi University calendar 1989-90). Brubacher & Rudy (1976) has contended that the student affairs office was originally created to free academic scholars from management
functions and to take burdens such as discipline off the shoulders of the president.

Hughes (1990) has asserted that student services in Kenyan higher education have reflected a blend of available resources, university priorities, educational traditions, and innovation in response to local conditions. When comparing Kenyan university structure with the typical United States higher education organization chart, Hughes (1990) has noted that student welfare services in Kenya were far more decentralized, with many responsibilities remaining at the level of the academic department or the individual faculty member. Faculty retain primary responsibility for responding to students with tutoring needs and advising on academics and careers. Faculty have served as student club patrons (advisors) and as wardens in the residence halls. Wardens have lived in or near the hall for which they were responsible and have been charged with facilitating the living-learning environment, assisting in the resolution of conflict, and serving as advocates for students with problems.

Each university has had a student organization which, apart from acting as a link between the student body and the university administration, has also assisted in some aspects of the students' welfare through the offices of the dean of students (Owako, 1991). The organization
draws up programs for entertainment, cultural, and social activities. A variety of activities are provided to cater to diverse interests. They range from academically oriented to nonacademic activities, organized in the form of clubs and societies. Students are encouraged to enroll because such activities contribute to their development in leadership as well as to their personal individual growth.

According to Hughes (1990), these organizations have been the vortex of student activism across campuses in Kenya. McKown (1975) has noted that University of Nairobi students have been aware that what happened in government and politics was going to affect their lives. They have been reasonably well informed about national as well as international political figures and about important national political events. To support McKown's contention, the chairman of Maseno University College Students Organization (MUCSO), has recently criticized the declaration of the national universities' vice-chancellors that the new financing policy on university education system in Kenya—which was scheduled to take effect during the 1991 to 1992 academic year—was incontestable. The students' chairman (leader) has termed the decision, as it has been abruptly implemented, to be unfair as well as unfortunate.

In addition, the student chairman of MUSCO has stated that the declaration that the students should either
accept the new fees policy or face expulsion was meant to threaten the students, and that it might have assumed a political dimension if allowed to work (New loan scheme . . ., 1991). Meanwhile, the chairman of the students’ association at the Kenyatta Campus has charged that the decision was unacceptable and dictatorial because it had not been discussed with the students (Other groups plan . . ., 1991). Student leadership in the Kenyan universities has been difficult. Some student leaders have been expelled, while others have been jailed for championing the students’ cause (Student leaders . . ., 1992).

Much of the work of the student welfare service's professional staff in Kenyan universities has been that of ombudspersons. They have done lots of negotiating; they have been the link; they have been the clearing house. The staff has had to relate well to both students and faculty (Hughes, 1990). To accomplish this, two student committees have worked closely with the dean of students office: (a) the welfare committee, and (b) the disciplinary committee (Moi University calendar 1989-90). The Student Welfare Committee has been a university senate committee whose terms of reference have included:

1. To deal with such matters as the senate may refer to the committee from time to time;
2. To deal with such aspects of student welfare as the committee may deem appropriate.
3. To deal with matters referred to the committee on aspects such as catering services in the university;
4. To deal with matters relating to the health of students and medical services that may be referred to the committee;
5. To deal with matters relating to recreation and development of games and sporting facilities;
6. To advise on matters pertaining to student organizations;
7. To advise on matters relating to student careers;
8. To serve as the governing body for sports, recreation, and entertainment;
9. To advise on the proper principles of university policy on sports, recreation, and entertainment;
10. To prepare and supervise the expenditure of sports, recreation, and entertainment. (Kenyatta University calendar 1989-90, p. 438)

The membership of the Students' Disciplinary Committee has included the deputy vice chancellor as chairman, the dean of students, two student representatives, two university senate representatives, the dean of faculty of the effected student, the relevant warden, and the university secretary. Terms of reference for this committee have included:

1. To receive and consider matters of disciplinary nature affecting students on behalf of senate, and to report to the senate on the appropriate action taken, provided that the disciplined student may appeal to the vice-chancellor;
2. To investigate issues surrounding misconduct by students which may have adverse effect on students and to recommend to the senate appropriate corrective measures; and
3. To recommend to the senate serious disciplinary cases that may require suspension or expulsion. (Kenyatta University calendar 1988-89, p. 437).

The office of the dean of students in Kenya has worked closely with the University Students Accommodation Board (USAB). USAB has administered accommodation and catering
services to the students in the public universities. This board was established by the Kenya government in 1983. Its main objective has been to separate the management and financing of student accommodations and of feeding and welfare services from the management and financing of university teaching and research, thereby improving the quality of university education training and research (Education in Kenya, 1987).

Kenyan education has been undergoing significant reforms since the nation's independence in 1963. Note that before independence, Kenyan education was modeled on the British system. Precepts and practices were introduced without regard for, or adaptation to, Kenyan circumstances (Cameron, 1970). The Kenya Education Commission, the National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies, the Presidential Working Party on a Second University in Kenya, and the Presidential Working party on Education and Manpower Training have made significant contributions to these reforms.

The Kenya Education Commission Report of 1964 attempted to bring an African character to the educational system of Kenya. The terms of reference asked the commission to survey the existing educational resources and to advise the government of Kenya in the formulation and implementation of national policies for education.
giving regard to the special needs of Kenya and its position as an African nation.

The National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (Educational objectives and policies, 1976) was asked to redefine Kenya's educational objectives and to recommend policies to achieve these objectives, with the financial constraint that public recurrent expenditure on education should not grow at a faster rate than the government's recurrent budget, giving consideration to the need to relate education to employment opportunities and to the requirements of rural development.

The Presidential Working Party on a Second University in Kenya (Second university in Kenya, 1981) was required to make general recommendations on the implementation of government decisions on the establishment of a second university. The party was guided in its work by these terms of reference:

1. Review generally the present higher education system in relation to development objectives of the country and recommend how the proposed university could best assist in their achievement.

2. Recommend a philosophical framework, concept, and objectives within which the university could best serve the interest of the Kenyan society.

3. Recommend on the size of the proposed university--including student enrollment, structure, and disciplinary coverage.
The 1988 report, "Education and manpower training for the next decade and beyond," has noted that there was a need to emphasize and focus on policies which would enhance development of education and manpower training to prepare the nation for the challenges of the 21st century. The working party's terms of reference have included:

1. To review generally the whole educational philosophy, policies, and objectives to ensure that they were in consonance with changing social, cultural, economic, and political demands of the country.

2. To recommend ways and means of sustaining the momentum of educational growth without sacrificing quality or relevance.

3. To recommend ways and means of improving quality of education in all public, harambee, and private institutions. These should include strategies for more efficient use of existing human, physical, and fiscal resources; the production and distribution of basic learning and teaching resources; and the proper administration, management, and supervision in all educational and training institutions.

Historical Justification for the Study

From the review of literature it may be seen that historically such a study as was proposed had ample
justification. In the past, Kenyan university students have benefited from tuition free education and have received handsome allowances— at least until 1991-92 academic year when the strategy of cost sharing was implemented. Under this strategy, students will be expected to pay their own living expenses (Mwiria 1991; Loan schemes . . ., 1991; Varsities to get 1.7 billion loan, 1992). Students unable to pay to live on campus will have to attend the university as day scholars, seek aid from authorities in their home areas, or secure a commercial bank loan (Mwiria 1991).

With the full implementation of the 8-4-4 from the 7-4-2-3 education system in 1990, new university students will be a year younger and will have a year's less preparation. Now more than ever before, these young adults will need a temporary parent in the person of the dean of student affairs. Thus, the pressing need to study the office of the dean of students which will determine matters concerning student life in Kenyan universities seemed to be undeniable.

The challenges and problems facing the Kenyan universities in the 1990s have been enormous, for example:

1. The government required universities to be run in a businesseslike manner by using their facilities to generate income (Difficult year for all, 1992)
2. A multi-party democracy which was completely new in the history of the nation was established (Challenges facing Africa, 1992).

3. The critically important tutorial system collapsed (Charter for the second . . ., 1992).

In addition, economic recession has been coupled with unprecedented political unrest (Censorship and human rights, 1990). These unprecedented changes both in Kenya and abroad have had a direct impact on the management of the university in general and on the delivery of student personnel services in particular. The dean of students and student affairs staff will have to respond imaginatively to the changes that have been and will be taking place in both society and the university. This will be where the dean's leadership effectiveness will play an important role. The operation of student personnel services will depend to a large extent on how well the dean treats, leads, and influences the student and student affairs staff members.

Terrell (1989) has urged student affairs professionals to be aware of opportunities to promote leadership training and experience for themselves, their staff, and students. Further, he has suggested that student affairs professionals must demonstrate leadership that will inspire, motivate, and organize the entire higher
education community toward achieving the common objective of providing the highest quality of education for the greatest number of potential leaders.

Johnson (1989) has asserted that chief student affairs officers on many campuses have seemed reluctant to provide leadership beyond the confines of their own divisions. Many have perceived their role as supportive of the direction of the president and academic deans but not as equal partners on the decision-making team. Renick, Melvin, Terrell, and Jones (1989) have contended that students and staff often look to student personnel administrators for guidance, supervision, insight, vision, and practical solutions to complex problems. These multiple demands have required leadership with political savvy, budgetary awareness, solid interpersonal skills, and self-knowledge. In order to respond to such challenges, the leadership skills of the personnel administrators must be developing continually.

As McDade (1989) has noted, student affairs professionals have often been cast in a reactive role, responding to student and institutional crises and answering requests for services. Now there will be a unique opportunity to take a proactive leadership role, offering innovative programming that will improve not only campus life but also the overall educational process.
Oshagbemi (1988) has pointed out that leadership affects motivation and job satisfaction, productivity, and an organization's success. Wattenbarger (1969) has asserted that the dean of student personnel services has the responsibility of helping students, faculty, and student personnel services staff members to succeed.

Shaffer (1967) has been in agreement with Wattenbarger, emphasizing that the major responsibility of staff leaders is leading, stimulating, and facilitating the personal and professional growth of their colleagues. Further, Shaffer (1967) has noted that people who have stopped growing cannot help other people grow. Therefore, individual staff members have the personal obligation of continuous professional growth.

Leadership effectiveness has been an important aspect of the dean of students. Currently, a wave of democratic awareness has been sweeping across Kenya, and the masses—especially the university students—have been demanding changes in their daily lives (Predictions, 1992). Under these circumstances, the dean of students has had to provide an enormous amount of leadership and do so with candor. He has had to be willing to look at the issues as they would affect the students and the student personnel staff and to be responsive but with no sense of protecting the status quo. Therefore, the study of the leadership behavior of the dean of students in Kenyan universities
has become desirable because the results could help the deans to manage student affairs more effectively.

Johnson (1989) has offered another reason why student affairs leadership has become essential on an expanded campus. Anxieties about money and status are a source of stress for today's freshmen. The student affairs office has not had a corner on solutions for these and other problems brought to campus by today's students; however, the skill, beliefs, and knowledge of the professional deans could assist in exploring other options. Residence hall and orientation programs, leadership training, volunteer opportunities, career planning offices, and other programs and services—in partnership with the faculty in the classroom—could assist students in becoming active and mature participants in their education. Students could be challenged outside the classroom to examine their belief and to broaden their view of life's roles and life's values.

Related research and literature into leadership theories, leadership, and leader behavior have been topics of major concern and investigation in a number of fields. Major historical approaches to the analysis of leadership have included great man, traitist, situational, and behavioral. Data presented in the literature review seemed to support the conclusion that (a) several clusters of traits have been identified that clearly differentiate
leaders from followers, and (b) a pattern of traits that is acceptable in one situation will not necessarily be acceptable in others. Several definitions of leadership have been cited. However, no one specific definition was suggested that all researchers and theorists would accept.

Numerous behaviors have been investigated using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), and two patterns or dimensions always seem to emerge: consideration and initiating structure. These two dimensions were first developed by Ohio State University. The consideration dimension emphasizes a deep concern for group members' needs and encourages a two-way communication, whereas initiating structure emphasizes the achievement of organizational goals.

Education should seek to develop well-rounded, well-informed, productive citizens. Universities should place great emphasis upon each individual student's all-round development. In Kenya, as elsewhere in the world, the deans of students occupy vital leadership positions. Some of the deans' critical leadership functions might include planning, managing, mediating, educating, and coordinating the activities of the students--specifically those pertaining to nonacademic matters. Because deans of students perform diverse or conflicting roles, they must possess special qualifications and competencies so as to be able to handle the multitude of demands that the
position calls for. The expectations and conceptions that Kenyan students held regarding the leadership role of the deans of students have been explored. Findings have been statistically analyzed; conclusions and recommendations based on those findings have been formulated and will be presented.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study covered the four public universities in the Republic of Kenya, and their constituent colleges, investigating the perceptions and expectations held by deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders regarding the real and ideal leadership behaviors of the deans of students. This study was expected to provide information to the deans of students that might help them be more responsive to the changing needs of students and student affairs staff.

In addition, it was hoped that this study would arouse an awareness that student personnel services has become a profession which deserves an equal partnership with its academic counterparts. This would mean that for it to operate efficiently, there would need to be sufficient budgetary support as well as adequate staffing.

In short, the result of this study could provide information to assist Kenyan public universities to enhance their student service programs. This study could also contribute to the leadership field research on student personnel service in Kenyan public universities--
an area in which existing knowledge has been sparse, inadequate, or in need of updating.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study has covered all four public universities in Kenya as well as their constituent colleges.
2. The deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders were asked to respond.

Limitations of the Study

1. A major limiting factor to the statistical significance of this study was that there were only four public universities and their constituent colleges; therefore, the size of the sample might have resulted in skewed statistics.
2. The possible biases of the deans of students, the student affairs staff, and student leaders might be another limiting factor.
3. Because this study did not take into consideration differences in age, sex, length of service, and academic degrees or demand of students, these might also be limiting factors.
4. Potential nonresponse by those requested to be respondents might further limit the study.

However, the potential benefits far outweigh any limiting factors, therefore, this study was important as well as informative.
The Survey Instrument

The researcher chose the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as the most appropriate instrument for this study because it incorporated two significant dimensions of leader behavior: consideration and initiating structure. This instrument was originally devised by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University (Halpin, 1966). The LBDQ was developed to measure the behavior of leaders as perceived by members of their work-groups. The LBDQ asked respondents to describe how the leader acted (real) and how they think that person should act (ideal). The leader was also asked to describe his/her own behavior.

A high score on initiating structure characterizes individuals who play active roles in directing group activities through planning, scheduling, communicating information, and implementing innovative ideas. Consideration, on the other hand, reflects the extent to which job relationships are characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and sensitivity to subordinates' feelings. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport as well as two-way communication. A low score indicates the behavior of a supervisor who is more impersonal in relationships with group members.

The LBDQ consists of 40 items that are descriptive statements of the leader's behavior in a given situation.
Only 30 items are actually scored. The consideration and initiating structure scales or keys are each comprised of 15 items. Each item is scored on a scale of 4 = always, 3 = often, 2 = occasionally, 1 = seldom, and 0 = never. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 0 - 60.

Halpin (1955) wrote that for LBDQ--Real, the estimated reliability of split-half method is:

• 83 for the initiating structure scores, and
• 92 for consideration scores.

For the LBDQ--Ideal, the corresponding estimated reliability is:

• 69 and
• 66.

The LBDQ has undergone many revisions and has been used for research purposes in industry, the armed services, and education (Bass, 1990; Carson & Schultz, 1964; Fleishman, 1953; Hemphill, 1955; Knight & Holen, 1985; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1976; Skipper, 1977; Stogdill, 1969, 1974).

However, because leadership is a dynamic quality, precise measurements will always be open to modification.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of one dean and one deputy dean of students, 12 student affairs staff members, and 25 student leaders in each of the 4 public universities. In addition, one dean of students, 5
student affairs staff members, and 10 student leaders from 3 constituent colleges of the main campuses were included, making a population of 11 deans of students, 63 student affairs staff, and 130 student leaders. The student affairs staff members were limited to those individuals working with the office of the dean of students: student counselors, games tutors, games officers, and wardens. The student leaders were limited to those students who were the chairpersons of various student unions and clubs. The sample for this study was drawn from the population of all deans and deputy deans of students, and a random sample of student affairs staff members and student leaders from a list provided by the four Kenyan public universities and their constituent colleges.

Procedure for Collection of Data

1. A letter requesting permission to conduct this study was sent to the Director of Personnel Management, Office of the President, in the Republic of Kenya.

2. A letter acknowledging this permission and asking for cooperation with this study was sent to each dean of students at the four public universities in the Republic of Kenya.

3. A letter explaining the purpose of the study and a copy of the questionnaire was sent to each dean of students and mailed to each student affairs staff member.
and student leader determined by random sampling from a list of names provided by each university. The letter assured the respondents' anonymity.

4. All respondents were asked to return the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope supplied by the researcher.

5. Follow-up letters were mailed to the respondents if the anticipated 75% return rate was not achieved.

6. In order to gain some insightful information concerning the office of the dean of students, the researcher arranged interviews with eight deans of students. (See Appendix H.)

Data Analysis

Data from the instruments were tabulated and analyzed by computer. A series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses. The level of significance was set at .05. If there were significant differences in the ANOVA, Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) was used for further comparisons to show which groups among deans, student affairs staff, and student leaders were significantly different. The level of that significance was set at .01.

Additional Research

The researcher traveled to Kenya. While there, he did additional relevant research into the literature, which
has been deemed appropriate to incorporate into the study. In addition to research into published documents, formal interviews were conducted with selected deans of the four universities and their colleges, and informal discussions were held with student leaders on the various campuses. Where appropriate, the results of these interviews and discussions has been incorporated into the study.

Summary

Specific educational and leadership theories have been explored to form the underlying basis for this study. Education should seek to develop well-rounded, well-informed, productive citizens. Universities should place great emphasis upon each individual student's all-round development. In Kenya, as elsewhere in the world, the deans of students occupy vital leadership positions. Some of the dean's critical leadership functions might include: planning, decision making, and the coordination of the activities of the students, specifically those pertaining to nonacademic matters. The expectations and conceptions that Kenyan students held regarding the leadership role of the dean of students were explored. Conclusions were developed based on the findings, and recommendations have been formulated. These findings, conclusions, and recommendations have
become the heart of this study and will be reported subsequently.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Findings of this study describe the leadership behavior, real and ideal, of the deans of students in the Kenyan public universities. Two instruments were administered to obtain data: (a) the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), and (b) the demographic questionnaire designed by the author under the tutelage of professors at the University of North Texas in Denton. These instruments were administered to a random sampling including 11 deans of students, 65 student affairs staff members, and 130 student leaders. One hundred ninety-five questionnaires were returned, including: ten deans of students (90.9%), 55 student affairs staff members (87.3%), and 130 student leaders (100%). The study was designed to describe the leadership behavior, real and ideal, of the deans of students as perceived by the three respondent groups. Descriptive statistics are used to present the respondents' demographic data. The statistical analysis of data is organized according to the twelve hypotheses formulated for this study. A significance level of .05 was established for the research.
Gender and Age Distribution

Gender and age distribution of the three groups—deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders—are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Gender and Age Distribution of Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Deans of Students</th>
<th>Student Affairs Staff Members</th>
<th>Student Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 10$</td>
<td>$n = 55$</td>
<td>$n = 130$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**
- Male: $6 \, 60.0\%$; $27 \, 49.1\%$; $97 \, 74.6\%$
- Female: $4 \, 40.0\%$; $28 \, 50.9\%$; $33 \, 25.4\%$

**Age**
- 20-24: $0 \, 0\%$; $0 \, 0\%$; $121 \, 93.0\%$
- 25-35: $1 \, 10.0\%$; $18 \, 32.7\%$; $9 \, 7.0\%$
- 36-40: $3 \, 30.0\%$; $21 \, 28.2\%$; $0 \, 0\%$
- 41-50: $3 \, 30.0\%$; $12 \, 21.8\%$; $0 \, 0\%$
- 51-60: $3 \, 30.0\%$; $4 \, 7.3\%$; $0 \, 0\%$

$N = 195$
The data show the number and percentages of gender distribution of the three respondent groups. Sixty percent of the deans were male, while 40% were female. The percentage of female respondents in the student affairs members group (50.9%) was slightly higher than that of their male counterparts (49.1%). The student sample consisted of three-fourths male (74.6%) and one-fourth female (25.4%). Also presented in Table 1 are data concerning the age distribution of the three respondent groups: 10% of the deans of students were between 25 and 35 years of age, 30% were 36 to 40, 30% were between 41 and 50, and 30% were in the 51-60 age group. The majority (70.9%) of the responding student affairs staff members were in the 25-40 age group, and 29.1% were in the 41-60 age group. As also revealed in Table 1, 93% of the student leaders were between 20 and 24 years of age, and 7% were in the 25-35 age group. Therefore, in terms of age, the majority of the students were traditional students.

Number of years in present position for both deans of students and student affairs staff members, as well as number of years as club leaders for student leaders is presented in Table 2.

Examination of Table 2 reveals that 20% of the deans of students had held their present position for a period of 1 to 2 years, 30% for 2 to 3 years, 10% for 3 to 4
### Table 2

**Number of Years in Present Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Position</th>
<th>Deans of Students n = 10</th>
<th>Student Affairs Staff Members n = 55</th>
<th>Student Leaders n = 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Years as Club Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 195

years, and 40% for 4 to 6 years. Table 2 further reveals that of the 55 student affairs staff members who responded, 30.9% had been in their positions for a period of 1 to 2 years, 36.4% for 2-3 years, 14.5% for 3-4 years, and 18.2% for 4 to 6 years.

Number of years as club leaders for student leaders is also presented in Table 2. Slightly more than half
(52.3%) of the student leaders were in their first year as club leaders, while 45.4% were in their second year. Only a small percentage (2.3%) were in their third year as club leaders.

Educational Preparation

One of the most crucial elements in the educative process is the competency of the personnel charged with the responsibility of effecting desirable changes in students. The educational preparation of the deans of students and student affairs staff members in Kenyan institutions is presented in Table 3.

Regarding their highest degrees earned, half of the deans of students hold master's degrees while the other half hold only bachelor's degrees. As concerns student affairs staff members, 40% had only a bachelor's degree, while those with a master's degree comprise 36.4%, and those with doctoral degrees comprise 9.1% of the sample.

Also in reference to Table 3, 70% of the deans of students who responded to the questionnaire indicate that they graduated from public institutions, while 30% indicate they graduated from private institutions. More than three-fourths (78.2%) of the student affairs staff members graduated from public institutions while less than one fourth (21.8%) indicate they graduated from private institutions.
Table 3

Educational Preparation of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational preparation</th>
<th>Deans of Students n = 10</th>
<th>Student Affairs Staff Members n = 55</th>
<th>Student Leaders n = 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 195
Data concerning the student leaders' major fields of study are also presented in Table 3. Examination of the table reveals that 69.2% of the student leaders who responded were enrolled in liberal arts, 14.6% in business, 6.9% in science, while 5.4 indicated they were pursuing other fields of study.

In summary, demographic data have revealed some interesting information. For example, female students are under represented (only 25%) in university education, while the female population is slightly above 50%. The majority of the university students are of traditional college age (18-24 yrs.). As stated at the outset, these students come to the university from varying ethnic backgrounds with complex social behavior problems such as alcohol and drugs. There was also an alarming number of pregnancies. Perhaps the development of a contraceptive for males in the university laboratories mentioned in Chapter 2 was an attempt to solve this problem. It is the duty of the deans of students to develop innovative ways to help these students with their pressing personal problems.

Responses to Dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure

In this study, both the real and ideal forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) were
scored on two dimensions of leadership behavior: (a) consideration, and (b) initiating structure. The consideration dimension generally includes behavior indicative of mutual trust, respect, warmth, and rapport in relationships between deans of students and their respondent groups. This dimension emphasizes a deeper concern for group members' needs and includes such behavior as allowing other respondents more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication. Initiating structure, on the other hand, includes behavior in which the deans of students organize and define group activities as well as determine the deans' relationship to the other respondent groups. Here the dean defines the role he or she expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, and establishes ways of getting things done. In short, this dimension emphasizes the achievement of organizational goals.

In Table 4 is presented a summary of the means and standard deviation scores for the perceptions (real) and expectations (ideal) of each respondent group regarding the deans' of students' leadership behavior on both consideration and initiating structure.

Table 4 shows the two dimensions of the leader behavior of deans of students as perceived by the deans themselves, by student affairs staff members, and by student leaders. The dean's ideal mean score provides
Table 4
Real and Ideal Dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behavior</th>
<th>Deans of Students n = 10</th>
<th>Student Affairs Staff Members n = 55</th>
<th>Student Leaders n = 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>35.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>38.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>40.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>46.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 195

his/her ideology in respect to the two dimensions of leader behavior. The deans' real and ideal behavior has also been described by student affairs staff members and by student leaders. Examination of Table 4 reveals that the deans of students described themselves as very high on both consideration and initiating structure. Overall, the mean expectations of all the three respondent groups are greater than the mean perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students. This would indicate
that the behavior of the deans of students does not conform to expectations—their own and that of their subordinates—thus, leaving room for improvement.

Analysis of Hypotheses

Research Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3

Research Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be a difference in the mean ratings of deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. Hypothesis 2 predicted that there would be a difference in the mean ratings of deans of students and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimensions of consideration. Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be a difference in the mean ratings of student affairs staff members and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. To test these hypotheses, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) at the .05 level of significance was used to statistically test whether the three mean ratings (deans, student affairs staff, and student leaders) were significantly different from each other. Whenever the ANOVA revealed a significant $f$ value, Fisher's least
significant difference (LSD) at the .01 level was computed to pinpoint which groups were significantly different. The ANOVA summary of Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5,429.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,714.79</td>
<td>96.32</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5,411.16</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,840.74</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Deans: n = 10, staff members: n = 55, student leaders: n = 130, p < .05
N = 195

Table 5 shows data on the perceptions of the leader behavior of deans of students in the real dimension of consideration, revealing significant differences among the three groups. When the ANOVA detected significant differences, the least significant difference (LSD) test—a multiple comparison procedure—was utilized to make all pairwise comparisons among the respective mean ratings of the deans of students, student affairs staff members and student leaders in the Kenyan institutions under study.
Differences in means of the deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders on the real (perceived) consideration dimension are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

**Least Significant Difference Tests for Real (Perceived) Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student leaders</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Affairs Staff</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .01 level.

N = 195.

The LSD in Table 6 indicates that each group differs from both the other two in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. This shows that there is a statistically significant difference among the perceptions of deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of
students on the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 stating that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of deans of students and student affairs staff regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students on the consideration dimension is retained. Hypothesis 2 stating that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of deans of students and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students on consideration is retained. Hypothesis 3 stating that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of student affairs staff and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students on consideration is retained. The perceptions of the deans of students can be assumed to be different from both those of student affairs staff members and student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real (perceived) consideration dimension.

The perceptions of the student leaders are equally assumed to be different from those of the student affairs staff members as regards the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real (perceived) consideration dimension.

**Research Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6**

Research Hypothesis 4 predicts that there will be a difference in the mean ratings of deans of students, and
of student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. Hypothesis 5 predicts that there will be a difference in the mean ratings of deans of students and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. Hypothesis 6 predicts that there will be a difference in the mean ratings of student affairs staff members and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration.

Differences in the mean ratings of the deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders on the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7
ANOVA Comparing Ideal (Expected) Dimension of Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2,701.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,350.61</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>3,610.43</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,311.67</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Deans: n = 10, staff members: n = 55, student leaders: n = 130, p < .05
N = 195
The data on Table 7 indicate that there is a significant $f$ value. This is an indication that there are significant differences in the respective mean ratings of the three groups as regards the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. Further tests using the least significant different (LSD) were calculated to determine which of the groups' means differed significantly. Differences in the respective ratings of deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration are shown in Table 8.

Table 8
Least Significant Difference Tests for Ideal (Expected) Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student leaders</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student affairs staff</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .01 level.

$N = 195$. 
As revealed in Table 8, there are significant differences in the mean ratings, at the <.01 confidence level, between the deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. There is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans of students and those of student affairs staff members as well as those of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of deans of students and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. Therefore, on the basis of these findings, both Hypotheses 4 and 5 are retained.

Moreover, Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. Because no significant difference was found, Hypothesis 6 was rejected. The LSD
did not reveal any significant differences between the means of these two groups. This implies that the expectations of the student affairs staff members are the same as those of the student leaders as regards the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration.

**Research Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9**

Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 predicted that there would be differences among the respective mean ratings of deans of students, student leaders, and student affairs staff members regarding leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. Results of the ANOVA comparing the three groups on the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure are shown in Table 9.

Significant \( f \) value was found, as indicated on Table 9, implying significant differences among the respective mean ratings of the three groups. In order to determine which respective mean ratings differed at \( \leq .01 \) level of confidence, the LSD test was calculated and the results are shown in Table 10.

Examination of Table 10 reveals that significant differences in the respective mean ratings at the \( \leq .01 \) confidence level were found between Group 1 and Groups 2 and 3—in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating
Table 9

ANOVA Comparing Real (Expected) Dimension of Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4,131.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,065.65</td>
<td>52.84</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7,505.29</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,636.59</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Deans: n = 10, staff members: n = 55, student leaders: n = 130, p < .05
N = 195

Table 10

Least Significant Difference Tests for Real (Perceived) Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student leaders</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student affairs staff</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .01 level.
N = 195.
structure. A significant difference among the perceptions of deans of students, student leaders, and student affairs staff members on real (perceived) initiating structure exist. Table 10 also illustrates that there is a statistically significant difference between the respective mean ratings of student leaders and student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students on the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure.

Therefore, Hypothesis 7 stating that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of deans of student and student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure is retained. Hypothesis 8 stating that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of deans of students and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure is retained. Hypothesis 9 stating that there would be a difference between the mean ratings of student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of student in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure is also retained.

The perceptions of the deans of students can be assumed to be different from those of student affairs staff members and student leaders as related to the
leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) initiating structure dimension. The results of this study also indicate that the perceptions between the student affairs staff and student leaders as regards the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) initiating structure dimension are significantly different. This simply means that the way the two groups perceive or view the leadership behavior of the deans, perhaps due to differences in experiential background, is completely different.

Research Hypotheses 10, 11, and 12

Research Hypothesis 10 predicted that there would be a difference in the mean ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. Hypothesis 11 predicted that there would be a difference in the mean ratings of deans of students and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. Hypothesis 12 predicted that there would be a difference in the mean ratings of student affairs staff members and student leaders in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure.
To test these hypotheses (9, 11, and 12), a series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to detect the differences on respective mean ratings on the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure among the three groups: deans of students, student leaders, and student affairs staff members. Results of the ANOVA comparing these three groups are shown in Table 11.

Table 11
ANOVA Comparing Three Groups on Ideal (Expected) Dimension of Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>763.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>381.77</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5,349.45</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,112.99</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Deans: n = 10, staff members: n = 55, student leaders: n = 130, p < .05

N = 195

The f ratio on Table 10 is significant. This is an indication that there are significant differences among the respective mean ratings of the three groups. The LSD found that significant difference in the respective
ratings at .01 confidence level exist between deans of students and student leaders and student affairs members. However, no statistically significant difference was found between the respective mean ratings of student leaders and those of student affairs staff members. These findings are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Least Significant Difference Tests in Ideal (Expected) Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student leaders</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student affairs staff</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .01 level.

N = 195.

Examination of Table 11 reveals that there is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans of students, student leaders, and
student affairs staff members in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of student leaders and those of student affairs members in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. Therefore, Hypotheses 10 and 11 will be retained. The expectations of the deans of students are different from those of either the student leaders or the student affairs staff members as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure.

As was indicated on Table 11, student affairs staff members and student leaders showed no statistically significant difference. Therefore, because there was not enough evidence to retain it, Hypothesis 12 was rejected. It could be assumed that the perceptions of student affairs staff members are the same as those of student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure.

In addition to the statistical analysis of the hypotheses for this study, a series of one-way analysis of variance were performed on some demographic variables of the deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders. The aim was to find out what influence, if any, these variables had on the perceptions and
expectations of the leadership behavior of the deans of students among these groups. These variables were tested and are reported in Table 13: (a) student age, (b) faculty education, (c) years as club leaders, (d) faculty age, (e) student field of study, (f) faculty position, (g) student classification, (h) gender, and (j) type of institution graduated from.

Summaries of the ANOVA for the demographic variables of deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders on the real (perceived) dimension of consideration are presented on Table 13.

The results shown in Table 13 indicate that there is no significant difference at the $\leq .05$ confidence level in the perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the three groups in regard to demographic variables. What this means is that these demographic variables did not influence any of the groups' perceptions about the leadership behavior of deans of students on the real (perceived) dimension of consideration.

Similar series of ANOVA were performed on the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration, real (perceived) initiating structure and ideal (expected) initiating structure dimensions. No significant differences were found. Again, these demographic variables did not influence the three groups' perceptions of the deans of
Table 13
Summaries of ANOVA for Demographic Variables on Real (Perceived) Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Between</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,597.34</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Between</td>
<td>391.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97.90</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3,694.76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Between</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,852.52</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Between</td>
<td>245.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3,841.29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Between</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,839.18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Between</td>
<td>143.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3,943.14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Between</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,870.21</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Between</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>10,756.74</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>55.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Between</td>
<td>138.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138.66</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3,947.73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

student age, faculty education, years as club leaders, faculty age, student field of study, faculty position, student classification, gender, and type of institution graduated from.

students in the leadership dimensions of consideration and initiating structure.

The deans of students were described on both consideration and initiating structure of the Leadership
Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). A high score on initiating structure characterizes deans who play active roles in directing group activities through planning, scheduling, and communicating information. Consideration reflects the extent to which job relationships are characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and sensitivity to subordinates' ideas.

Each dimension has fifteen leader behavior items on the LBDQ (see Appendix C for copy). Mean item scores for both consideration and initiating structure dimensions are presented in Tables 14 and 15. The discrepancies between real and ideal are expressed in mean differences.

Examination of Table 14 reveals that 11 out of 15 behavior statements were described by respondents as lower in actual consideration than expected to be. These discrepancies should be interpreted as the respondents' dissatisfaction with the leadership behavior of the deans of students in regard to these specific behavior statements. Close scrutiny of Table 14 reveals, for example, that the respondents felt the dean of students is actually doing more personal favors for group members than he is supposed to do. The respondents also perceived that the deans of students kept to themselves more often than expected. Much dissatisfaction is expressed for the disregard the deans of students showed for not seeking approval on important matters, for not being friendly, and
Table 14

Mean Scores on Consideration Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>(Difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aReverse scoring.

Note: See Appendix C for text of survey items.

N = 195.
Table 15

Mean Scores on Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>(Difference) Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>-.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix C for text of survey items.

N = 195.
for failing to make group members feel at ease when talking with them.

The item mean scores on initiating structure shown on Table 14 also indicate significant mean differences. Here, the dean of students is perceived as one who never wants to be questioned and rules with a heavy hand. The respondents feel that the dean of students did not maintain standards of performance as expected, and that the deans' part in organization is not understood by all members as expected.

In sum, the respondents' concern about the shortcomings of some aspects of the leadership behavior of deans of students seems genuine. However, it must also be remembered that the position of dean of students is a leadership position. Most of the time the leadership role makes heavy demands upon an individual dean, who under the current conditions in the universities and colleges in Kenya may easily become incapable of giving attention and consideration to every problem of each individual member of the burgeoning student body. That is the nature and the reality of the position of dean of students in a nation whose recently liberated population is hungry for education, advancement, and power.

Interviews with Deans of Students

As has already been mentioned, the office of the dean of students in the Kenyan public universities has not been
studied extensively. Thus, the literature concerning this office in Kenya is almost nonexistent. Because of this, the researcher supplemented the questionnaire research by arranging personal interviews with four deans and four assistant deans of students in order to gain first-hand information concerning this office from the deans themselves. In addition to interviewing the deans of students, the researcher also had the opportunity of making informal contacts with student leaders, student affairs staff members, and even some administrative personnel. Even if the information gathered from these interviews is not directly related to the original design of this study, it nevertheless provided valuable background about the leadership behavior of the deans of students that could not have been obtained in any other way.

The sessions with the deans of students were recorded on tape. Reconstruction of the feelings, tone, and verbal phrasing was made possible by the transcription of the tapes.

Difficulty was experienced in scheduling interviews with the student leaders and student affairs staff members because they were in the midst of assisting with the administration of final examinations at the time the researcher chose to conduct the interviews. These interviews with the deans ranged in length from forty
minutes to one hour. Five structured questions (see Appendix H) were asked, but this did not necessarily limit the scope of the interview because the deans were given the freedom to provide additional input not related to the questions.

Interview Questions and Replies

1. What is your opinion about the position of dean of students on the current campus? All of the deans of students view this position as both very important and very controversial on their particular campuses. The deans feel that their office is the central office on the campus because it coordinates various student services and acts as a bridge between students and the administration. However, they also feel that the position is controversial because whenever there are crises on campus, students tend to accuse the office of the dean of students of siding with the administration, while the faculty perceives the position of dean of students as that of being the disciplinarian. Therefore, whenever there is some crisis of student unrest on campus, the faculty has been known to blame the dean of students for being too lenient. Frequently, the administration defers to the office of the dean during these crisis times, thus, running away from their own responsibilities.

One dean described the position of dean of students as chaotic because of the seemingly endless problems which
come through the office to be solved. Another dean referred to the office as a clearing house because of the variety of information that must go through this office to other constituents of the university.

Finally, all of the deans commented that the position of dean of students in the modern Kenyan universities demands great leadership ability, especially during these times of a burgeoning enrollment and the attendant pressing problems.

2. How do you lead the faculty who participate in student affairs? The majority of the deans of students say that they always try to be sensitive and responsive to the faculty who participate in student affairs. Through weekly meetings, memorandums, and periodic reports about the students, faculty members are advised on the day-to-day problems students encounter. Student problems are numerous and varied, including problems concerning psychological matters, drug addition, alcoholism, student assault upon other students, theft, and students not attending lectures. Deans of students encourage faculty members (especially wardens) to take a keen interest in understanding the students' problems and to encourage students to have free discussions concerning the problems rather than suppressing or disguising their frustrations.

3. How do you lead the students? Most deans believe that they are there to improve the quality of student life
on their campuses. They find themselves in the midst of arguments or conflicts among students, or between students and the administration. Therefore, they must be good negotiators with extensive skills in management and guidance. They emphasize that new students are issued a handbook for students containing regulations governing student conduct and discipline while attending the university. Various organizations and clubs on campus are also described in the handbook. Deans encourage students to enroll in student organizations and clubs because activities offered through the clubs contribute to personal individual growth as well as to the development of the student's leadership abilities. A guidance and counseling service operating under the office of dean of students on most campuses offers students the opportunity to seek help in personal, social, and academic matters. The deans also offer guidance through student leadership in various organizations such as The Kenyatta University Student Association (KUSA), comparable to student government in the United States. The university council, the university senate, and the disciplinary committee—each with two student representatives—also provide leadership opportunities for students.

One of the deans referred to university students as "some of the brightest fellows in the country" and stated that "they will always notice a genuine sense of caring,
honesty, and patience" when displayed by the deans of students (personal interview with Mureithi of Moi University, 29 September, 1992). All deans note that recently there have been riots and walkouts that have led to the closure of most campuses. At times these riots have been devastating, resulting in damage to the property, student imprisonment, and even loss of student lives. The reasons offered by the deans for the rebellious nature of the students was that the central government through the administration in the universities introduced cost-sharing and pay-as-you-eat (PAYE) systems. For the first time in the history of the Kenyan university, students were required to pay part of their tuition and to pay for their own meals (food) in the university. Student leadership claim that this was abruptly implemented and that they were not even consulted.

To avoid further occurrences of this nature, the deans of students assert that they have to guard against student incitement by addressing student problems immediately—as they arise. One dean in particular notes that the administration must also be very responsive to genuine student agendas.

The deans of students assert that they relate well with their staff members and all of them work as a team for the benefit of students. (However, statistical results showing significant differences between
expectations and actualities regarding the deans' leadership behavior in both consideration and initiating structure call this statement into question.) Deans of students further assert that they are accessible and open to suggestions from their staff members. They also state that they try to encourage a two-way communication, as much as possible, with their staff members.

Two deans pointed out that one of the ways their offices lead the students is through peer counseling. They said that this is an informal counseling where one student (with a few days of in-service training in counseling) is used to counsel his/her peers. This seems to work because of the close contact between student peers.

4. How do you lead the student affairs staff members? Almost all deans answered that a series of informal meetings are held to discuss immediate issues or problems affecting students. An agreement on the mode of operation concerning these issues is sought. At times the dean has the opportunity of calling in individual members and assigning them tasks that he may deem necessary. A couple of deans also noted that once every month a warden's meeting is held to discuss matters affecting the students. Whatever is decided at these meetings is recorded in the minutes then passed on to the university administration for action or response depending on the issues raised. To keep staff members abreast of any new
developments in student affairs, one dean communicates with them through memorandums. The deans indicate that the frequent seminars and in-service training are provided to the staff members as a means of improving their abilities to serve the students better.

5. What kind of qualities should a dean of students have? Numerous qualities were cited. All deans express the idea that students use their office as a source of information. Therefore, they must be knowledgeable about issues in the university as well as the country at large. Some deans realize they are in a political system, and a good dean must know how to play his/her politics well. Foresight was frequently cited as a quality a dean of students should possess—a dean should be able to anticipate student reaction to issues or situations and be prepared to assist with solutions should problems arise. Personal integrity is another quality frequently cited—being a good role model to these young people. One dean illustrates this quality by saying: "You can't be a habitual drunkard" and expect students to heed your advice to refrain from drinking (personal interview with Michieka, Kenyatta University, 4 November, 1992). Students will neither trust nor respect you when you request them to perform a certain task in one way while you as their leader perform the same task in another way. A good dean must be democratic, with sensitivity in
solving students' problems. A dean of students should have some basic training in counseling as well as an understanding of law so as to be able to help students with their multitudinous problems. Deans of students should have the capacity for decision making. Deans of students should be committed to their work (profession) and have a good understanding of their university. Other qualities mentioned are: A dean of students should be objective, honest, logical, imaginative, self-confident, flexible, sincere, emotionally stable, and a good scholar with excellent management skills.

The researcher had the opportunity to informally talk with some student leaders. Overall, students feel that they are not being consulted by the administration (deans of students included) on matters that affect their lives directly. They gave an example of the banned student union (Nairobi University), rules governing residence (trying to regulate visiting hours almost caused chaos between students and administration on one campus because students were not asked for their input). One student leader stated that they should be consulted on "policies, decisions, and rules that affect them directly on both academic and non-academic matters" (personal conversation, student leader Moi University, 12 Nov., 1992).
Summary of Findings

Student perceptions on different issues should be looked into carefully by deans of students so as to adjust their own perceptions in order to be better prepared to serve the students. It surely seems reasonable that in any decision concerning students they be informed or consulted because this could prevent some confrontations with the administration. One student noted that this is a period of the multi-partisan, and as such he has a right to be informed. The student affairs staff members hold many different titles and positions with the universities. For example, there were wardens who were also lecturers, student counselors, accommodations officers, and hostel officers. Some student advisors were also professors.

The leadership behavior of the deans of students has been described on the two dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. High scores on initiating structure means the dean does a good job of directing group activities through planning, scheduling, communicating information, and implementing innovative ideas. High scores on consideration mean the deans of students have respect for subordinates' ideas and sensitivity to subordinates' feelings.

However, there are statistically significant differences between the expectations of the deans'
behavior by the various respondents and their perception of that behavior in practice. The respondents expressed some dissatisfaction with the leadership behavior of the deans of students. They feel that the deans of students never seek their approval on important matters. Overall, the deans' real behavior did not conform to their ideal behavior. However, given the conditions of overcrowding at the Kenyan universities as well as the demands of the leadership role of deans of students, it would not be feasible to expect him/her to attend to or give consideration to each and every individual member of the student body.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concerns the perceptions of the deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the public universities of Kenya. The main purpose of the study was to determine whether differences exist among these three groups in both their expectations and perceptions regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students. Therefore, the population for this study included deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders from the four public universities in Kenya and from their constituent colleges. The study replicated Chen's 1988 investigation of the perceptions of the role of the deans of students in the universities of the republic of China.

Both the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and a self designed demographic questionnaire were used to collect the data, which were obtained from the sample of 10 deans of students, 55 student affairs staff, and 130 student leaders. Responses from the demographic questionnaire were tabulated, summarized, and discussed.
Data from the LDBQ were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). A series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) at .05 level were used in order to test the significant differences between the perceptions and expectations (real or ideal) of the three groups.

The position of the dean of students in the Kenyan Public universities is generally perceived as an important leadership position, but one with conflicting role expectations making heavy demands upon the person holding that office. Personal interviews with the deans of students were used to supplement the findings of the study instruments. These interviews revealed that deans have varying degrees of experience and influence that they had gained from previous positions in higher education. Most of them indicated that they had been high school headmasters.

Trewatha, Newport, and Johnson (1992) seem to be in agreement with this kind of career path to positions of leadership when they note that "Leadership depends on the capacity to influence others which is acquired through experience, study, observation, and previous positions of authority" (p. 514).

Summary of the Kenyan Situation

During the late 1960s, Kenya's elitist national system of higher education included only one public university,
Nairobi University. In the 1980s, high school leavers multiplied, and demands for entry into the only public university was great. Finally, the government decided to add more universities so as to be able to cater to the heavy demand. By 1990, the national system of higher education included four public universities—Nairobi, Kenyatta, Moi, and Egerton—plus their constituent colleges, thus breaking the old elitist view of higher education and establishing one of mass education in Kenya. By the 1991/1992 academic year, enrollment in public universities had risen from 11,000 in 1985 to an all time high of over 40,000 students. Female students make up only 28% of the entire university student population. Such a large increase in student admissions put severe strains on the financial, academic, physical, and human resources available to the public universities.

It is important to note that financing university education in Kenya had been the central responsibility of the government for a very long time. Remember that enrollment had been fewer than 300 students in 1965, 5,000 in 1978. Higher education, production of skilled manpower, has been viewed as a major factor in economic growth. With the population explosion in the universities, the government can no longer justify using so much money on higher education, which is clearly benefitting a minority. Consequently, in 1992, the
government introduced cost-sharing on university education, with fees to be partially paid by the students. A pay-as-you-eat (PAYE) system, with students paying out of their pockets for the food they eat in the cafeterias, was also introduced. As a consequence, university education—to the majority of the qualified students in Kenya—seems unaffordable. Students rioted over the introduction of cost-sharing schemes, reduction of their allowances, and the introduction of fees. Universities had to be closed for seven months. Kenyan public universities are being starved for funds at a time when they are required to provide needed services to a multitude of students. Lack of foreign exchange has hurt the universities' capacity to acquire international scholastic journals and books.

Many problems face university students in Kenya. Congestion has reached alarming proportions. Lack of facilities and proper motivation such as lack of availability of jobs after graduation have all contributed to the general decline of academic standards. Due to congestion, students have inadequate access to libraries. University library facilities in Kenya have been stretched to the limit because they are now expected to serve student populations more than five times their intended capacity.

For example, the capacity of Kenyatta library is 1,000, and it serves 8,000 students. Lack of adequate
textbooks means students confine their intellectual activity to memorizing lecture notes. This could be a contributing factor to failure rates that are at an all time high.

It is these conditions which, when uncorrected for extended periods of time, frustrate students and incite complaints. For the most part such student grievances have been taken lightly. As a result, there has been periodic unrest in Kenyan public universities, sometime with devastating consequences. The deans of students in Kenyan public universities work under circumstances such as the ones described. However, they are supposed to coordinate all university activities that affect health, catering, residence, sports, and student welfare--including guidance and counseling.

The office of dean of students is charged with varying degrees of responsibility. The concern for the "whole" student appears to be the major reason for the existence of this office. Higher education in Kenya is just emerging when compared with western systems of higher education, and research such as the one reported here is rare. Thus, the results of this study can aid the deans of students in the Kenyan public universities in ascertaining more appropriate and effective ways to serve their students.

The role of dean of students is both powerful and demanding. In this role, the dean is perceived by the
students as having all the answers to their problems. He is supposed to be the role model, and is frequently the major source of information. Numerous changes are taking place in both the university and in the country at large.

For example, the influx of students (18-23 year old) into the campuses—from the diversity of multi-ethnicity in Kenya—bring numerous social problems, including drugs, alcohol, and unwanted pregnancies. Some student are frustrated and anxious over money for fees or meals. These kinds of anxieties can have a negative effect on their education. Kenya has now moved from a one party to a multi-party state. In the one party state, official corruption was widespread and inefficiency was common. However, with the advent of multi-party politics, the catch words became accountability and transparency. Those in leadership positions have to exercise their authority and face full responsibility for their actions.

Deans of students need to respond to these changes with urgency and with innovative ideas. The office of dean of students, especially in the guidance and counseling services, has been established in the Kenyan public universities to help students in their daily adjustments.

There are conflicting expectations and perceptions among deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders concerning the deans' role. The deans
perceive themselves as being fair and neutral—neither for the students nor for the administration. They are just doing their job. Student affairs staff perceive the deans of students as being too lenient on the students, especially when there are confrontations between the students and the administration. At such times, the student affairs staff tends to think that the deans of students are not in control as they are supposed to be. Student leaders, on the other hand, view the deans of students as being one of them—the administration. During good times, however, they regard the dean as a counselor and source of information.

For this study, respondents were asked to describe the leadership behavior of the deans of students on two dimensions: consideration and initiating structure. High scores on initiating structure mean the dean does a good job of directing group activities through planning, scheduling, communicating information, and implementing innovative ideas. High scores on consideration mean the deans of students have respect for their subordinates and sensitivity to subordinates' feelings. Student affairs staff express some dissatisfaction with the leadership behavior of the deans of students. They feel that the deans of students never seek their approval on important matters. Overall, the deans' real behavior did not conform to their ideal behavior. However, given the
volatile conditions on campuses and the resultant demands of the leadership role of the dean of students, which make the role exceedingly heavy, it would be next to impossible for the deans to attend to or give consideration to each individual staff member.

Summary of the Study Findings

Some of the major findings concerning the respondents demographic data include:

1. Seventy-four percent of the 195 respondents are male, 60% of the deans of students were male, while 75% of the 130 student leaders were male. These percentages are the true reflection of the gender breakdown of the university as a whole. Women in Kenya have been underrepresented in education (more so in the university) for a very long time. Women form slightly more than 50% of Kenya's population, yet they make up only about 28% of the public universities' population. This inadequacy of opportunity for a university education for women needs to be looked into—with urgency.

2. Thirty percent of the deans of students are in the 35-40 age group, another 30% in the 41-50 age group, and yet another 30% in the 51-60 age group. In responding as to how long they have been in their present positions, 30% of the deans of students stated they have been in their positions for 2-3 years, and almost 40% for 4-6 years. As
concerns their academic preparation, 50% have master's degrees while the remaining 50% have bachelor's degrees. Seventy percent of the deans of students indicated that they had graduated from public institutions. It is not immediately obvious what interpretation should be given to this information. However, the deans describe themselves as knowledgeable, experienced, considerate, willing, and ready to help the students become better citizens.

3. Over 65% of the student leaders are 22-23 years old, and 18% are 20-21 years old. Fifty-two percent are in their first year and 45% in their second year. Seventy percent of the student leaders indicate that they are in the college of liberal arts. In terms of age, most students are traditional students.

4. Forty percent of the student affairs staff members have only a bachelor's degree, those with a master's degree comprise 37%, and nine percent hold doctorates. In terms of educational preparation, this group of respondents seem to be fairly well prepared.

Statistical Data Analyses

Twelve hypotheses were proposed and tested, using the findings derived from the analyses of data for these hypotheses. Both real and ideal perceptions and expectations of leadership behavior of deans of students were examined.
1. Data testing Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 indicate that differences exist among the deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders in their perceptions regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students on the dimension of consideration.

2. Data testing Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 indicate that differences exist among deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders in their expectations regarding the ideal leadership behavior of deans of students in the dimension of consideration. However, data concerning Hypothesis 6 indicate that there is no difference between the expectations of student affairs staff and student leaders regarding the ideal leadership behavior of deans of students in the dimension of consideration. These two groups hold similar views about their expectations of the ideal behavior of deans of students.

3. Data testing Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 indicated that differences exist among the deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders in their perceptions regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in initiating structure. Each of the three respondent groups views the real leadership behavior of the deans of students differently in the dimension of initiating structure. Both the student affairs staff and the student leaders disagree with the deans' perceptions on initiating structure. Student affairs staff members
are in disagreement with student leaders' perceptions on the initiating structure dimension.

4. Data testing Hypotheses 10, 11, and 12 indicate that differences exist among deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders in their expectations of the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students on the initiating structure dimension. Both the student affairs staff members and the student leaders disagree with the deans of students in the ideal leadership behavior of initiating structure. Both groups have the same view of the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students on initiating structure. They seem to feel that the deans of students do not align their real behavior with their own ideals.

Conclusions

Several conclusions have been drawn on the basis of the results of collected data and the statistical analyses performed.

1. Demographic variables of gender, age, faculty position, faculty education, student field of study, and student classification appeared to have no significant effect on the respondents' reactions to the questionnaire.

2. Deans of students rated themselves very high on both initiating structure and consideration. These responses were an indication that they understand the
meaning of the two dimensions of leadership behavior. However, student affairs staff members and student leaders rated the deans much lower on the same leadership behaviors. Perhaps this is an indication of some degree of dissatisfaction on the part of these two groups. Deans of students should, therefore, take time to understand the implications of the perceptions of these respondents regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students.

3. The discrepancies between the ideal and real ratings are significant, indicating that the deans' ideal leadership aspirations do not conform to their real leadership behavior. Thus, the deans of students have room for improvement.

4. Student affairs staff members and student leaders have the same expectations regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students on both initiating structure and consideration. These findings seem to indicate that the deans of students need to find out what is expected, or what causes dissatisfaction, by these groups so as to adjust and provide effective leadership.

5. Deans of students differed significantly from both the student affairs staff members and student leaders in their perceptions regarding real leadership behavior of deans of students on the consideration dimension. These findings indicate a need for the deans of students to
reexamine their roles with a view to meeting the needs of the two groups.

6. Women were under represented in the Kenyan public universities. This has been so for a very long time. The trend needs to be examined, and equal access needs to be provided to all regardless of gender.

7. The falling academic standards in the Kenyan public universities is not surprising. Evidence abounds. A large increase in student admission has put severe strain on the financial, physical, and human resources available to the public universities. Admissions should be made depending on the availability of space, and not on political grounds.

Comparison of China and Kenya Studies

This study of leadership behavior of the deans of students in the public universities of the Republic of Kenya is being compared with Chen's 1988 study of the deans' leadership behavior in the universities of the Republic of China to determine whether there are similarities or differences between the findings of the two studies.

The present study also utilized the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) that was used in Chen's study. Chen's sample, taken from the population of 15 universities in the republic of China, included 10
current deans and 8 former deans of students, 173 student affairs staff members, and 224 student leaders. The present study's sample, taken from the population of the four public universities in Kenya and their constituent colleges, included 10 deans of students, 55 student affairs staff members and 130 student leaders. In addition, the researchers in both studies conducted interviews with some of the deans of students.

Chen's findings in the republic of China in 1988 revealed that high initiating structure and high consideration are the ideal behaviors for the deans of students. The chief investigator's findings in the republic of Kenya in 1993 indicate similar ideal leadership behaviors are desirable; therefore, this study supports Chen's overall findings. Moreover, Halpin (1966) pointed out that effective leadership behavior is associated with high performance on the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Therefore, these two dimensions form the basis of the effective behavior of the deans of students.

In both studies, deans' of students self-rating mean scores were higher than the mean scores of the student affairs staff members and student leaders on the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Simply stated, deans tend to hold high self-expectations. It
could be assumed that deans of students want to be—as well as think they are—good leaders.

In both studies, the expectations of the student affairs staff members and the student leaders regarding the ideal leadership behavior of deans of students on the initiating structure and consideration dimensions are the same. However, the two groups in both studies have different perceptions about the real leadership behavior of the deans of students on both dimensions. This may indicate that the two groups have different relationships to the deans of students in the two countries. Regarding China, Chen (1988) noted:

The student affairs staff members are the subordinates of the deans of students, so they have a superior-subordinate relationship. On the other hand, the student leaders are seen as students by the deans of students, establishing a teacher-student relationship. (p. 175)

More than likely the deans of students utilize different leadership behaviors with each group, which might explain why the two groups express different perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students in China.

In both studies, the mean scores of the three groups—deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders—on real initiating structure are greater than the mean scores on real consideration. The inference can be drawn that all three groups—in both studies—believe that the performance of the deans of
students on initiating structure is higher than the deans' performance on consideration, thus suggesting that deans of students in both countries present a high initiating structure behavior. There is nothing particularly wrong when one type of behavior tends to dominate in certain situations. Indeed, researchers such as Halpin (1956) have indicated that initiating structure can be engaged effectively with no sacrifice of consideration.

Chen's findings indicated that current campus events had no influence on the perceptions of deans of students. Whereas, the Kenya findings indicate that current events on campus do influence the perceptions of leadership behavior. As Chen (1988) wrote:

[Having the same] perceptions and expectations of leadership behavior raises two questions: Does the position of dean of students exert influence in the leadership of the deans of students? On the other hand, do the persons who hold the job of dean of students possess a similar personality? (p. 172)

Another question might also be asked: Are perceptions of leadership behavior influenced by innate tendencies to expect more of ourselves and of others than is humanly possible?

The similarities between the perceptions and expectations about deans of students revealed in the two studies may be due to:

1. The foreshortened time frame—1988 and 1993—which varies by only a few years.
2. Cultural beliefs: For example, those in authoritative positions in both countries tend to maintain a reserved relationship. In this case, deans of students in their leadership positions treat student leaders as students and exercise authoritative leadership styles at times—thus, communication between the two groups is hardly on the same level.

3. Accelerating social change: In the republic of China, as well as in Kenya, university students have been pressing for democracy—especially on their campuses. In both countries, students want to participate in their campus governance and can no longer remain passive observers.

4. Institutional similarities, such as policies for the role and responsibilities of the deans of students, may have played a part in there being similar findings.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of the study have led to the formulation of certain recommendations. Because this was a pilot study which found interesting and significant information regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the public universities in Kenya, further studies should be made to replicate the results and ascertain their validity.
1. A similar study should be made using a different leadership survey instrument to determine if similar findings would hold true.

2. A replication of the study is recommended for other Kenyan educational institutions such as teachers' colleges, high schools, and institutes of technology to determine if the same findings would result.

3. Further studies on the leadership behavior of deans of students should be conducted using different respondents, for example: vice-chancellors, faculty members, and other administrators.

4. The lack of statistically significant differences between responses based on demographic variables such as gender, age, field of study, and degrees earned is highly questionable. A similar study with emphasis on these variables is recommended to determine whether they would remain statistically non-significant.

5. Given the volatility of the educational situation in the burgeoning nation of Kenya, additional studies should be made to determine how the internal and external political factors effect both the perceptions and expectations of the behaviors of individuals in leadership positions in Kenyan universities.

6. After sufficient time has passed for Kenyan public universities to have weathered their growing-up years, this study should be replicated as closely as possible to
give a comparative analysis of the deans' leadership under differing conditions.

7. Self study can become the basis for self improvement. Therefore, the findings of this study can assist university administration in designing appropriate workshops, training programs, conferences, and seminars to enable deans of students, student affairs staff, and student leaders to improve their leadership behavior and, thus, their educational environment.

8. A study of faculty members and their perceptions of the deans of students is needed.

9. A study should be made to determine the perceptions faculty members have of deans of students and how that image may be effected by the deans' having or not having a terminal degree.
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MAP OF KENYA
## KENYA

1. Egerton University  
2. Kenyatta University  
3. Moi University  
4. University of Nairobi

Source: Commonwealth Universities Year Book 1991, p. 2255.

The places named are the seats of the universities numbered above. A placename followed by a letter as well as a number indicates a location where the university concerned has another campus.

### KENYA STUDENTS IN NAIROBI, MOI, KENYATTA AND EGERTON UNIVERSITIES AND (J.K.U.C.A.T.) 1985/86-1989/90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>7,482</td>
<td>8,593</td>
<td>15,051</td>
<td>20,046</td>
<td>24,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduates</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, i.e. Diplomates, etc.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>16,425</td>
<td>23,138</td>
<td>27,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nairobi, Moi, Kenyatta and Egerton Universities and J.K.U.C.A.T.

Figure 2-A. Map of Kenya showing the four Universities and enrollment figures
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STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR THE LEADER BEHAVIOR

DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
STATEMENT OF POLICY

for

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRES
AND RELATED FORMS

Permission to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaires and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, will be considered after receiving a written request, and is 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. **Inclusion in Dissertations**: Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission will be granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

3. **Copyright**: In granting permission to use the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright.

4. **Inquiries**: Communications should be addressed to:

   Business Research
   The Ohio State University
   1775 College Road
   Columbus, OH 43210

Rev. 5/91
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LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Name of Leader Being Described ____________________________________________

Name of Group Which He/She 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 "member," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

Published by
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Copyright 1957
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/she 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. Does personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group. A B C D E
3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. Tries out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. Acts as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. Is easy to understand. A B C D E
7. Rules with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. Finds time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. Criticizes poor work. A B C D E
10. Gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E
12. Keeps to himself/herself. A B C D E
13. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
14. Assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. Is the spokesperson of the group. A B C D E
16. Schedules the work to be done. A B C D E
17. Maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E
18. Refuses to explain his/her actions. A B C D E
19. Keeps the group informed.
20. Acts without consulting the group.
21. Backs up the members in their actions.
22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
23. Treats all group members as his/her equals.
24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.
25. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.
26. Is willing to make changes.
27. Makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.
28. Is friendly and approachable.
29. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
30. Fails to take necessary action.
31. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.
32. Lets group members know what is expected of them.
33. Speaks as the representative of the group.
34. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
35. Sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.
36. Lets other people take away his/her leadership in the group.
37. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.
38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.
39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.
40. Keeps the group working together as a team.
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
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PERMISSION TO USE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (LBDQ)
March 30, 1992

Mr. Geoffrey B. Maronga
P.O. Box 534
Arlington, TX 76004

Dear Mr. Maronga:

We grant you permission to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as part of your graduate research at the University of North Texas. We do not grant permission to modify or duplicate this instrument. Please follow the guidelines on the attached Statement of Policy.

Enclosed is a copy of this instrument along with a scoring manual for your information. Please use the enclosed Order Form when placing your order.

Sincerely yours,

John M. Mills, Director
Administration and Budget

ahr

enclosures
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LETTERS OF PERMISSION TO CONDUCT THE STUDY
Mr. Geoffrey B. Maronga,
P.O. Box 534,
ARLINGTON.

APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN KENYA.

Your letter enquiring on the above has been brought to our attention.

Forwarded herewith are two copies of the appropriate application forms.

Please complete and bring them to our office after arriving in the country.

The delay in the reply is regretted.

( J.W. WANJOHI ) (MISS)
for, PERMANENT SECRETARY/ADMINISTRATION.
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND INTERNAL SECURITY - BOX 30510, NAIROBI

REP: .......................................................... 18 ............

The Secretary,
National Council for Science and Technology
P. O. Box 50623
NAIROBI

RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

APPLICANT(S) .......... GEOFFREY BOSIRE MARONGA

The above named has been authorized to conduct research on

"PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP ROLE OF DEANS OF STUDENT...
IN THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES OF KENYA"

As indicated on the application form, this research will be conducted in

ALL PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

For a period ending ......................... FEBRUARY 1993

Under the Standing Research Clearance awarded to Kenyan Universities/Public Institutions.

I herewith enclose copies of his/her application for record purpose. He/She has also been notified that he will need a minimum of two copies of his/her research findings at the expiry of the project.

A. A. MUSASIA
FOR: PERMANENT SECRETARY/ADMINISTRATION

cc.

G. B. MARONGA
P. O. BOX 1770
KISII
Dear Mr. Maronga,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter to the Vice-Chancellor, Egerton University dated March 25th, 1992 regarding your request for distributing questionnaires to certain respondents on campus. Kindly arrange to send the (LBDQ) for our records. When you pass a copy of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), ensure that the University (Egerton University) also receives a copy of your clearance to the proposed study in the Kenyan University.

Apart from the above conditions which you should satisfy prior to the distribution, permission is hereby given to you to conduct your study as requested.

With kind regards.

Yours faithfully,

Prof. J.A. Lugogo,
DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR (R&E)

JAL/Jo
27th April, 1992

Mr Geoffrey Maronga
University of North Texas
P O Box 534
Arlington, Texas 76004

Dear Mr Maronga

I am writing on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor of Moi University, in reply to your letter of March 25th 1992 seeking permission to bring and distribute the questionnaire (LBDQ) for getting information from our Deans for your Doctoral research on "The Perceptions of the Role of Deans of Students at All of the Universities of the Republic of Kenya".

We have no objection to your request. You, however, need to seek research clearance from the Office of the President (OP) before you can carry out your research at our campus. So long as you come with the clearance from the Office of the President, we have no problem.

Please let me know when you have obtained the clearance so that I may help in introducing you to the relevant people at our University.

Yours sincerely

PROF M K MALECHE
DEPUTY VICE CHANCELLOR

c.c. Dr John P Eddy
Professor of Higher Education and
Student Academic Advisor

MKM/rmi
Dear Mr. Maronga,

We are in receipt of your letter dated 23rd July, 1992 addressed to the Vice-Chancellor of this University regarding permission for you to distribute questionnaires to our undergraduate students for the purpose of your doctoral research.

I am pleased to inform you that the Vice-Chancellor has approved your request. You may therefore, prepare to distribute your questionnaire on "The Perceptions of the Role of Deans of Students at All of the Universities of the Republic of Kenya" at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

PROF. J. N. MUTIO
DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR (ACADEMIC)

P.O. Box 45944
Nairobi, Kenya.
Telephones 610801/12.
Telex 25463 Fax 610760

13th November, 1992
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APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF INVESTIGATION

INVOLVING THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
Application for Approval of Investigation
Involving the Use of Human Subjects

Anticipated number: 200
Age of subjects 20 – 60
Sex: Male and female
Ethnic Background Diversified

Purpose of study:

The study will seek to determine whether differences exist between the perceptions of deans of students and the perceptions of student affairs staff and student leaders regarding leadership behavior of deans of students in the Republic of Kenya.

To determine whether differences exist between the expectations of the deans of students and the expectations of student affairs staff and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students. **Major hypotheses:** there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and student affairs staff and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiative structure.
There will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. These hypotheses will be tested using data collected by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

The researcher will travel to Kenya to administer the questionnaire.

11. A letter requesting permission to conduct this study will be sent to the Director of Personnel Management, Office of the President, in the Republic of Kenya.

Permission to use the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) has been granted by the Ohio State University Business Research Support Services.

A letter to the vice-chancellors of each of the four public universities in Kenya seeking permission to administer the LBDQ in their institutions has been sent out.

A cover letter to the deans of students, student affairs staffs, and student leaders explaining the importance of the study and giving the assurance that they will not be identified in the study has been mailed out. No names or signatures are required on the questionnaire.

The result of this study will provide information to assist Kenyan public universities to enhance their student service program. Also, this study will contribute research
on student personnel service in Kenyan public universities, an area in which existing knowledge is sparse, inadequate, and in need of updating.

Student affairs staffs and student leaders may fear that their views or opinions may be known or disclosed to their supervisors. They will be assured that all the questionnaires will be handled only by the researcher and that all data will be analyzed collectively and not on an individual basis.
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LETTER OF PERMISSION FROM THE INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD (IRB)
May 11, 1992

Geoffrey Maronga
N.T. Box 9103
Denton TX 76203

Dear Mr. Maronga:

Your proposal entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of the Role of Deans of Students at All of the Public Universities in the Republic of Kenya," has been approved by the IRB and is exempt from further review under 45 CFR 46.101.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (817) 565-3946.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Peter Witt, Chair
Institutional Review Board

PM/tl
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRES
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: DEANS OF STUDENTS

1. What is your opinion about the position of dean of students on the current campus?

2. How do you lead the faculty who participate in student affairs?

3. How do you lead the students?

4. How do you lead the student affairs staff members?

5. What kind of qualities should a dean of students have?
1. What is your opinion about the position of the dean of students on the current campus?

2. How does the dean of students lead or direct the faculty who participate in student affairs?

3. How does the dean of students lead the students?

4. How does the dean of students lead the student affairs staff members?

5. In your opinion, what qualities should a dean of students have?
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF

1. What is your opinion about the position of the dean of students on the current campus?

2. How does the dean of students lead or direct the faculty who participate in student affairs?

3. How does the dean of students lead the students?

4. How does the dean of students lead the student affairs staff members?

5. In your opinion, what qualities should a dean of students have?
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE:

DEANS OF STUDENTS

Please provide the information requested by checking those that apply to you.

1. What is your gender?
   ______ male
   ______ Female

2. What is your age category?
   ______ 25-35
   ______ 35-40
   ______ 41-50
   ______ 51-61

3. How long have you been in this position?
   ______ 1-2 years
   ______ 2-3 years
   ______ 3-4 years
   ______ 4-6 years

4. What is your highest degree?
   ______ Bachelor
   ______ Master
   ______ Doctorate

5. From what type of institution did you receive your academic degree?
   ______ public
   ______ private
QUESTIONNAIRE: STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF

Please provide the information by checking those that apply to you.

1. What is your gender?
   ______ male
   ______ Female

2. What is your age category?
   ______ 25-35
   ______ 35-40
   ______ 41-50
   ______ 51-61

3. How long have you been in this position?
   ______ 1-2 years
   ______ 2-3 years
   ______ 3-4 years
   ______ 4-6 years

4. What is your highest level of education?
   ______ High school
   ______ Bachelor
   ______ Master
   ______ Doctorate

5. From what type of institution did you receive your academic degree?
   ______ public
   ______ private

6. What is your current position and title with the university?
   Exact title:
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

   Current Position:
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
QUESTIONNAIRE: STUDENT LEADER

Please provide the information requested by checking those that apply to you.

1. What is your gender?
   ——— male
   ——— Female

2. What is your age category?
   ——— 18-19
   ——— 20-21
   ——— 22-23
   ——— 24-25
   ——— 26-30
   ——— 30-and above

3. What is your classification?
   ——— 1st year
   ——— 2nd year
   ——— 3rd year
   ——— 4th year

4. What is your major field or college?
   ——— Liberal Arts
   ——— Law
   ——— Business
   ——— Science
   ——— English
   ——— Other

1. How long have you been leading your club or organization?
   ——— 1 year
   ——— 2 years
   ——— 3 years
   ——— 4 years

6. What type of institution did you graduate from before joining university?
   ——— public
   ——— private
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