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This study was designed to explore the perceptions of the leadership behavior of deans of students at 15 universities in the Republic of China (ROC). The study groups included the deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders within the 15 universities.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was employed to assess the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. The population included 10 current deans of students and 8 former deans of students, 173 student affairs staff members, and 224 student leaders. In addition, six current deans of students and one officer of the Ministry of Education were interviewed by the researcher.

The conclusions are as follows.

1. Current and former deans of students had the same perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior in the initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

2. Effective leadership behavior of deans of students was associated with high scores on initiating structure and consideration.
3. Deans of students employed different leadership behaviors to lead the student affairs staff members and student leaders.

4. The leadership behavior of the deans of students was inclined toward high initiating structure and low consideration.

5. Deans of students and student affairs staff members had differing perceptions of leadership behavior on real consideration.

6. Deans of students and the student leaders had differing perceptions of leadership behavior on real initiating structure.

This study suggested that a dean of students may want to employ a plan of self-study, or participate in leadership training programs, workshops, and conferences related to student affairs to improve leadership behavior effectively.

Further research to examine the perceptions of the leadership behavior of deans of students is recommended.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically, the basic purposes of higher education have been to explore, accumulate, and transmit knowledge, with scholarship and the production of scholars in all fields recognized as hallmarks. The task of college and university personnel is to vitalize these purposes by assisting students in developing the limits of their potentialities and in making contributions to the betterment of society. Therefore, college student personnel services are an integral part of all institutions of higher education (Packwood, 1977). The dean of students, the most common title of the chief student affairs officer (Rickard, 1985), has an important role of responsibility in student personnel services.

The philosophy of "the Student Personnel Point of View" imposes upon educational institutions the obligation to consider the student as a whole (American Council on Education Studies, 1937, p. 1). The concept of education is therefore broadened to include attention to the students' well-rounded development--physically, socially, emotionally, and spiritually, as well as intellectually (American Council on Education, 1949, p. 1). The wholistic point of view
assumes that students' individual differences are planned for, that all students at the university are considered a functioning whole, and that students should be met at particular points of development. The assumptions serve as the basis for the profession's emphasis on student development in the provision of services (Brown, 1972).

Traditionally, the role of college student personnel professionals was clearly defined. Their primary function on campuses was to serve as the most tangible agent of the policy in loco parentis, meaning that the agents' specific duties were to act as disciplinarians, moderators of student behavior, and upholders of moral and social values. The role of student affairs in the 1980s, as Peter Garland (1985) suggests, has gone beyond the traditional role of guardian. The college student professionals have moved from the periphery of the college campus to the center of the institution. The student personnel administrator role is closely related both to the quality of the undergraduate nonclassroom experience and to student perceptions of the institution (Garland, 1985).

A dean of students is generally assigned to afford services which improve the quality of life for students and enhance the students' competencies as productive citizens (Eddy & Sharma, 1986). The Council of Student Personnel Association in Higher Education has described the role of the dean of students as follows:
Deans are responsible for working with students, for administering the services... and for formulating, interpreting, and enforcing rules and social standards... Depending on the size of the institution, the dean of students or vice president of student affairs administers and coordinates an organization... complex and diverse in its composition and services.... As an administrator, he is responsible for budgeting, selection, training, and coordination of staff members, and assisting in the development of institutional policy. He supervises program evaluation and research and advises the president and faculty committee related to student life,... (Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education, 1964)

It is the researcher's opinion that the dean of students needs a more complete understanding of the deans' roles in the administrative structure of institutions in order to solve the possible problems and to effectively execute the position of dean of students. An analysis of the dean of students' role may also help to bridge the gap in the lack of understanding between the dean and reference groups with which the dean is in constant contact. Included in these groups are student affairs staff members and student leaders.

Since, through leadership, the deans can influence the reference groups to work together willingly on related tasks in order to attain goals desired by the groups (Ford, 1985), leadership is the important role of the deans of students. A greater understanding of the perceptions and expectations of the dean of students held by those reference groups in the institutions, therefore, will help the deans to make the necessary adjustments in their own leadership behavior and become more effective administrators.
In the Republic of China (ROC), also known as Taiwan, university education emphasizes not only academic education but also moral education (Lee, 1986). Basically, the implementation of moral education is the main responsibility of the dean of students. The dean plays the role of guide and disciplinarian. Recently, accelerating social change in Taiwan has influenced the values and ethics on the university campuses. Many of today's college students in the ROC cannot endure a passive role on campus, and they desire to participate positively in campus governance. Therefore, student movements have occurred on some campuses to ask for campus democracy and freedom of speech ("Anxious For Campus Democracy," 1987). These new demands impact the traditional job of student personnel affairs. Since the dean of students is the chief of student personnel affairs, he must deal with this changing climate appropriately. However, no existing research has studied the role of the deans of students in the Republic of China. For the sake of helping the deans of students, a study of the leadership behavior of the deans of students is necessary and can assist the deans in adjusting behavior in the managing of new situations. This study focused on the leadership of deans of students at selected universities in the Republic of China, as perceived and expected by student affairs staff members, student leaders, and deans of students.
Statement of the Problem

This study explores the perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students at selected universities in the Republic of China.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To determine whether differences exist between the perceptions of the deans of students and the perceptions of student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

2. To determine whether differences exist between the expectations of the deans of students and the expectations of student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

3. To determine whether differences exist between the perceptions of the deans of students and the perceptions of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students;

4. To determine whether 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. To determine whether 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; and
6. To determine whether differences exist between the expectations of the student affairs staff members and the expectations of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students.

Hypotheses

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

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

2. There will be a significant difference between the respective 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;

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

4. There will be a significant difference between the respective 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;

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

6. There will be a significant difference between the
respective ratings of deans of students and of student
leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of
students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating
structure;

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

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

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

11. There will be a significant difference between the respective 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; and

12. There will be a significant difference between the respective 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.

Background and Significance of the Study

The entry of China into the modern world dates to the revolution that established the Republic in 1911. Led by Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, the National Revolution ended 4,000 years of dynastic rule. In 1949, the Republic of China temporarily moved the seat of government to Taiwan in the wake of governmental change on the mainland (Questions and Answers, 1986). Taiwan, an island off the southeastern coast of the Chinese mainland, with an area of 35,981 square kilometers, is the smallest province of China. The
population of Taiwan was 19,408,000 in 1986 (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1987).

The current system of higher education in Taiwan evolved from the structure existing on the Chinese mainland prior to 1949 (The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, 1977). The Ministry of Education, which is a branch of the central government, is headed by a cabinet-level office and is in charge of all administrative matters dealing with academic work, culture, and education in the Republic of China (Ministry of Education, 1984). All of the institutions of higher education must submit to the policy of the Ministry of Education (Lee, 1976). Higher Education is comprised of junior colleges, colleges, universities, and research institutes (Ministry of Education, 1986). Universities or colleges may either be public or private and admission is limited to those qualified candidates who have passed the entrance examination. The period of study for most undergraduate students is four years, with a bachelor's degree awarded upon graduation. All well-administered public and private universities and colleges may also set up graduate schools with the approval of the Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education, 1984). An entrance examination is mandatory. A master's degree and a doctoral degree are awarded by the school upon graduation. In the 1985-1986 school year, the number of institution of higher learning in the ROC was 16 universities, 12 colleges, and 77
junior colleges, and the total number of students was 428,576 (Ministry of Education, 1986).

Higher education in the ROC today is the product of many important historical, social, political, and philosophical factors. It is a composite of the traditional belief, based mainly on the thinking of Confucius, that the highest achievement one can claim is to be a recognized scholar (Smith, 1977, p. 1). Confucius' philosophy of life concentrates on "jen" (benevolence or humanity) (Chang, 1957). The meaning of the word is succinctly defined by The Doctrine of the Mean: "jen is man" (Kung, 1986). That is to say, "jen" is that which makes man a man. In Confucius' view, "jen" stands for the sum of all moral virtues, and in education his emphasis is placed on equal opportunity and self-enlightenment, while the goal is set at the cultivation of moral character (Kung, 1986). Due to the influence of Confucius' educational philosophy, education in the ROC stresses national morality, cultural traditions, scientific knowledge, and the ability to work and contribute to the community (China Yearbook, 1980, p. 231).

In order to assist the Chinese student to attain the goal of education, the Ministry of Education made "The Main Point of Discipline Education" and asked for all of the schools to execute it. "The Main Point of Discipline Education" is based on Dr. Sun Yat-Sen's 'Three Principles of the People' which emphasizes ethics, democracy, and
science and in order to cultivate students to possess noble will, strong beliefs, intellectual humanity, and courage (Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education, 1984). Therefore, these students can be good children in the family, positive members in society, royal citizens in the nation, and the pioneers who maintain justice and peace in the world. The meaning of a disciplined education is to cultivate in students a healthy personality so that the idea of morality can be transmitted. Moreover, through the accomplishment of disciplined education in the schools, the students learn moral, intellectual, physical, and group-life training.

To execute the disciplined education in higher education, every university and college establishes an Office of the Dean of Discipline and Guidance. However, in more recent years, several universities have changed the name of the office to "Office of Student Affairs" (Lee, 1976). The task of disciplining and guidance is to ensure that the student affairs administrators and staff members apply proper attitudes, model manners, and provide operations of reward and punishment so students can use the principle of action and obedience to the regulations of the group (Hung, 1986). The Office of Discipline and Guidance also seeks to assist students in resolving problems which interfere with academic progress, and in utilizing campus resources which enhance the learning processes. Since the
People's Republic of China had used student movements to make campus revolts on the mainland and to thereby influence the national security (Chao, 1986), a vital job of the Office of Dean of Discipline and Guidance is to prevent campus disorders and to maintain campus calm in Taiwan. In order to successfully achieve these jobs, offices of the Dean of Discipline and Guidance consist of three divisions: student life, extracurriculum, and physical education and health (Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education, 1984).

The Office of Dean of Discipline and Guidance is headed by a Dean of Students. According to University Law (Article 15), the dean of students should be a professor who has been certified by the Ministry of Education (Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education, 1984, p.118). In addition to the basic qualification above, the Ministry of Education (1985) also requires that a dean should have been a chairman of the department, a dean of the school, or a director of the division of the Office of Dean of Student Affairs for three years; or that the dean has been a class adviser for four years; or has taken eight credit hours in the courses of education, counseling, or discipline education. A dean of students is appointed by the president of the university or the college. The dean automatically becomes a member of the cabinet of the central administrator and reports to the president directly. The dean is also responsible for
planning, organizing, leading, and controlling the 
activities of the total program of student personnel 
services (Parker, 1979, p. 9).

Williamson expressed the thought that "deans have 
continued to relieve the president of unpleasant duties, and 
their functions include buffering between administration and 
students and occasionally between students and faculty."
Williamson added that "they have come to be the central 
administrators who take care of crises and in many ways 
restrain rampant adolescents" (1957, p. 231). In the ROC, 
the dean of students has the main responsibility for 
developing rapport between the student personnel services 
and the student body. The main concern in the area is in 
fostering an understanding and good relationships so that 
the student affairs staff members will be more effective in 
meeting the needs of the students. The dean of students is 
in the inevitable position of presenting the problems, 
gripes, and complaints of the student body to the 
administration, and at the same time presenting the 
philosophy, policy and decisions of the administration to 
the students. The dean services and assists in the 
educational process, yet is often perceived as just the 
opposite of the original intent (Hecklinger, 1972). Instead 
of being seen as a positive force on campus as a 
representative of student interests, the dean may be seen as 
one of the chief barriers to student freedoms and to student 
participation in campus affairs.
Therefore, the manner in which the dean treats and leads the students will influence the cooperation of the students and the operation of student personnel work. In order to be a leader of staff members in student affairs, the dean must integrate the staff members and efforts on campus into the main stream of institutional activity (Shaffer & Martinson, 1966). The dean provides and stimulates the continuous professional and personal growth of the staff through staff development (Merkle, 1983). Further, the dean improves relationships and increases the effectiveness of cooperation between the various student personnel professionals; such as health services, student activities, and residence halls. Thus, in order to lead student affairs staff members effectively and to achieve the goals of student personnel affairs, depends on the performance of the dean's leadership behavior.

Since the leadership of the dean of students is so important to student personnel affairs in the ROC, study of the role of the deans of students can be considered an important issue. However, a review of the related literature revealed that very little has been written about leadership in student personnel affairs which would provide guidance for the deans of students. Furthermore, at present, because the ROC government has become more democratic than before, a more open and democratic campus is demanded by the ROC college students. More and more
students in prestigious universities are asking for the right of participating in campus governance and of freedom of speech ("Anxious For Campus Democracy," 1987). The values and ethics of the students are changing to reflect these changes in social values. Thus, the traditional role of student personnel work cannot satisfy the needs of current college students. A new policy of student affairs must be produced to deal with the new impact of the campuses. As a result, the role of leadership of the deans of students will become even more important than before. Therefore, the study of the leadership behavior of the deans of students is necessary in order to help the deans manage all of the complexities of today's student affairs.

This study examined the perceptions and expectations held by student affairs staff members and student leaders in 16 universities related to the leadership behavior of deans of students. The 16 universities, including nine national universities and seven private universities, make up the total university system in the ROC (see Appendix A for exact title and a complete list of the universities). Although one public university rejected to participate in the survey offered by the researcher on campus, the results of this study of the remaining 15 universities can be generalized to represent all of the universities in Taiwan. The survey demonstrates the real and ideal leadership behaviors as perceived and expected by student affairs staff members and
student leaders. The study also suggests methods by which deans of students can adjust leadership behavior in order to perform more successfully.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are used:

1. **Consideration**: The term refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group (Halpin, 1955, p. 18).

2. **Dean of Students**: The person who is responsible for planning, organizing, leading, and controlling the activities of the total program of student personnel services (Parker, 1979, p. 9).

3. **Expectation**: The desirable or appropriate behavior associated with a certain role (Teepanont, 1986, p. 12).

4. **Initiating Structure**: The leader's behavior in delineating the relationships between himself and members of the working group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and ways of getting the job done (Halpin, 1955, p. 18).


6. **Perception**: An immediate or intuitive cognition or judgment (Ideal Leader Behavior, 1957, P. 1)
7. Role: The expected behavior patterns attributed to a particular status position (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1976).

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the following:

1. The bias, expectations and perceptions of the deans of students, student affair staff members, and student leaders responding to the instrument;

2. Deans of students at the 15 universities in the Republic of China;

3. Student affairs staff members of the 15 universities in the Republic of China; and

4. Student leaders at the 15 universities in the Republic of China.

Differences in age, sex, length of service, and academic degrees of the deans of students and student affairs staff members are not considered in this study.

The Survey Instrument

The research instrument which was used in this study is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (see Appendices B and C), 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 was chosen for this study because it incorporates two significant dimensions of
leader behavior: "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure." The LBDQ asks respondents to describe how the leader acts (real) and how they think he should act (ideal). Moreover, the leader is asked to describe his own behavior. Halpin (1955) indicated that for the LBDQ-Real, the estimated reliability by the split-half method is .83 for the initiating structure scores, and .92 for the consideration scores. For the LBDQ-Ideal, the corresponding estimates of reliability are .69 and .66.

The LBDQ has undergone many revisions and has been used for research purposes in industry, the armed services and education (Bass, 1981; Carson & Schultz, 1964; Fleishman, 1953; Hemphill, 1955; Knight & Holen, 1985; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1976; Skipper, 1976, 1977, 1978; Stogdill, 1969, 1974). In the Republic of China, the LBDQ has been translated into Chinese and used in various studies of education administration (Liao, 1978; Lin, 1983). Moreover, Fleishman (1973) emphasized that the concepts of consideration and initiation structure are little influenced by the cultural differences. However, in order to eliminate such possible problems, the researcher translated the LBDQ into Chinese, and this translated questionnaire was submitted to a jury panel for content validation. The jury panel consisted of five professors who are experts in the study of educational administration, leadership, and English translation; and each member was requested to consider the
relevance and clarity of each translated item. At least three of the five jury members were asked to approve an item prior to including the item on the final questionnaire. The approved Chinese-version LBDQ was then administered to the sample population.

Population and Sample

The population for this study included one dean of students, 15 student affairs staff members, and 20 student leaders in each of 15 universities. The total population was comprised of 15 deans of students, 225 student affairs staff members, and 300 student leaders. In addition, 12 former deans of students were also drawn from the 15 universities. The selection of the sample in each university was limited as follows: the student affairs staff members were the persons who work in the Divisions of the Office of Dean of Discipline and Guidance; the student leaders were the students who are the chiefs of the student government or student clubs. The former deans of students were current faculty members or administrators who had ever been employed in the position of the dean of students. The sample for this study was drawn from the population of all deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders in the 15 universities. A standard table of random numbers was used to select an appropriate sample.
Procedures for Collection of Data

1. A letter requesting permission to conduct this study was sent to the Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education, Ministry of Education, the Republic of China.

2. The researcher found an assistant researcher in each university, and mailed the selected name of the sample and questionnaire to the research assistants.

3. Each assistant researcher distributed the questionnaire to one dean of students, 15 student affairs staff members, and 20 student leaders in the respective university.

4. The assistant researcher collected the completed questionnaires from the respondents, and then mailed the responses to the researcher in Taipei.

5. During the collection of the related data and questionnaires in Taiwan, the researcher also interviewed six deans of students in six different universities as well as one officer in the Ministry of Education.

6. The researcher, in addition, mailed the questionnaires to the 12 former deans of students and the completed questionnaires were gathered from the respondents.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The questionnaires were manually checked for accuracy of completion. Data from the instruments were tabulated and analyzed by computer. Two kinds of statistical techniques
were used to test the hypotheses. A t test was used to test hypotheses one to eight. A significant t value determined the differences between deans of students and student affairs staff members and between deans of students and student leaders on the real and ideal dimensions, and between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. These hypotheses were tested at the .01 level of significance. A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test hypotheses nine to 12. An F Ratio was obtained from the analysis to determine the differences between the student affairs staff members and student leaders on the real and ideal dimensions, and between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. These hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance on the two-tailed test.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters as follows:

Chapter I presents the introduction, statement of the problem, purposes of the study, hypotheses, background and significance of the study, definition of terms, limitation of the study, and survey method of the study.

Chapter II contains the review of literature related to the study.

Chapter III describes the population of the study and provides a detailed presentation of the instrument, method
of data collection, and an explanation of the statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter IV contains the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered.

Chapter V presents a summary, discussion of findings, conclusions, applications, and recommendations for further research.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature is divided into nine sections. The first section concerns the definitions of leadership. The second section reviews the theories of leadership, and the third section describes different styles of leadership. Section four presents a brief history of the development of the dean of students in America in particular; section five covers the functions of the dean of students; section six analyzes the role of the dean of students; and section seven includes the qualities of the dean of students. Section eight presents the writings on leadership in student personnel services. The last section discusses leadership studies of the educational administrators who responded to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in the Republic of China.

Definitions of Leadership

Leadership appears to be a rather sophisticated concept, with an elusive, mysterious quality about it. Leadership is easy to recognize, hard to describe, and difficult to demand in others. The term "leadership" means different things to different people (Yukl, 1981).
Researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspective and the aspect of the phenomenon of most interest to them. The confusion is caused by the use of other imprecise terms such as "power," "authority," "management," "administration control" and "supervision" to describe the same phenomenon. Stogdill (1974a, p. 7) concluded that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept."

Most conceptions of leadership imply that at various times one or more group members can be identified as a leader according to some observable difference between this person(s) and other members, who are referred to as "followers" or "subordinates" (Yukl, 1981). Burns (1978, p. 19) indicated that leadership is defined as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders and followers. Koontz and O'Donnell (1972, p. 57) viewed leadership "as the art of inducing subordinates to accomplish their assignments with zeal and confidence." "Zeal" reflects order, earnestness, and intensity in the execution of work; "confidence" reflects experience and technical ability. The various terms identify the leader as part of a group and yet distinct from the group. The leader acts to help a group attain objectives with the maximum application of
capabilities, but the identity of the leader remains intact, never losing his own identity. Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that leadership involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leader over followers. Tead (1935, p. 20) said that "leadership is the activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goals which they come to find desirable." Similarly, Hodgetts (1981, p. 233) indicated that "leadership is the process of influencing people to direct their effort toward the achievement of some particular goal(s)." In addition, Wallace and Azilagyi (1982, p.149) thought that "leadership is a process involving two or more people in which one attempts to influence the other's behavior toward the accomplishment of some goal or goals."

From a review of other writers' revelations, Hersey and Blanchard (1977, p. 84) concluded that most management writers agree that "the definition of leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation." The definition mentions any particular type of organization; in any situation in which someone is trying to influence the behavior of another individual or group, leadership is occurring.

Some scholars thought that power and leadership are closely related, for leadership always implies some
influence (Duncan, 1981). For example, Dubin (1951) noted that leadership is the exercise of authority and the making of decisions. Bass (1976, p.64) defined leadership as "the observed effort of one member to change other members' behavior by altering the motivation of the other members or by changing their habits." Bowditch (1985, p. 127) defined leadership as the relationship between people in which influence and power are unevenly distributed on a legitimate basis (contractual or consensual) but not in insulation—that is, there are no leaders without followers.

In a managerial sense, leadership involves more than just being able to get others to follow but also implies providing goal-oriented direction and obtaining desired results (Carlisle, 1982). If group progress is inconsistent with the expectations of the members, the leader will lose influence. Davis thought that "leadership is a part of management, but not all of it," and "leadership is the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically." Davis's connotation stresses the role of leadership in eliciting behavioral responses which are more than routine, and suggests the tapping of latent human capability in achieving group objectives. Leadership, on the other hand, is a more restricted type of managerial activity focusing on the interpersonal interactions between a leader and one or more subordinates, with the purpose of increasing organizational effectiveness (Schriesheim, Tolliver, & Behling, 1984).
Recently, attribution theory was used to explain leadership. The attribution theory has a foundation in psychology and is based on the assumption that individuals have an inherent need to explain events that surround them (McElroy, 1982). Calder (1977) adopted an attribution theory to view leadership as an attribution that people make about other persons—not as a set of traits or behaviors. In other words, a person is a leader because others say so.

Some scholars thought that the social construction of organizational realities has elevated the concept of leadership to a lofty status and level of significance (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). Such realities emphasize leadership, and the concept of the approach has thereby gained a brilliance that exceeds the limits of normal scientific inquiry. Thus, the scholars developed highly romanticized, heroic views of leadership—what leaders do, what they are able to accomplish, and the general effects they have on the lives of others. One of the principal elements in the romanticized conception is to view that leadership is a central organizational process and the premier force in the scheme of organizational events and activities (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985).

The romanticized conception of leadership also suggests that leaders do or should have the ability to control and influence the fates of the organizations in their change. This assumption of control and the responsibility it
engenders is a double-edged sword: not only does it imply giving credit for positive outcomes, but it also entails laying blame for negative ones (Salancik & Meindl, 1984). To summarize, the romanticized conception of leadership denotes a strong belief—a faith—in the importance of leadership factors to the functioning and dysfunctioning of organized systems.

Stogdill (1974a) abstracted, surveyed and analyzed more than 3,000 books and articles in his book, Handbook of Leadership, and he suggested the following eleven definitions of leadership (pp. 7-15):

1. a function of group process
2. personality or effects of personality
3. the art of inducing compliance
4. the exercise of influence
5. a form of persuasion
6. a set of acts or behaviors
7. a power relationship
8. an instrument of goal achievement
9. an effect of interaction
10. a differentiated role
11. the initiation of structure

In brief, leadership is clearly a role that leads toward goal achievement; involves interaction and influence; and usually results in some form of changed structure or behavior of groups, organizations, or communities, strength of personality, and ability to induce compliance or to persuade critical variables in the effectiveness of leaders. However, all of these relative influences depend on time and circumstance (Lassey, 1976).

As Karmel (1987, p. 476) noted, "It is consequently
very difficult to settle on a single definition of leadership that is general enough to accommodate these many meanings and specific enough to serve as an operationalization or the variable." A global definition of leadership, for all purposes, does not seem to be useful in advancing scientific inquiry, nor will scientific inquiry be facilitated by abandoning pursuit of definition. Therefore, the problem of definitional confusion should be attacked by specification and classification of the purposes for which inquiry is undertaken. The definition of leadership will require identification of the underlying dimension of purposes such as "need of the user (e.g., scientist, student) or "complexity" (extensiveness of the behavioral domain to be measured) (Karmel, 1978). Whenever feasible, leadership research should be designed to provide information relevant to the entire range of definitions, so that over time the leadership research will be possible to unite the utility of different conceptualizations and arrive at some consensus on the matter.

Theories of Leadership

A theory is supposed to be a method to try to understand fact. Theories of leadership attempt to explain either the factors involved in the emergence of leadership or the nature of leadership and consequence (Bass, 1981). A theory can be useful in defining research problems for the
social scientist and in improving prediction and control in the development and application of leadership.

Although there are various theories of leadership in the literature, most writers indicate that leadership theories fall into three categories: the trait, behavior and situational theories of leadership (Bowditch & Anthony, 1985; Carlisle, 1982; Dessler, 1980; Graham, 1986; Hersey, 1977; Hodgetts, 1981; Koontz & O’Donnell, 1972; Mcguire, 1974; McPherson, Crowson, & Pitner, 1986; Stoner, 1982; Wallace, 1982).

**Trait Theory**

One of the earliest efforts in the study of leadership was an attempt to identify the personal characteristics of leaders (Stoner, 1982). The view of leadership—that leaders are born, not made—is, in fact, still popular. The approach was based on the assumption that effective leaders have a finite number of identifiable traits or characteristics that distinguish the effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Dessler, 1980). Thus, the trait theory has attempted to isolate the attributes of successful and unsuccessful leaders, and implies that the reason why one individual is successful, and another is not successful, is that the successful leader possesses traits differing from those of leaders who are less successful (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1976). The types of traits studied most frequently
in the early leadership research include physical characteristics (such as height, appearance, energy level), personality (such as self-esteem, dominance, emotional stability), and ability (general intelligence, verbal fluency, originality, social insight) (Yukl, 1981).

Trait theories emerged out of work done by the American Psychological Association at the beginning of World War I (Stogdill, 1974b). The Committee of Psychologists had been appointed to assist the U.S. Army in screening and selecting military personnel; and a number of useful tools including the Army Alpha Test of Intelligence were developed. Following the war, the same techniques or methods were applied in industrial situations, and the early "traitist" leadership research grew out of the personnel-testing movement. In addition to personnel testing, the traits of leaders have been studied by observing behavior in group situations, by choice of association (voting) or by nomination or rating by observers, and by analysis of biographical data (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1976).

In an early review, Stogdill (1948) examined the results of 124 trait studies conducted between the years 1904 to 1908. A number of traits were found to differentiate repeatedly between leaders and nonleaders in several studies, and the differentiations were related to capacity (intelligence, verbal facility, originality), achievement (scholarship, knowledge, sports), responsibility
(dependability, initiative, aggressiveness), participation (activity, sociability, cooperational), and status (social position, popularity). Despite the evidence that leaders tend to differ from nonleaders with respect to certain traits, Stogdill found that the results varied considerably from situation to situation. Thus, Stogdill (1948, p. 64) 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."

A more recent survey (Stogdill, Nickels, & Zimmer, 1971), involving 136 trait studies, covered research conducted between 1948 and 1969. In the survey, the traits are classified as self-oriented physical characteristics, intellectual characteristics, and personality, task oriented (achievement drive, initiative, persistence), and socially oriented (cooperativeness, tact, and sociability) characteristics. A positive finding consists of (1) a statistically significant difference between the different groups of subjects or (2) a statistically significant correlation between a leadership trait and a criterion of leader effectiveness.

Stogdill (1974a) reviewed 163 trait studies conducted during the period from 1949 to 1970. In the more recent set of trait studies, a greater variety of measurement
procedures was used including: projective tests, situational tests, and forced choice tests. Additional recent trait studies have dealt with managers and administrators, as opposed to other kinds of leaders. Emphasis on selection focused on trait research on the relation of leader traits to leader effectiveness rather than on the comparison of leaders and nonleaders. Most of the same traits were again found to be related to leader effectiveness and some additional traits and skills were also found to be significant. Stogdill's study showed that many leadership researchers overreacted to the earlier pessimistic literature reviewed by rejecting the relevance of traits. Thus, recognition exists that certain traits increase the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but do not guarantee effectiveness. The relative importance of different traits is dependent on the nature of the leadership situation (Yukl, 1981).

The trait theory persisted for over 60 years, as researchers tried to search for the key characteristics which could identify leaders. In fact, much research had failed to demonstrate a consistent, definite relationship between leadership ability and either physical traits, personality characteristics, or combinations of the two (Reitz, 1977). The fact that situational factors may override personality factors indicates that an important personality attribute for one role may be inadequate for
another (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1976). However, in recent years, the investigation of leader traits has been more productive. Since the researchers have improved the research tools, new measuring approaches are available: the inclusion of more relevant traits, use of better measures of traits, examination of trait patterns rather than looking only at individual correlations, and the use of longitudinal research (Yukl, 1981). In a review of the trait literature, House and Baetz (1979) contended that trait research needs to be continued due to the magnitude of the correlations between leader traits and criteria of leadership are as high and often higher than correlations between leader behavior and leadership criteria.

Behavioral Theories

Following the failure of the trait theory to predict successful leader behavior, researchers turned to an examination of the structure and functions of groups and tried to isolate the behaviors that made leaders effective. Behavioral leadership theories focus on the leader's actions and behavior in carrying out his leadership functions, rather than on intelligence or initiative traits (Dessler, 1980). Trait theory attempts to explain leadership on the basis of what the leader is, behavioral theory on the basis of what the leader does. Different methods of studying leadership behavior have been used to describe the
activities and behavior of managers and other kinds of leaders. Each method has unique advantages and limitations. The best research strategy is to use a combination of methods rather than continuing the single-method strategy predominant up to the present time (McCall, Morrison, & Hannan, 1978).

Ohio State Leadership Studies

Among the best-known studies of leader behavior has been the series of inquiries that started at Ohio State University in the 1940s (Hemphill & Coons, 1950). The studies isolated two independent leadership factors, referred to as initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to "the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure" (Halpin, 1966, p.39). On the other hand, consideration refers to "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff" (Halpin, 1966, p. 39).

The two dimensions are measured by two separate questionnaires. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) is an instrument designed to describe the methods used by leaders to carry out activities (Halpin,
1959). The LBDQ contains fifteen items pertaining to consideration and an equal number of items for initiating structure. Respondents judge the frequency with which the leader engages in each form of behavior. Thus, consideration and initiating structure are dimensions of observed behavior as perceived by others. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) attempts to assess the leaders' perception of personal behavior in leadership roles. The LBDQ was completed by leaders' subordinate(s), superior(s), or associates (peers). The LOQ was self-scored by the leaders. The concepts of consideration and initiating structure were applied in different fields of studies such as industrial studies (Fleishman, 1953; Fleishman & Hurris, 1962; House, Filley & Kerr, 1971; Korman, 1966), military studies (Halpin, 1954, 1955; Holloman, 1967; Hooper, 1968), and educational studies (Carson & Schultz, 1964; Hemphill, 1955; Campbell & Cunningham, 1959; Miklos, 1963; Siriparp, 1983; Knight & Holen, 1985; Teepanont, 1986).

The most important conclusion of the Ohio State Studies was concerning the relationship between initiating structure and consideration dimensions of leadership behavior. While most earlier studies concluded that such dimensions were arranged along a continuum and were therefore mutually exclusive, the Ohio State University researchers contended that the leadership factors were independent of one another (Graham & Hays, 1986). Each dimension was a separate and
distinct type of behavior that was not tied in any direct way to the other. Thus, a high level of initiating structure did not preclude the leader from exhibiting a high degree of consideration behavior, and vice versa. In an article, "Twenty Years of Consideration and Structure," Edwin Fleishman (1973, p. 37) gave a conclusion to studies of the initiating structure and consideration:

The consistency of some of the results was stressed, notably the preponderance of findings which seem to indicate that the high-structure-high-consideration pattern optimizes more different effectiveness criteria, whereas the low-consideration-low-structure pattern most often appears the least desirable. There is some evidence that the results with consideration are more consistent and the results with structure more situational, while consistent results have been stressed, the negative and inconsistent results need explaining, too.

The University of Michigan Studies

Beginning in 1947, the University of Michigan Survey Research Center conducted a series of studies on leadership behavior (Likert, 1961). The purpose of the project was to develop qualitative measures of the variables that influence both group output and satisfaction. Through the studies, two styles of behavior were identified: employee-centered and production-centered (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1976). Production-centered leaders set rigid work standards, organized tasks down to the last detail, prescribed the work methods to be followed and closely supervised their subordinates' work. Employee-centered leaders encouraged
subordinate participation in goal setting and in work
decisions and helped ensure high performance by inspiring
trust and respect.

The results of the Michigan studies support the
conclusion that employee-centered leader behavior could be
the most effective and appropriate. The studies also found
that the most effective leaders had supportive relationships
with subordinates, tended to use group rather than
individual decision making, and encouraged subordinates to
set and achieve high performance goals (Coch & French, 1948;
French, Israel, & As., 1960; Morse & Reimer, 1956).

The Managerial Grid

The interactive effect of the leader and the
organization is logically considered in the Managerial Grid
concept developed by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1978).
The Managerial Grid consists of a vertical axis for "concern
for people" and a horizontal axis for "concern for
production." Each axis is divided into a nine-point scale
reflecting degrees of concern for the two factors. Thus,
there are 81 possible relationships between the concern for
production and people.

Five of the major styles of leadership are the
following: the grid style 1.1 is impoverished management,
or laissez-faire management—low concern for people and
production. Style 1.9 is country club management—high
concern for employees but low concern for production. Style 9.1 is task or authoritarian management—high concern for production and efficiency but low concern for employees. Style 5.5 is middle-of-road management or organizational management—an intermediate amount of concern for both production and employee satisfaction. Style 9.9 is team or democratic management—a high concern for both production and employee morale and satisfaction.

Blake and Mouton (1978) suggested that the 9.9 style is the most effective type of leadership behavior. In perspective, Blake and Mouton have developed an applied approach to leadership by blending theory and practice. The approach aids the manager in identification of the most effective personal leadership style and then develop a strategy for implementing it.

System 4

Rensis Likert (1961, 1967), incorporating the basic style categories of task orientations and employee orientation, devised a four-level model of management effectiveness. Likert’s work focused on various patterns of managerial and organizational leadership behaviors, structures, and controls, and the effects on employee attitudes, motivation, and perceptions. Based on a series of questionnaires that graphically illustrated organizations in terms of the different patterns, Likert identified four

In System 1, supervisors who are exploitative-authoritative leaders make all the work-relates decisions and order the subordinates to carry out the decisions. In System 2, supervisors who are benevolent-authoritative leaders issue orders, but subordinates have the freedom to discuss the orders. In System 3, supervisors who are consultative leaders set goals and issue general orders after discussing them with subordinates. In System 4, supervisors who are participative leaders trust their subordinates, and goal setting and decision making are collaborative activities.

Likert is quite clear in his preference for the ideal pattern of organization—System 4. Moreover, he argues that a change in leader behavior is one of the important determinants that can influence a shift to the System 4 pattern.

Four-Factor Theory

Bowers and Seashore (1966), who are also from the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan, believe that Likert's work and the early Ohio State work provide evidence that four factors adequately define leadership. The proposed categories of leadership behavior were labeled and defined as follows (Bowers & Seashore, 1966, p. 247):
1. Support. Behavior that enhances the feelings of personal worth and importance of the group.

2. Interaction facilitation. Behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships.

3. Goal emphasis. Behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goal or achieving excellent performance.

4. Work facilitation. Behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, and planning, and by providing resources such as tools, materials, and technical knowledge.

One benefit of this definition allows for the possibility that someone in the group other than the designated leader may share in the leadership process. A manager may ask subordinates to share in performing certain leadership functions, and in some cases subordinates may carry out the functions under personal initiative.

The four factors apparently are associated with different combinations of satisfaction and performance. The four-factor approach to date has only been evaluated in a limited number of studies and much more work is needed (Taylor, 1973).

The 3-D Management Style Theory

In the 3-D Management Style Theory, William J. Reddin was the first to add an effectiveness dimension to the task
concern and the relationship concern dimensions of earlier attitudinal models such as the Managerial Grid (Reddin, 1967). Reddin's theory is to integrate the concepts of leader style with situational demands of a specific environment. When the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation, it is termed effective when the style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed ineffective.

Reddin's three-dimensional theory of leadership is also built around (1) the tasks to be accomplished, and (2) relationships with other people (Reddin, 1970). The task-oriented approach refers to leaders who structure work relationships while the relationship-oriented approach characterizes leaders are interested in building and maintaining interpersonal relations among people. The two elements result in four basic styles of leadership: (1) high task and low relationship, (2) high task and high relationship, (3) high relationship and low task, and (4) low relationship and low task.

The three-dimensional theory is a useful model since it identifies some of the variables that are important in leadership effectiveness. In a capsule form, the theory emphasizes the importance of (1) being aware of situational problems; (2) determining the style of leadership that will be most effective in solving situational problems; and (3) being sufficiently flexible to change leadership styles in
order to achieve higher output from the subordinates (Treuatha & Newport, 1979).

Conclusion

In a careful review of the different leadership behavioral theories and research studies, Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1976) indicated a number of common threads: (1) each of the theories attempts to isolate broad dimensions of leadership behavior; (2) each of the theories has proponents who believe their approach to describing and predicting leadership effectiveness is the best; and (3) the measurement of leadership style for each of the theories is accomplished through paper and pencil questionnaire responses, and the paper and pencil method of measurement is limited and controversial. In the behavior theories, each of the approaches is associated with highly respected theories and research, and each has been studied in different organizational settings. However, the linkage between leadership and such important effectiveness indicators as production, efficiency, and satisfaction is not conclusively resolved by any of the behavior theories. In order to satisfactorily resolve the deficiencies, the situational or contingency theory of leadership has been developed.

Situational Theories

Problems with the trait and behavioral theories led
researchers to refine and refocus the study of leadership in organization. The result was increased emphasis on the important situational factors that affect the leader's attempts to influence. The situational study of leadership has concentrated on sociological variables inherent in specific groups and situations, and has taken the point of view (1) that leadership is the product of relationships in social and group situations, and (2) that leaders in different situations, may show dissimilar characteristics (Hencley, 1973). Vernon (1965) has defined situation not only by the characteristics of the environment or the "life space" in which it takes place (objective reality), but also by the perceptions of the situation provided by those interacting within it (subjective reality).

Since the situational perspective on leadership identified various factors that can influence leadership behavior, the contingency approach of leadership is developed in order to identify which of these factors is most important under a given set of circumstances and to predict the leadership style that will be most effective under those circumstances (Stoners, 1982). These perspectives emphasize that there is not "one best way" to lead in all situations; moreover, the most effective style of leadership is contingent or dependent on the situation (Bowditch & Anthony, 1985). In fact, contingency theories combined the trait approach and the behavior theories to
suggest that the most effective leaders are individuals who can adapt leadership styles to the demands of a particular situation, group, and personal values (Fiedler, 1967). An entire body of literature has grown up around various contingency approaches to organizational structure, and a host of contingency explanations of leadership have been produced.

**Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership**

Fiedler (1967) proposed the earliest and best known of the situational theories of leadership. Fiedler's model views group performance or effectiveness as dependent upon the interaction of leadership style and the favorableness of the situation. According to Fiedler's model, there are three basic situational variables that influence the favorableness of a situation for a leader (Fiedler, 1967, p. 22-32):

1. Position power. The degree to which the leader complies with and accepts his direction and leadership.
2. Task structure. The degree to which the group's task is routine and predictable.
3. Leader-member relations. The extent to which the leader "gets along" with his men and the extent to which they have confidence in him and are loyal to him.

Fiedler created a new instrument to measure leadership style on a simple scale that indicated the degree to which a man described favorably or unfavorably the least preferred co-worker (LPC)--the employee with whom the person could
work least well. A leader is asked to think of all past and present co-workers, and is instructed to select the person least compatible as a co-worker. Then the leader rates the least preferred co-worker on a questionnaire. A leader’s LPC score is obtained from responses given to a semantic differential scale. The semantic differential scale is a questionnaire composed of bipolar and adjective items; using an eight-point continuum, the leaders rate LPC as “smart/stupid,” “energetic/lazy,” “good/bad,” and so on. A leader who is critical in rating the least preferred co-worker will obtain a low LPC score, whereas a leader who is lenient in rating the co-worker will obtain a high LPC score.

Fiedler’s model suggests that an appropriate match of the leader’s style (as measured by the "LPC" score) and the situation (as determined by the interaction of three variables), leads to effective managerial performance. Fiedler’s model has been used with some success as the basis of a training program in which managers are shown how to alter the situational variables to match leadership styles, rather than modifying styles to fit the situation (Fiedler & Mahar, 1979).

Fiedler’s model and the methodology of the validation studies have been severely criticized in the last few years. Graen and his associates (1970) carried out laboratory experiments in which results were obtained strongly
contradicting the Fiedler's model. Campbell and his
associated (1970) have found that task structure seems to be
the only important factor. Chemers and Rice (1974) found
that studies in which respondents’ LPC scores are compared
with the LBDQ results have shown that the two are not
identical. Schriesheim and Kerr (1976) raised serious
questions concerning the LPC scale’s construct validity,
content validity, and predictive validity. Further, Ashour
(1973) asserted that the model is not really a theory, since
the model does not explain how a leader’s LPC score has a
causal effect on group performance. Although Fiedler (1971,
1973, 1977) has replied to most of the criticisms, the
debate over the Fiedler’s model is still continuing. As
further research is conducted, many of the questions
regarding the model’s validity and utility will probably be
resolved in the coming years (Yukl, 1981). Since Fiedler’s
research has contributed to the knowledge of leader
effectiveness, the work of Fiedler should be recognized as
extremely important.

Path-Goal Theory

The Path-Goal Theory of leadership was developed to
explain the manner by which the behavior of a leader
influences the motivation and satisfaction of subordinates.
Originally, a non-situational version of the theory was
proposed by Evans (1970). House (1971) formulated a more
elaborate version of the theory that included situational variables. Since then the theory has been refined and extended in collaboration with other researchers (House & Dessler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974; Stinson & Johnson, 1975).

Path-Goal Theory states that the functions of a leader consist largely of increasing personal rewards for subordinates for goal attainment and making the path to rewards easier to follow—by clarifying them, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route (House, 1971). The Path-Goal theory is based on the expectancy theory of motivation as proposed by Vroom (1964). Thus, the assumption is that individuals are satisfied with tasks if performance leads to desirable outcomes, and diligent work will result in desirable outcomes. The implications of the assumptions for leadership is that an individual's motivation depends on the expectation of reward and the values, or attractiveness, of that reward, and the Path-Goal Theory focuses on the leader as a source of reward. The theory attempts to predict how different types of rewards and different leadership styles affect the motivation, performance, and satisfaction of subordinates.

Research conducted to test the Path-Goal Theory has yielded mixed results. More support is found for the hypotheses related to the effects of leader behavior on
subordinate satisfaction than for the hypotheses about the
effects on subordinate motivation and performance (House,
1971). Nebeker and Mitchell (1974) found that expectancy
theory has the capacity to predict and explain leader
behavior, a finding that provides some indirect support for
the Path-Goal Theory. However, Path-Goal Theory has some
deficiencies. Schriesheim and Kerr (1976) pointed out that
the linkage between Path-Goal Theory and expectancy theory
guarantees that the former is limited by the conceptual
problems of the latter; therefore, the conceptual
underpinnings of Path-Goal Theory are certainly
questionable.

In conclusion, Path-Goal Theory has nevertheless made
several notable contributions to the understanding of
leadership: the Path-Goal theory identified key leadership
style and situational factors and has shown the interaction
of the variables in complex organizational settings. The
theory provides guidance in determining how employees will
react to certain situations and offers corresponding
suggestions of acceptable leadership behavior. Thus,
leaders can and should alter leadership styles to fit work
situations.

Situational Leadership Theory

In an attempt to explain the inconsistencies between
consideration and initiating structure, Hersey and Blanchard
(1977) formulated a contingency theory of leadership. The theory was originally called the "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership," and in the revised form is referred to as the "Situational Leadership Theory."

The situational leadership model holds that the most effective leadership style varies with the "maturity" of subordinates. Hersey and Blanchard defined maturity not as age or emotional stability but as "the capacity to set high but attainable goals (achievement-motivation), willingness and ability to take responsibility, and education and/or experience of an individual or a group" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 151). Maturity of a subordinate is measured only in relation to a particular task that the subordinate is to perform. Follower maturity involves two related components: (1) job maturity--ability and technical knowledge to do the task, and (2) psychological maturity--feeling of self-confidence and self-respect about oneself as an individual (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977, p. 163). A "high maturity" subordinate has the ability to do a particular task and also has a high degree of self-confidence about the task, while a "low maturity" subordinate lacks both ability and confidence.

Hersey and Blanchard (1977) believe that the relationship between a manager and subordinates moves through four phases as subordinates develop and "mature" and that managers need to vary their leadership style with each
phase. In the initial phase—when subordinates first enter the organization—a high task orientation by the manager is most appropriate. In the second phase, as subordinates begin to learn tasks, task-oriented management remains essential, because subordinates are not yet willing or able to accept full responsibility; the manager can also start to use employee-oriented behaviors. In the third phase, the subordinates' ability and achievement motivation are increased, and subordinates actively begin to seek greater responsibility; the manager will no longer need to be directive. In the final phase, as subordinates gradually become more confident, self-directing, and experienced, the manager can reduce the amount of support and encouragement. The motivation, ability, and experience of subordinates must constantly be assessed in order to determine which style combination would be most appropriate. If the style is appropriate, subordinates were not only be motivated but will be aided in the move toward maturity. The manager who aids subordinates in the development of efficient task orientation and self-confidence will constantly change leadership style to fit the situation.

The situational theory emphasizes that treatment of each subordinate separately is essential, and to change treatments as the situation changes. Furthermore, the theory also advances the rather innovative proposition that leaders have another option besides just adapting to the
present situation, namely, changing the situation by building the skills and confidence of subordinates.

The Vroom-Yetton Decision-Process Theory

The Vroom-Yetton decision-process theory (Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Vroom, 1984) is the most recent of the contingency theories to be examined. The decision-process theory attempts to determine the degree to which the leader should share decision-making power with subordinates. This theory differs from other contextual models in that situational characteristics are considered attributes of the particular problem at hand rather than more general characteristics of role expectation and situation status.

The central criterion for judging leadership effectiveness in the Vroom-Yetton model is decision effectiveness. The theory indicates that there are three classes of outcomes that bear on the ultimate effectiveness of decisions (Vroom & Yetton, 1973, p. 20):

1. Decision quality--referring to the extent to which decisions under consideration would make a difference to the organization.
2. Decision acceptance--referring to the degree of subordinate commitment to implement a decision effectively.
3. Time required to reach a decision--referring to how important it is for decisions to be made slowly not methodically versus quickly.

A key role of the administrator in the decision-making theory is the task of correctly diagnosing a particular
problem that is being faced in order to choose an appropriate leadership style.

For the purpose of selecting an appropriate decision style, Vroom and Yetton have suggested several decision rules aimed at simplifying the process. The rules are expressed in the form of a decision tree, represented horizontally on a graph. The decision tree allows leaders to select a strategy by answering a series of questions relating to the decision roles. To use the model, one starts at the left-hand side of the diagram asking oneself the appropriate question each time one encounters a box. The problem attributes are expressed in the form of yes-no question. One answer determines the path through the tree which eventually leads to the prescribed decision process.

The Vroom and Yetton theory has not been researched sufficiently to test the model in entirety. House and Kerr (1976) pointed out that one of the problems in applying the model is likely to be its lack of parsimony. A limitation of the model is the narrow focus upon decision-making as the central contest in which leadership is displayed. However, this model is still a convenient guide for leaders selecting a decision style. By following the analytical approach, leaders have an opportunity to select a style that should result in decisions that are more rational and effective.
Conclusion

Current research in leadership is now almost entirely directed toward situational studies (Schriesheim, Tolliver, & Behling, 1980). The situational theories examine the interrelationships among leader and subordinate behaviors or characteristics and a given situation(s). Four situational theories of leadership attempt to identify which of these situational factors is most important and to predict which leadership style will be most effective in a given situation. The four theories are in agreement with the facts that effective leadership depends upon the situation, and there is no "one best way to lead." Although most of the situational models have not been fully tested, the existent research generally supports the notion that a situational view of leadership is necessary to portray accurately the complexities involved in the leadership process.

Leadership Styles

Efforts have been made to categorize leadership based on what a leader does and how he relates to followers (Carlisle, 1982). The approach to understanding leadership has concentrated on the leader directions to others—styles. Leadership style has been defined as "the underlying need-structure of the individual which motivates behavior in various leadership situations (Fiedler, 1967, p. 36)."
Leadership style thus refers to the consistency of goals or needs over different situations.

The earliest use of the word "style" to describe a characteristic manner of behavior seems to have been by Weber (Boles & Davenport, 1975), who categorized styles as traditional, bureaucratic, and charismatic. Weber's assumption apparently was that style is a personality characteristic rooted in the leader's perception as to the source of authority. The traditional style was described as autocratic and the charismatic was considered to have a mystic quality that did not agree with Weber's personal views of what should be. Weber seemed to prefer the bureaucracy style.

In the early 1930s, research studies by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) at the University of Iowa made use of synthetic styles of behavior used by adults in supervising the activities of children. These studies divided leadership into styles based on the method used by the leader to exert authority and power. Following the study, the most traditional patterns for dealing with leadership style have been to describe a demonstrative behavior as being autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire. The autocratic, or authoritarian, leaders centralize power and decision-making in themselves, giving orders without consulting others. The autocratic leader structures the complete work situation for employees who do as requested
(Davis, 1977). Since all work revolves around the leader who is task-oriented and shows limited concern for subordinates' feelings, activity is considered leader-concerned. Communication is generally one-way—from the leader to the followers. The democratic leader, on the other hand, decentralizes power and authority and is concerned with obtaining group involvement. Most major decisions are made after discussion with group members with communication open and two-way (Carlisle, 1982). Employees are broadly informed about conditions affecting jobs, which encourages ideas and suggestions. The emphasis is on cooperation and participation to achieve the maximum potential of the group. The laissez-faire leader adopts a "hands off" attitude and helps only when asked (Miller, 1975). The leader depends largely upon the group to establish goals and work out problems. Group members train themselves and provide self-motivation. The leader exists primarily as a contact with outside persons to bring the group the information and resources it needs to accomplish its job. Communication is open, and since the group members make most decisions, personal interests are taken into consideration.

A number of studies, including Lewin, Lippitt, and White's study (1935), indicate that the democratic leadership style is best in most situations. Kahn and Katz (1960) found that employee-oriented leaders tend to have
high-performing groups. Likert (1961) found that employee-centered leaders achieve more favorable results. Moreover, Katz, Maccoby, and Morse's study (1950) confirmed the implication that democratic leadership was best. However, several researchers concluded that an authoritarian leadership results in higher productivity than does a more participative style. For example, Filley, House and Kerr (1976) concluded that when subordinates' task demands are clear and routine to the subordinate, participative leadership is not likely to have an effect because there is little participation. Stogdill (1974, p. 370) reviewed several studies of leadership style and summarized that "neither democratic nor autocratic supervision can be advocated as a method for increasing productivity, but member satisfaction is associated with a democratic style for supervision." In brief, the styles of leadership are related to the conditions associated with different organizations.

One of the first attempts to differentiate between leadership styles was through the leadership behavior continuum developed by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973). Tannenbaum and Schmidt depicted a broad range of styles as a continuum: the left end of the continuum is the authoritarian, boss-centered manager; the other end is the democratic, subordinates-centered manager. Various possible combinations of leadership styles exist between these two
extremes. A particular pattern of leadership behavior is related to the degree of authority exercised by the leader coupled with the amount of authority granted to subordinates. Behavior at the extreme left of the continuum characterizes the leader who exercises a high degree of authority and control. Conversely, the democratic leader on the extreme right exhibits a behavior pattern that grants subordinates freedom to participate in the decision-making process. Regardless of the leadership style selected, the manager should be sufficiently flexible to adapt to different situations. The continuum strongly emphasizes the interdependencies among managers, nonmanagers, and the situation and concerns the power and influence of managers and nonmanagers over one another.

In addition, the Tannenbaum and Schmidt continuum implies the need for managers to understand themselves, the capabilities of subordinates, groups, the organization and goals, and broad social environment in which management operates. A knowledge and understanding of these elements helps the leader choose a style that is appropriate and effective in achieving goals. In short, the Tannenbaum and Schmidt continuum emphasizes a flexible leadership style and the importance of assessing the relevant forces affecting a particular style.

Miller (1975) found a variety of personalistic leadership styles in educational administration. Miller
indicates that "a person might want to develop a matrix of styles depending upon the need and circumstance of the given situation" (Miller, 1975, p. 32). Miller labels seven style of personal leadership styles as paternalistic-authoritarian, intuitive-rationalistic, charismatic, bureaucratic-managerial, pragmatic functional, political legalistic, and personalistic humanistic.

Davis (1977) pointed out that leadership styles describe a leader's predominant way of acting with a group. Leaders use different leadership styles, and the style tends to build different organizational climates. Davis divided leadership into three styles. Motivational styles ranges along a continuum from strongly positive to strongly negative. Power styles range from autocratic through participative to free-rein. Orientation styles are consideration and initiating structure.

Owens (1979) defined five leadership styles, which comprise the matrix: (1) the autocratic leader, (2) the bureaucratic leader, (3) the diplomatic leader, (4) the participative leader, and (5) the free-rein leader. Owens rejects the concept of a "best" or "ideal" leadership style and suggests that the "best" leadership style depends on: (a) the individual personality of the manager himself; (b) the individual followers--the class of people and the type of work performed; and (c) the particular situation and circumstances on a current given day or at a particular hour.
The study of Astin and Scherrei (1980) concluded that there are four presidential types which are the bureaucrat, the intellectual, the egalitarian, and the counselor. Astin and Scherrei also identified five types of administrations which are hierarchical, humanistic, entrepreneurial, insecure, and task-oriented.

Duncan (1981) mentioned that when the people talk about the way a person leads, the people are really looking at the power of influence the leader has in comparison with group members. Duncan has stated "there is an almost infinitive range of leadership styles" (Duncan, 1981, p. 221). For simplicity, Duncan discussed three common styles: the autocratic, the democratic, and the laissez-faire.

Hodgetts (1981) identified the leadership styles as authoritarian paternalistic, and participative. Although many authors like a participative approach, Hodgetts advises that participative leadership is not always ideal and that special conditions have to be present for success.

Carlisle (1982) suggested the use of substitute terminology in order to avoid the value connotations associated with the political terms that were originally adopted. Thus, Carlisle distinguished the following leadership styles: directive (autocratic), participative (democratic), and free-rein (laissez-faire). Carlisle compared the advantages and limitations of each leadership style and concluded that there is a strong preference for
the participative approach among behaviorally oriented management writers.

Preston and Zimmer (1983) described effective leadership as a function of the leader's style, the nature of the followers, and the characteristics of the situation. Preston and Zimmer suggested the following leadership styles: autocratic (autocratic, tough autocrat, and benevolent autocrat), consultative, democratic or free-rein, manipulative, and expert leadership.

For a half-century, the study of leadership has centered on autocratic versus democratic approaches; on questions about the locus of decision-making-directive versus participative; or on questions about behavior-initiation versus consideration (Bass, 1985). Some researchers have tried to break through the paradigm. The new concept of leadership styles--transactional leadership and transformational leadership--are presented by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). According to Burns (1978, p.4), transactional leaders "approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contribution." Such transaction comprises the bulk of the relationship among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties. To extend the definition to supervisory-subordinate relations, transactional leaders serve to recognize and clarify the role and task requirements in order for the
subordinates to reach the desired outcomes. Transactional leaders also recognize the needs of subordinates and offer clarification of the solution to satisfy the wants and needs.

Unlike the transactional leader who indicates how current needs of followers can be fulfilled, the transformational leader sharply arouses or alters the strength of needs which may have lain dormant (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders attempt and succeed in raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness. Such guidance requires a leader with vision, self-confidence, and the inner strength to work successfully for that which is right or good, not for that which is popular or acceptable according to the established wisdom of the time. In summary, the transformational leader is one who motivates group members to do more than was originally expected. The original performance expectation is based on the group members' original level of confidence in reaching desired, designated outcomes by means of the performance.

Tichy and Devanna (1986) mentioned that transactional leaders were fine for the earlier era of expanding markets and nonexistent competition. Such leaders managed what private businesses and made no effort to market change. However, transformational leadership is about change, innovation, and entrepreneurship, and is a behavior of
process capable of being learned and managed. Transformational leadership is a leadership process that is systematic, consisting of purposeful and organized search for changes, systematic analysis and the capacity to move resources from areas of lesser to great productivity. Thus, transformational leadership is the key to revitalizing large organizations (Tichy & Ulrich, 1984), and leaders must develop a new vision for their organizations, mobilize employees to accept and work toward achieving the new vision, and institutionalize the needed changes.

In conclusion, although many researchers categorize various leadership styles, none of the leadership patterns and styles is a recipe for success or failure. The use of leadership style should be determined by many factors in the situation, such as the maturity of the staff, the experience and the dedication of employees, and the leader's own traits and abilities. Leadership styles must adjust to fit new situations, new challenges, and new people. A static style of leadership may be worse for a leader than showing no leadership at all (Preston & Zimmer, 1983).

A Brief History of the Development of the Dean of Students in America

The dean of students in an institution of higher education is commonly perceived as the "chief student personnel officer" (Blue, 1972). The title varies from
institution to institution. Some of the synonyms are: Dean of Student Affairs, Dean of Student Activities, Vice-President for Student Activities (Affairs), Vice-President for Student Development, Chief Student Officers, and Student Affairs Administrator.

The term "dean" had a meaning and tradition in higher education prior to being used for student affairs purposes (Dinniman, 1977). Dibden (1968) declared that the term "dean" evolved in medieval universities, which had appropriated the name from ecclesiastical presidents, who in turn had used a name borrowed from Roman antiquity. The term "dean" was used to identify the early educational officials responsible for discipline at Cambridge and Oxford (Dinniman, 1977). In the German universities, the dean was a member of the faculty elected for a set period of time to represent the university officially and to be responsible for supervising the faculty and students (MacMitchell, 1963). Thus, historically, the term has roots in the supervision both of academic instruction and of non-classroom aspects of student life.

According to Cowley (1940), the first dean appointed in an American institution seems to have been Samuel Bard, after whom Bard College, New York, is named. Bard took office in 1792 as Dean of the medical faculty of Columbia University. The first officer to hold the title of Dean of the Faculty in a collegiate institution in the United States
was appointed by President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University in 1870. Eliot appointed Ephraim Gurney, Dean of the College. Gurney, who can be looked upon as the forerunner of the present-day dean, had responsibilities both in academic supervision and in student discipline.

In 1890, Eliot created two deanships— one, entitled the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, to supervise instruction; and the other retained the title of Dean of the Harvard College, to supervise student relations. LeBarron Briggs, who was appointed to be the post of dean became the first dean in the history of American higher education to be solely responsible for student personnel administration. The first dean of men, Thomas Arkle Clark, was appointed in 1901 at the University of Illinois (Turner, 1955). Earlier, Clark had held the title Dean of Undergraduates. The dean of the men's role was to provide authority and responsibility for "handling" problems associated with students' adaptation to college life (Barr, Keating, & Associates, 1985). Clark's job dealt with discipline, academic counseling, housing, and student life. Definitions of the position of dean of men began to take shape as the deans examined the roles in the period from 1910 to 1930. A typical definition was "that an officer in administration who undertakes to assist the men students to achieve the utmost of which they are individually capable through personal effort in their behalf, and through mobilizing in
their behalf all the forces within the university which can be made to serve this end" (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978, p. 14).

The predecessors of the deans of women--lady principals, matrons or advisors of women--were originally appointed to supervise dormitories (Holmes, 1939). Later, dean of women also supervised all boarding houses, sorority houses and clubs which were used to house women students not accommodated in campus dormitories. Through the maintenance of proper living conditions, the deans of women contributed materially to the good health of the women students, thus enabling them to face the strain of higher education at the pace of men. The title Dean of Women was first given to Marion Talbot at the University of Chicago in 1892. The first deans of women faced multiple expectations. The dean of women was expected to deal with all of the conditions facing women students in a male-dominated culture and, at the same time, champion the intellectual and personal ambitions of young women.

Because the growth of the institution was so rapid and the consequent complexity great, an introduction of a new administrator to study the problem and to undertake certain specific minor duties was necessary. The first dean of students in the United States was appointed in 1902 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Massachusetts, by President Henry S. Pritchett, where the
work of supervision of and consultation with students was assigned to a new officer, the Dean of Students, Professor Alfred E. Burton (Prescott, 1954). Although the first office of the dean of students appeared in 1902, at that time only a few deans of students had been appointed in colleges and universities. Lloyd-Jones and Smith (1938) analyzed 521 college and university catalogues for the year 1932 to determine the total number of student personnel workers employed in the institutions. The study found 34% of the student personnel workers with the title dean of students. The greatest growth in use of the title "dean of students" was accomplished during the second quarter of the century (MacMitchell, 1963). Lange (1944, p.383) stated that by 1944 the dean of students was "emerging as a major administrative officer charged with the responsibility of coordinating all personnel services on the campus."

Smith (1961) investigated the data compiled in the Education Directory for the years 1940, 1945, 1950, 1955, and 1960; and the results indicated that substantial gains had been made in the state universities toward establishing a positive environment for the chief student personnel officer to direct and coordinate all of the student personnel services. Smith contended that the dean of students was being recognized by the more prominent state universities as having an important function in the student personnel program.
In addition, Crookston (1974) examined the nomenclature of chief student personnel administrators (CSPA) in various studies from 1950 through 1972 and found that, approximately 50% of the time, the most frequently used title was "Dean of Students." In another nationwide survey Brooks and Avila (1974) found that 49% of the CSPAs use the title "Dean of Students."

However, Paul (1980) found that only 24% used the title of "Dean of Students," and 76% used the title of "Vice-President for Student Affairs." Recently, however, Rickard (1985) investigated titles of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs). The results indicated that the majority (58%) of CSAOs held the title of "Dean of Students."

Arbuckle (1953) stated that not all of the studies concerning the prominence of dean of students in colleges and universities produced the same results. Depending on type, size, and geographic location of the institutions there was a substantial difference as to whether there was or was not an office of dean of students. However, the title "Dean of Students" is now in popular use.

Functions of the Dean of Students

A more viable definition of the job of the deans of students is that consideration must also be given to the functions actually performed (Dutton, 1973). Analysis enables the deans to identify proper and improper use of time and to make adjustments to function more effectively.
The dean of students reports directly to the administrative head of the institution and coordinates the functions of student service offices subordinate to him. There are various functions in relation to the dean's responsibilities. A dean performs differentiated roles depending on the institutional setting and level and breadth of responsibility. Deans of students in large institutions have responsibilities which differ from the responsibilities in smaller institutions. Thus, a better understanding of the many functions that determine the role will better equip the dean of students to perform appropriately and make necessary role modifications. The following research has explored the different categories of the functions of the dean of students.

Williams (1957) found that the main function of the student personnel administrator was coordination and administration of the personnel program, whereas a group of well-trained and highly qualified staff members performed the duties of the various officers. The personnel services provided in the institutions were fairly uniform and included housing, placement, extracurricular activities, financial aid, health services, orientation, counseling, testing, and the maintenance of student records.

Beck (1959) found that the responsibilities of deans of students included (1) executing faculty policy concerning scholarships, probation, suspension, and dismissal; (2)
having the responsibility for discipline on academic matters; (3) evaluating re-admission applications; (4) planning chapel programs; and (5) supervising religious programs on campus.

Swan (1959) found that the areas of student personnel work which were functions of a majority of personnel deans included admission and screening of prospective students, new-students orientation, counseling, student activities and government, student housing, health services, scholarships, financial aid, and student discipline.

A study by Riggs (1960) found that the areas of responsibility for the personnel officers varied in dimension, but that the functions performed most frequently were in the areas of counseling, general administration of the college, placement, discipline, admissions and pre-admissions, student activities, orientation of new students, and financial aid.

Bursch (1962) felt that student services can be grouped under three general headings: (1) student welfare services, (2) student activities services, and (3) student control services. Bursch indicated that as the role of dean of students has become more sharply defined over the years, the function of providing advice and guidance has taken on primary significance.

The study of Smith (1961) indicated that a major proportion of the dean’s time is spent with individual
counseling, supervising the personnel program, committee work, public relations, administrating the personnel programs, and coordinating personnel services with academic departments.

Stanbury (1965) indicated that functions for which the deans were responsible included admissions and records, articulation with both feeder secondary schools and surrounding colleges, follow-up studies of former students, college publications, and student program planning and registration. Deans were line officials, responsible to the chief administrative officer of the college for the planning, development, supervision, and evaluation of student services.

The study of Arend (1974) indicated that the primary functions of the chief student personnel administrators are to assist students and administer the student personnel program. The primary functions require skills in relating well with students, providing supervisory leadership for the personnel staff, and relating well to the total campus community.

Dutton (1973) divided the functions of the student affairs administrator into three major areas: planning or critical decision-making functions, administrative functions, and direct educational functions. The planning decision-making functions include setting goals and priorities, formulating policy, creating and assessing
educational environments, allocating resources, and developing plans of action. The administrative functions involve coordinating, management, communication, consultation, leadership, facilitation, and process and program evaluation. The direct educational functions are teaching, counseling, program development, and services to students.

The study of Lilley (1974) indicated that the nine functions of most concern were serving as chief administrator of the student affairs unit, (1) formulating policies that affect students, (2) determining objectives, (3) preparing the budget, (4) overseeing the security staff, (5) enforcing non-academic discipline, (6) overseeing student government, (7) overseeing student-faculty liaison, (8) interpreting policy to students, and (9) advising faculty on students' needs. Lilley concluded that the role of the chief student personnel officer appeared to be one of coordinating and administering a heterogeneous group of functions.

Brodzinsk (1980) found the functions of the chief student personnel officer which were not included in the 20 areas listed on the questionnaire were religious programs and student recruitment. Brodzinsk also found that chief student personnel officers in the two and four-year sectors have similar functional responsibilities.

Unlike most researchers, Hecklinger (1972) advocated a
differing viewpoint. Hecklinger indicated that the early dean's major concerns were about matters of student conduct, decorum, social life and generally keeping students in line. Thus, with the development of more professionalism among deans and the changing attitudes toward the place of young people in the society, the dean's function became more "educational" in nature, and a variety of new services affecting student came under his auspices. Hecklinger suggested that elimination of the custodial and disciplinary function as well as the supervisory function. Thus, the functions of dean of students involved general services, instructional services, and administrative services. General services involve health service, counseling, advisement, recreation, financial assistance, career counseling and placement, orientation, and admissions. Instructional services include course organization, curriculum, registration, library, and possibly research. Administrative services include building and grounds, dormitories, student union, budget, purchasing, development, students, security, and community relations.

The result of the research studies above demonstrate that there is no single standard function for deans of students. In addition, the functions of the deans of students are so complex that the deans must execute various roles. However, the research also reveals that the dean of students occupies a vital place in the institutions and is
in a position to contribute much to personnel adjustment, growth of the institution, and development of the student. Thus, effective and appropriate behavior in the position of the dean is the critical issue to the deans of students.

The Role of the Dean of Students

One characteristic of group structure that is often used in analyzing behavior in and about groups is the set of roles defined for group members. A role is a set of expectations about the behavior of someone occupying a given position in a social unit (Carlisle, 1982). Within an organization, formal or informal, a variety of functions must be performed, and roles must be enacted by the members.

In a 1970 NASPA study of the assumption and beliefs of members of the academic community, Dutton, Appleton, and Birch (1970) studied the perceptions of the role of the dean of students held by presidents, faculty, and students. The researchers found that the dean's primary responsibility should be to help students, rather than to perform administrative tasks. The findings gave strong support for the view that the dean should be an advocate for students, and that the dean's role should be so constructed as to reduce involvement in conflict with students and to ensure student accessibility. The finding also offers support for the position that the dean's personal values—rather than the dictates of a president—should guide behavior.
However, students express greater support for a dean's commitment to "the students" and his non-involvement in control, discipline and value enforcement. Presidents consistently seem to attach more importance to administrative tasks, integration of counseling and discipline, and the upholding of institutional students and values. The study of Dutton et al. (1970, p. 19) summarized the "character" of the dean of students as follows:

He expresses a strong commitment to students and their welfare. He feels that social maturity and value development are institutional concerns integral to intellectual attainment. He supports allowing students freedom to develop their abilities, to make decisions, and to exercise their rights. He also feels that the counseling relationship should be confidential, that provision for privacy is important, that students have the maturity to participate in policy formulation, and that they should have a more significant role in institutional decision-making. Clearly, he expresses concern for the student and his development through provision for freedom to test and to experiment.

Blue (1972) in an extension of the study by Dutton et al. (1970), found significant differences in assumptions and beliefs of selected academic community members regarding the role of dean of students in 16 North Carolina colleges and universities. Reference groups in different types of institutions appeared to hold similar role expectations for the dean of students.

Similarly, the study of Lane (1969) indicated that the role of the deans of students in the two-year public colleges in New York state was primarily that of an administrator, who spent more time planning programs,
supervising professional workers and working with other administrators than the time spent counseling and assisting students and working with student groups. The respondents in Lane's study generally reported that leadership skills administrative theory and practice were the most important qualities for individuals entering their position.

However, one study produced a different result. Anton (1976) found eight identifiable sources for role definition perceived by chief student personnel administrators: (1) administrative supervisor, (2) administrative peers, (3) student affairs staff, (4) faculty, (5) written job descriptions (6) fellow student affairs administrators outside the incumbent's institution, (7) organizations and associations, and (8) the "self." Based on the findings, Anton concluded that students played no part in defining the role of the chief student personnel administrators.

The data indicate that the results of the studies of the assumptions and beliefs of students, staff, faculty, presidents, and deans of students treat important issues in higher education and--perhaps, just as important--present varying perceptions of the role, convictions, and perspectives of the dean of students. An important revelation of research is that presidents, administrators, faculty, and students--with varying degrees of awareness--have perceptions that influence behavior in response to the role of deans of students. Therefore, to know the
relationship between the dean of students and these various groups can clarify the dean's different roles.

Historically, the dean of students was appointed to serve as the president's alter ego in matters involving nonacademic student life: the position of dean of students began as an agent of the president. The role of the dean of student developed as the symbol of in loco parentis in the college or university environment (Lavender, 1972). Many presidents expect the dean to forestall student complaints and handle them, giving the president some time to prepare when student violence is on the way (Hodgkinson, 1970). However, if the presidents view the dean of students as an unobtrusive extension of campus security, then various student affairs functions are likely to be perceived by students and faculty as events under the control of administrative agents who work at the will and pleasure of the president. Therefore, Hodgkinson (1970) indicated that "no president admitted having any kind of vital relationship with the dean of students." Consequently the old in loco parentis role will shift to a law and order perspective, particularly with the increased level of violence in society and on many campuses (Rickard, 1972). Another role-conflict at several institutions, according to Hodgkinson (1970), involves the desire of the president to take a "hard line" in disciplinary matters to please off-campus constituencies, while the dean feels that the punishment is too harsh.
After World War II, the baby boom, the GI Bill, civil rights legislation, the student movement, and other significant changes brought higher education into a state of transition. All university presidents have not recognized the ways in which these changes have made the student deanship more professional. The dean no longer controls students, but attempts instead to manage crises, resolve conflicts, adjudicate differences, describe reality, and provide environments for growth as well as balancing the budget (Tilley, 1979).

Recently, according to the study of Kinnick and Bollheimer (1984), university presidents have identified that the retention of students, financial aid, future enrollments, and recruitment/admission standards are key issues. Presidents are also concerned with the role, function, and contribution that student affairs make toward the institution. Thus, both presidents and deans of students need to address the major issues. One key aspect of the results of Kinnick and Bollheimer’s (1984) study is that presidents expressed overall confidence in the dean of student’s skills and expertise to deal with the identified most important issues for the 1980s. In addition, Valerio (1980) pointed out that the relationship with the college president is one of the single most important determinants of effectiveness of the chief student personnel officer and therefore the student affairs division.
Gaining the cooperation of the faculty is an important task of the dean of students and the staff members. As the chief representative of personnel services, the dean of students take the initiative and is the leader in soliciting the assistance of the faculty in personnel work. However, as Elsner and Ames (1983) indicated, many faculty do not fully understand the impact of student services in the enhancement of student life. The dean of students and staff members should take every opportunity, both in general faculty meetings and divisional meetings, to communicate to the faculty the impact of programs and services. The importance of assessment, career guidance, financial assistance, and placement of students after graduation, as well as the advising and registration functions, must be communicated to the faculty (Welch, 1986). Not only should the student services be supported to improve the quality of the college experience, but also the value of services to reduce attrition rates.

Joseph Katz views deans of students as contributors to the improvement of teaching and the students' academic learning environment (Tilley, 1979). The shift in attention from offering services to the learner to helping faculty understand and adapt to student learning styles is a new concept in student services. The deans of students skilled in working with students are now invited to help enhance classroom communication and to improve the relationship
between learning and teaching styles. Furthermore, the student personnel services areas can provide student data that will be helpful in the instructional area (Welch, 1986). Since student profiles are constantly changing, to supply the information of the student to the faculty will assist professors in course and program development.

Woolf (1949) recommended that the development of a faculty advisor program as an excellent method to be employed by the dean of students in order to establish rapport and develop a positive attitude in the faculty toward the personnel program. The dean of students has the responsibility to supervise the program so that both the students and faculty will feel that a definite contribution can be made through the faculty advisor program.

In brief, deans of students discover that working cooperatively with faculty is the best way to meet student educational needs. As committed to the belief that the mission of the institution involves teaching, learning, and research will ensure a compatible working relationship with the faculty. Assisting the faculty to learn more effective teaching methods, providing information and advice for them while they work with individual students, and responding to inquires will build a substantive relationship and recognition of the competency (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978).

The dean of students must keep in close personal
contact with staff members if the task of student personnel services is to be carried out effectively and efficiently. Williamson (1961) mentioned that day-to-day informal conferences with different staff members not only brings the dean up-to-date, but also conveys a feeling of genuine interest in staff problems and difficulties.

A bewildering array of considerations is described by the deans as being of utmost importance in staff leadership roles (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978). The dean of students should not display dogmatic authority and at the same time expect full cooperation from staff members. Response of colleagues or staff based on respect, not awe, enhances authority. Staff effectiveness calls for skilled and competent leadership. The dean's enthusiasm, perceiving the long future, challenges the staff to greater productivity and encouragement when progress seems to lag. Without playing a note, the conductor uses skill to coordinate the various competencies of the staff upon a single important theme. Moreover, one cue to identifying effective student affairs staff leadership is to discover more competent staff than the staff leader in several skill areas. To assume that the dean is a financial aids expert, medical doctor, student recruiter, researcher and motivator extraordinaire is ridiculous.

The student affairs staff has an obligation both to staff members and clientele to refine skills, develop new
responses to changing circumstances, and otherwise actively engage in personal and professional activities (Canon, 1983). A realistic method to improve competencies in staff members is through a comprehensive development program. Staff development is defined as a planned experience designed to change behavior and results in professional and personal growth and improved organizational effectiveness (Merkle & Artman, 1983). The responsibility for initiating and maintaining a staff development program rests squarely on the shoulders of the chief student affairs officer. If the chief of student affairs has a high priority to staff development through words and deeds, staff development efforts can be effective. Canon (1977) suggested that the major roles of the chief administrator in staff development are to support the concept philosophically and financially, to ensure program consistency, and to serve as a model by participating in staff development activities. In addition, Bender (1980, p. 8) succinctly summarized the role of the dean of students in staff development in the statement, "without the leadership from chief student affairs officers, staff development programming will continue to be rhetoric rather than a reality."

Traditionally, universities have tended to employ a pattern of administration which has involved controlling students' actions, directing and modifying student behavior to fit the needs of the university and, to a resonable
degree, to accommodate the needs of students (Clemens & Akers, 1973). How can the dean of students break out of the traditional control-oriented role and become free to assist in student development? An attitudinal set of deans of students must be characterized by student involvement and more self-determination for students. The dean of students should encourage communication between students to inform other members of the campus population of activities of the student services. Motivational tasks to encourage the potential for independent development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, and the readiness to direct their efforts toward appropriate educational goals will ensue (Clemens & Akers, 1973).

A strong trend has been developing which is leading toward the student development approach (Chandler, 1973). Student development is concerned with the intellectual, emotional, moral, physical and social dimensions of student life (Brown, 1980). A critical dimension of the development is of personal identity wherein the value system is surrounded by rules (Thomas, Murrell, & Chickering, 1982). In addition, one study (Dutton, Appleton, & Birch, 1970) believed that social maturity as value development should be an integral part of students' education. Thus, student development and value development are inextricably bound together. The dean of student plays the most powerful role in the transmission of values through modeling. The dean
also serves as climate setter and community builder, which in turn lends support to a set of values which honor certain educational objectives (Thomas, Murrell, & Chickering, 1982). Another role for the dean of students in the purveying of values is that of advocate. A final role might be that of the performance monitor and supporter of research and evaluation related to the developmental outcomes of various student personnel activities.

Finally, the dean of students contributes to the learning environment through support programs and services which are designed to assist students in clarifying and achieving educational goals and the institution in maintaining a learning environment conducive to attaining its educational purposes (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978). To contribute to the learning environment, the dean must be much more than a "manager of services" and a "controller of behavior." Fundamentally, the dean must be a policy strategist, evaluator, change agent, and authority on human development as well as an effective administrator of programs and services. The dean must also be a mentor, a model upon which others may depend. In order to perform the multiple functions, the dean must understand and be able to articulate theories of human and community development, to assess and interpret student needs, and to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and services in meeting needs and goals.
From the analysis of the relationship between the dean of students and the reference group, the conclusion is that the role of dean of students is one of widely conflicting expectations, and that the expectations may provide a basis of understanding of the reason why deans experience role ambiguity, confusion, and sometimes conflict with members of the academic community (Eddy, Dameron, & Borland, 1980). According to Hodgkinson's study (1970), faculty, administrators, department chairmen, and students on college campuses across the country express considerable animosity toward deans of students who, like business managers, are perceived as heads of "service areas." Hodgkinson concluded that student personnel is a "never-never land"; the faculty views student personnel as administration and the administration views student personnel as faculty. The dean's position is plagued with misconcepts.

In order to be effective in the constantly changing role of dean of students, the dean must be aware of role changes and conflicts and complexities of values and convictions. Arend's (1974) study aided the dean in perceiving the role of deans, the changes which are taking place and the reasons for the changes. Arend indicated that the dean must be flexible and innovative in order to change structure and create new programs.

Similarly, Rodger (1963) found that (1) student personnel deans in smaller institutions do more counseling
with students than the deans in larger institutions; (2) student personnel deans in smaller institutions are comparatively ineffective in developing cooperative relationships; and (3) student personnel deans in larger institutions are more ineffective in conducting investigations of reports of student misconduct than their counterparts in smaller institutions.

Mackey (1977) examined three areas of responsibility of the dean of students: student advocacy, social maturity and value development, and governance. Mackey found that reference group members held similar expectations more frequently on issues concerning the dean's role in the social maturity and value development area, less frequently on issues in the student advocacy area, and least frequently on issues in the governance area.

Mackey (1977) found that issues producing the greatest amount of conflicting expectations among reference group members involved the dean's role with regard to (a) influencing students to adapt to the institutions' values; (b) the degree of commitment given to the individual needs of students; (c) the regulation of student conduct; (d) the priority given to personal relationships with students versus administrative tasks; and (e) consultation with students and faculty when formulating student affairs policy. Mackey also suggested that theoretical propositions in the literature concerning role conflict and reference
group consensus were applicable to the role to be performed by deans of students, and that an understanding of the events should promote better understanding of the dean's roles and improve performance. In addition, the changing expectations of reference group members can affect a dean's ability to perform.

The study of Matthay (1976) gained the conclusions as follows: (1) whereas faculty members and student leaders indicated a noticeable lack of knowledge concerning the dean's current activities, deans and presidents seemed to know the functions for which the dean is responsible; (2) there was potential for deans to experience a minimal amount of self role and intra-role conflict; and (3) a majority of respondents were satisfied with the job performance of deans of students, which supports the contention that deans must be somewhat effective in present positions.

The study of Moore (1976) indicated that institutional largeness and complexity have impacted the dean of students' role by adding more functions, increasing social distance in relationship to students, and emphasizing managerial as opposed to parental concerns. The view of the role of dean of students and the incumbent dean by the president was found to be the most significant determinant of the effectiveness of the dean; further, presidents typically exhibited little interest in student affairs. Faculty were found to have little understanding of the dean of students.
and to hold a traditional view of the role. Finally, the study concluded that students have impacted the dean's role by the changing views of authority, the introduction of values brought by students new to higher education, and greater and more formalized participation of students in institutional governance.

The studies above suggest that, according to different situations, the dean of students plays different roles. These situations are influenced by some factors that tend to determine administrative behavior. Dutton (1973, pp. 10-11) listed these factors as follows:

1. Values, conviction, aspirations, and needs;
2. Educational philosophy;
3. Goals, objectives, philosophy, traditions, life style, and governance patterns of the institution;
4. The perception of others with regard to the responsibilities and effectiveness of the student affairs administrator; and
5. The primary role of the student affairs administrator.

These factors influence the different roles the dean of students possesses. However, no matter what the role of dean of students, the critical role of the dean of students is to assist in creating the coordination and opportunities for reinforcing the intellectual, cultural, and artistic purposes of the institution (Kauffman, 1964).

Qualities of the Dean of Students

There is a recurrent theme in the literature that deans are "born and not made." The contention is that certain
personality characteristics, more indicative of a dean's character than of training, contain the key to effectiveness. While segments of this group may concede that training is helpful, training is perceived as neither necessary nor sufficient and totally inadequate as a substitute for key personal characteristics.

Although, there are researchers who accept the basic assumption that professional training is desirable, the researchers differ on theoretical or philosophical grounds as to the nature of effective training. The relative emphasis to be given to counseling, personnel administration, educational theory, or philosophy, and behavioral sciences, has often been debated.

The study of Rhatigan (1968) found that there is an urgent need for research that relates training experiences to professional effectiveness. Rhatigan also suggested that although graduate programs designed to prepare student personnel administrators are increasingly available, there will be a continuing need to provide brief training experiences to a substantial number of personnel workers (including deans) whose formal graduate work is in an unrelated discipline.

Thrash (1965, p. 12) provided insight into some qualities of deans of students that can help students most effectively and that can be of the most significant service to the universities.
1. Integrity. Professional honesty, in a position which requires integrity in major decisions which may enhance other's lives, is vital.
2. Intelligence. Deans must prepare themselves as best they can academically, and they must continue to learn through formal and informal methods.
3. Openness. Deans must be open, accepting persons who can understand what students mean, how they feel, what they fear, and what they want to do with their lives.
4. Commitment. Commitment is courage born of knowledge. It is the will to do what one has come to know must be done. It is a deep and mature feeling of responsibility.

Astin and Scherrei (1980) indicated that effectiveness in dealing with students, interpersonal skills, cooperation, creativity, and professional or technical competence are the qualities that student affairs officers most value in subordinates. In fact, student affairs officers are more inclined to give high ratings to initiative and creativity than to the other administrators. The officers are also singular in placing a high premium on risk taking. Unlike other administrators, the dean's traits are less personal ambition, less salesmanship, less competitiveness, and less influence with administrators in power; indeed, warmth, cooperativeness, and congeniality seem to characterize the student affairs officer's mode of operation.

The Carnegie Commission's Statement of purposes for higher education (1973) may offer a platform from which a rationale for student personnel services can be developed. The statement recognizes three major doctrinal views about educational purpose: (1) concern for values; (2) concern for
evolution of knowledge; and (3) concern for society. According to Teeter (1975, pp. 71-72), student personnel administrators might extend the Carnegie Statement to the following applications in the day-to-day work of their staffs.

1. Student personnel administrators are committed to providing a campus environment which constructively assists students in their more general developmental growth.

2. Student personnel administrator are committed to the development of human capability in society at large.

3. Student personnel administrators are committed to the enlargement of educational justice wherever possible.

4. Student personnel administrators are committed to the advancement of learning and wisdom.

5. Student personnel administrators are committed to fostering individual thought and persuasion for the sake of society's self-renewal.

Dutton (1973, pp. 11-12) suggested the following roles which are needed by the student affairs administrators.

Student affairs administrators must press for a role that involves much more than control, discipline, and administration of services.

They must strive for a role that places primary emphasis on involvement in the decision making process, development of the learning environment, assessment and interpretation of student needs, and effective execution of policy and program decisions.

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

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

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

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 the president, and after 60 hours of such behavior, to still find time for the family, church, community, research, writing, professional development, and NASPA conferences.

They must have the qualities of Moses, Solomon, Hercules, and Jesus Christ, and of course, it would be helpful to be able to walk on water.

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.

Writings on Leadership in Student Personnel Services

There has been an abundance of literature in the student personnel field. However, a large majority of the periodical articles, pamphlets, and books which have been written pertain to the areas of student personnel services. There are only a few writings relating to leadership of the dean of students. There seems to have been little attention
given to the role of the leader and the impact of his leadership on student personnel programs (Parker, 1979).

Discussion of the leader's behavior in relation to his influence on subordinates and students is rare.

Williamson (1961) spoke of democratic leadership in student personnel services and looked upon leadership as a condition of policy-making regarding control of controversy and conflict. Williamson felt that the leader of a student personnel services program should anticipate "that policies will be written largely when controversy and conflict indicate the need for such policies, or when a deficiency in established policies is perceived" (Williamson, 1961, p. 288).

Mueller (1961) emphasized the importance of developing student leaders and encouraged personnel workers to learn more of the new concepts of leadership and methods of developing leaders. According to Mueller, personnel workers must understand what leadership is and recognize the special relationships which exist between a leader and the group. Mueller (1961) said that democratic leadership, as exhibited by the staff members and encouraged in the students, must also serve as a model upon which to build "leadership" qualities in personnel workers.

Gladstein (1968) made a study of doctoral research in student personnel services in 1966. In the study, covering 589 dissertations, Gladstein found that the most frequently
researched areas were a survey of services, counseling, proposed organization, and evaluation. No listing was given in this study of leadership style or behavior as such, but personnel worker characteristics were included.

O'Banion, Thurston, and Gulden (1970) believed that the leader of a student personnel program must work democratically with his staff to develop plans which will assist in implementing the goals of the college. In the same situation, a leader who is committed to the facilitation of human development will promote participative leadership among the staff members. A leader will encourage the development of students through the initiation of programs that are designed to build potentials. In keeping with the concept of "participative leadership," the leader of a student personnel program should function as a full member of the administrative team. In addition, the leader should be both task-oriented and people-oriented.

Crookston (1972) suggested that in the transition from "regulator" of student services to "innovator" of student services, the student personnel worker's behavioral orientation has been modified. In the role of "regulator" of students and student activities, the leaders of student personnel services tend to be authoritarian, reactive, corrective, and status-oriented in their relationships with students and peers. An "innovator" who is more interested in a proactive approach to student development, the behavior
of leaders of student personnel leans more toward being egalitarian, encountering, collaborative, and competency-oriented.

Thurston and others (1972) concluded that leaders of student personnel programs tend to have difficulty shifting from being supervisors to student services. The reluctance to change roles and other factors suggest that the leader retains the orientation of a counselor and does not fully adapt to the leadership function.

Harway (1977) found that 59% of the student personnel officers described leadership style as open and accessible, as compared to 47% of the fiscal and academic administrators. Eighteen percent of the student personnel officers described themselves as democratic, as compared to 39% of the fiscal and academic officers who referred to themselves as more authoritarian than democratic.

Parker (1979) made a study to determine the nature of the perceptions of leadership behavior held by deans and directors of student development/student personnel services in Texas community/junior colleges. He found that high priority was placed on collaborative-interactive type behaviors and low priority on administrative-related behaviors.

Richardson (1980) investigated the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities. Based on Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid concept, Richardson found that the 9/9
(team) leadership style was the highest choice of the administrators, and the 1/9 (country club) leadership style ranked second. The findings indicated that the administrators preferred for the 1/9 (people-oriented) style and 9/1 (purpose-oriented) style of leadership.

Leadership Studies of the Educational Administration in the Republic of China

In the Republic of China (ROC), no systematic leadership studies exist regarding educational administration before the 1970s. At the end of the 1970s, a few scholars began leadership studies about a behavior approach that applied to the research of the relationship among school administrators, teachers, and educational effect (Lou, 1985). Several studies which used the LBDQ to evaluate the leadership behavior of the educational administrators are presented below in chronological order; however, there is only one study about higher education prior to the current study.

In 1978, Lu studied the relationship between principals' leadership styles and the schools' climate in junior high schools at Taiwan. Lu found that the schools' climate differs in a corresponding way to differences in the principals' leadership styles. When the principals apply leadership behavior in high consideration and high initiating structure, the best schools' climate results.
In 1978, Liao found that principal's leadership styles influenced teacher's job satisfaction. No relationship exists between the characteristics of the teacher's personalities and the teacher's job satisfaction. The conclusion related to the principals' leadership style and indicated that high consideration is better than high initiating structure in promoting the teachers' job satisfaction. However, Liao suggested that the principals' leadership styles might better use high consideration and high initiating structure.

In the same year, Tseng (1978) examined the relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' service spirit in junior high schools. The findings revealed that the main factor influencing the teachers' service spirit was the principals' leadership styles. The principals' consideration behavior is the best predictive variance to the teacher's service spirit. Therefore, the study suggested that principals should adopt high consideration and high initiating structure in leadership styles.

In 1980, Ts'ai found that the different principals' leadership styles created varying organizational climates. The study concluded that if the principals wish to improve the climate of the job performance, application of low consideration and high initiating structure to the leadership styles would be constructive. On the other hand,
if the principals wish to improve the phenomenon of alienation, the leadership styles should employ high consideration and low initiating structure. Finally, if principals wish to improve the whole organizational climate, high consideration and high initiating structure should be employed in the leadership style.

A year later, Jen (1981) found that principals' leadership styles and counseling teachers' backgrounds were not significantly related to the counseling teachers' job satisfaction. The counseling teachers' job satisfaction might be different because of variations in the principals' leadership styles. However, high consideration and high initiating structure were the best leadership styles on the view of the principals.

Huang (1982) investigated the relationship of teachers' job satisfaction to leadership style, job characteristics, locus of control, achievement motivation and dogmatism. In total, 178 secondary teachers and 247 elementary teachers were surveyed in the research. Huang found that among all 19 predictors, consideration had the highest predictive validity for job satisfaction and intention to quit. The higher the principal was on consideration and initiating structure, the higher the teachers' job satisfaction and the lower the teachers' intention to quit.

In 1983, Ch'iu conducted a study on the relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' service
spirit in senior high schools. The study found that the major principals' leadership styles is in high consideration and high initiating structure. A close relationship exists between principals' leadership style and teachers' service spirit. In particular, the consideration of the principals' can predict the teachers' service spirit.

Yang (1983) presented a study of a comparison between principals' leadership styles and schools' organizational climates in elementary schools and junior high schools. The study suggested that the principals could use high consideration of leadership behavior to improve the climate of job performance. The principals could also utilize high initiating structure of the leadership behavior to improve the climate of alienation. In addition, the principals could employ high consideration and high initiating structure of the leadership behavior to promote the teachers' spirit. The principals in junior high schools could utilize high initiating structure of leadership behavior, while the principals in elementary school could employ high consideration and initiating structure of leadership behavior.

Lin (1983) conducted a study of the relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in five-year junior colleges. The main findings of the study are as follows: (1) the principals of public five-year junior colleges showed more consideration
behavior than the principals of private junior colleges; (2) in schools with principals having high initiating structure and high consideration leadership style, teachers had more job satisfaction than those with low-initiating structure and low-consideration leadership style; and (3) the correlation between principals consideration behavior and teacher's job satisfaction is significantly higher than the correlation between the principals' initiating structure behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

The above leadership studies concentrate on the relationship between principals and the schools' educational effect. All of the studies recommend that the principals should use a leadership style with high initiating structure and high consideration. Various studies present the fact that the principals' consideration significantly influences teacher job satisfaction.

Summary

Study of the relevant research and literature generally indicates that the dean of students has a critical role in a college or a university. The dean of students is the high-level administrator most deeply concerned with students and involved in the daily life of the campus. The dean's primary responsibility is not only to perform administrative tasks but also to help students. The dean should perform the role of articulating student and institutional needs as
well as facilitating change in relation to the needs, building learning environments, and allocating resources in relation to defined objectives and needs. Conflict with students should be avoided. The dean must be accessible and helpful to the students. The students should perceive the dean as a counselor and an advocate. In order to perform as a leader in student affairs, a dean must comprehend the values and convictions that perpetuate a particular behavior and seek to find method to contribute to the greatest degree in the learning process. The dean must be cognizant of the perception of students and of role conflicts that tend to interfere with the ability to assist in student development. Finally, the dean must develop insight into the assumptions and beliefs of other members of the academic community in order to improve the image of an effective leadership.

Historically, leadership has been one of the most researched areas of management. The study of leadership has moved through three categories: the trait theories, the behavioral theories, and the situational theories. The foregoing review of literature indicates that there is no universally accepted leadership theory. However, the behavioral approach is the most popular approach to the study of leadership. Studies concerning leadership behavior fall into two dimensions: consideration and initiating structure. The two dimensions, consideration and initiating structure, were developed by Ohio State University, and have
been used in the practical and useful research instrument—the LBDQ. In the use the LBDQ, the varying results from study to study suggest that effects of leadership behavior on subordinate satisfaction and performance depend to a great extent on the nature a particular situation. Leaders in organizations should consider whether to adopt either a high consideration dimension or a high initiating structure dimension. However, most of studies recommended that the appropriate leadership behavior will tend to value and develop high consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

In conclusion, although there is no one study directly relating to the leadership of the dean of students in America or in the ROC, this review of literature provides the appropriate information and support to give context to this study.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and research procedures that were utilized in the study. It is divided into four parts: (a) the population of the study, (b) a description of the survey instrument, (c) the method of data collection, and (d) an explanation of the statistical treatment of the data.

Population and Sample

In the Republic of China (ROC), although there were 16 universities, one of universities declined to be surveyed. Therefore, the sample for this study was drawn from the population of all deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders in the remaining 15 universities. Each of the 15 universities has approximately 45 student affairs staff members and 80 student leaders. The sample drawn from each of the 15 universities included: (1) one dean of students, (2) 15 student affairs staff members, and (3) 20 student leaders, making the total population (1) 15 deans of students, (2) 225 student affairs staff members, and (3) 300 student leaders. In addition, a sample of 12 former deans of students was also drawn from the 15 universities. The selection of the sample from each
university was limited as follows: Student affairs staff members were persons who worked in the divisions of the Office of the Dean of Discipline and Guidance; student leaders were students who were either leaders of the student government or leaders of student clubs. The former deans of students were current faculty members or administrators who had ever been employed in the position of dean of students.

To ensure an appropriate sample for this study, a standard table of random numbers was used. Each student affairs staff member and student leader was assigned numbers which were randomly selected from a random number table. The selection process was completed at each of the 15 universities.

The Survey Instrument

The research instrument which was used in this study is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (See Appendices B and C), devised by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University (Halpin, 1966). Hemphill and Coons (1950) constructed the original form of this questionnaire. Halpin and Winer (1952), in reporting the development of an Air Force adaptation of this instrument, identified initiating structure and consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. According to Fleishman and Peters (1962), initiating structure reflects the extent to which a role may be defined and structured to attain
projected goals of the leader and subordinates in a group. A high score on initiating structure characterizes individuals who play an active role in directing group activities through planning, scheduling, communicating information, and implementing innovative ideas.

Consideration 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 and two-way communication. A low score indicates the behavior of a supervisor who is more impersonal in relationships with group members. The LBDQ was developed to use the two dimensions described above to measure the behavior of leaders as perceived by work-group members.

The LBDQ was employed in this study to ascertain the differences in the perceptions and expectations of deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders in relationship to the leadership behavior of deans of students at the 15 universities in the ROC. In this study, the LBDQ was used in two forms:

1. The LBDQ-Real, on which the respondents describe personal perception of the actual (real) behavior of the deans of students;

2. The LBDQ-Ideal, on which the respondents describe expectations or beliefs related to the behavior of the deans of students (ideal behavior). With modified instructions,
the same instrument was used to measure leadership ideology in self-evaluation by the deans of students.

The LBDQ consists of 30 items that are descriptive statements of the leader's behavior in a given situation. The 15 items are the initiating structure dimension, and the remaining 15 items are the consideration dimension. Each item is scored on a scale of 4=always, 3=often, 2=occasionally, 1=seldom, and 0=never. The theoretical range of scores on each dimension is from 0 to 60. Halpin (1955) indicated that for the LBDQ-Real, the estimated reliability of the split-half method is .83 for the initiating structure scores, and .92 for the consideration scores. For the LBDQ-Ideal, the corresponding estimates of reliability are .69 and .66.

Revised versions of the LBDQ have been used for research purposes in industry, the armed services and education (Bass, 1981; Carson & Schultz, 1964; Fleishman, 1953; Hemphill, 1955; Knight & Holen, 1985; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1976; Skipper, 1976, 1977, 1978; Stogdill, 1969, 1974). Within the Republic of China, the LBDQ has been translated into Chinese and used in various studies of education administration (Ch'iu, 1983; Huang, 1982; Jen, 1981; Liao, 1978; Lu, 1978; Ts'ai, 1980; Tseng, 1978; Yang, 1983). Fleishman (1973) emphasized that the concepts of initiating structure and consideration are little influenced by cultural difference. However, in order to eliminate
possible cultural problems, the researcher translated the LBDQ into Chinese and reaffirmed the content validity. Permission was granted by Ohio State University to translate the LBDQ into Chinese and to use the instrument in the study (See Appendix D). In order to verify content validation, the translated questionnaire was submitted to a jury panel of five professors who are experts in the study of education administration, leadership, and English translation (See Appendix E). Each member was requested to consider the relevance and clarity of each translated item. At least three of the five jury members had to approve an item for it to be included on the final questionnaire. The approved Chinese-version LBDQ was subsequently administered to the selected subjects.

Procedures for Data Collection

The following procedures were used in data collection:

1. A letter explaining the purposes of the study and requesting permission to conduct the study was sent to the Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education of the Ministry of Education in the Republic of China (See Appendix F).

2. An assistant researcher in each of the 15 universities mailed a list of the names of potential subjects to be used in the research. A random sampling selection was conducted by the researcher and the related
data [translated into Chinese] were forwarded to each assistant researcher.

3. Each of the 15 assistant researchers in the related 15 universities distributed the questionnaire to each member of the population selected in the random sampling: one dean of students, 15 student affairs staff members, and 20 student leaders per university. In addition to a copy of the LBDQ (See Appendix G), a demographic sheet (See Appendix H), an instruction sheet giving directions on how to complete the questionnaire (See Appendix I), as well as a cover letter (See Appendix J), were distributed to the subjects. The demographic sheets were constructed specifically to meet the requirements of each of the categories: deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders. The instruction sheet presented the procedure to be followed in order to complete the questionnaire. Each questionnaire received a designated coded number to separate the various responses precisely into three respective categories: deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and requested cooperation of the respondents. The letter also emphasized that all data collected would be held and treated in strictest confidence. The respondents were instructed to base their answers not on desirable or undesirable behavior but to give personal opinions on the behavior of the deans
of students: how deans of students act (real) and how deans of students should act (ideal).

Table 1

Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Staff Stud.</td>
<td>Dean Staff Stud.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chengchi Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 12 16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tsinghua Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 10 14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taiwan Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>0 11 6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Taiwan Normal Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 12 14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chengkung Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 13 16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chungshing Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 14 11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chiautung Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>0 7 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Central Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>0 11 15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tunghai Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 13 15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fujen Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 14 20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Soochow Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 13 20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chungyuan Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>0 11 16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tanchiang Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 4 20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Univ. of Chinese Culture</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fengchia Univ.</td>
<td>1 15 20</td>
<td>0 13 18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 225 300</td>
<td>10 173 224</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percen. Returned</td>
<td>.66 .72 .74</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Ques.</td>
<td>0 2 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Ques.</td>
<td>10 171 221</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Within two weeks, the assistant researchers collected the questionnaires from the respondents. Nonrespondents received a phone call. All completed questionnaires were mailed to the researcher at Taipei. The number of responses are shown in Table 1, and the demographic information of the respondents is shown in Appendix K.

5. During the collection of the related data and questionnaires at Taiwan, the researcher conducted one hour interviews with six deans of students to gain additional information (See Appendix L). Due to the delicate nature of the LBDQ, and to the possible repercussion of the evaluations of the deans of students by student affairs staff members and student leaders, the researcher consulted Chi-Tong Yang—who is a standing committieeman of the Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education, at the Ministry of Education in the Republic of China, and who is responsible for the deans of students affairs in all of the colleges and universities—in order to obtain the advice in administering this study and in gathering the data to be used as pure academic research.

6. Many student activists have appeared on Taiwan's campuses since 1986, and in order to deal with these situations, the current deans of students may exhibit leadership behavior contrary to the behavior of the deans of students before 1986. In order to compare the current
leadership behavior with the behavior of the former deans of students, the researcher mailed questionnaires to 12 former deans of students at the 15 different universities (See Appendix M), as well. The number of responses totaled eight.

The Statistical Treatment

The returned questionnaires were manually checked for accuracy of completion. The information obtained from the returned questionnaires was fed into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) at the National Chengchi University Computer Center at Taipei, Taiwan.

Two kinds of statistical techniques were used to test the hypotheses. A t test was used to test hypotheses 1 through 8. Hypotheses 1 through 4 were determined by a significant t value to see if there were differences between deans of students and student affairs staff members on real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Hypotheses 5 through 8 were also determined by a significant t value to see if there were differences between deans of students and student leaders on the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Hypotheses were tested at the .01 level of significance. A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test hypotheses 9 through 12. An F Ratio was obtained from the analysis to determine the differences between the student
affairs staff members and student leaders on the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance for a two-tailed test. Moreover, to test these hypotheses, a two-way ANOVA answered three questions (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds):

(1) The first question compares the row means to see if there are any significant differences present.

(2) The second question involves a comparison of the column means to discover any significant differences present.

(3) The third question concerns the possible existence of an interaction between the two independent variables.

Summary

This study investigated 15 universities in the Republic of China. The sample for this study consisted of the following from each university: (1) one dean of students, (2) 15 student affairs staff members, and (3) 20 student leaders, making the total population (a) 15 deans of students, (b) 225 student affairs staff members, and (c) 300 student leaders. In addition, 12 former deans of students were also surveyed by the researcher.

The research instrument used in the study was the LBDQ, which was employed to ascertain the differences in the perceptions and expectations of deans of students, student
affairs staff members, and student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of deans of students at the 15 universities in the ROC.

The procedures for data collection were as follows: (1) a letter was sent to the Ministry of Education of the ROC to obtain the permission to conduct this study; (2) the researcher mailed the names of the random selected sample and the related data to the assistant researchers in each of the 15 universities; (3) each of the 15 assistant researchers distributed a copy of the LBDQ, a demographic sheet, an instruction sheet, and a cover letter; (4) the assistant researchers collected the questionnaires from the respondents and mailed them to the researcher; (5) the researcher interviewed six deans of students in six universities and an officer of the Ministry of Education; and (6) the researcher also surveyed 12 former deans of students at the 15 different universities.

Hypotheses 1 through 4 were tested by a t value to discover any significant differences between deans of students and student affairs staff members on the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Hypotheses 5 through 8 were tested by a t value to discover any significant differences between deans of students and student leaders on real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Hypotheses 9 through 12 were tested by a two-way ANOVA and an F Ratio was obtained from
the analysis to determine the differences between the
student affairs staff members and student leaders on the
real and ideal initiating structure and consideration
dimensions.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings which describe the leadership behavior, real and ideal, of the deans of students as perceived by the student affairs staff members and student leaders of 15 universities in the Republic of China. Analyses of the data were obtained by administering to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaires to 15 deans of students, 225 student affairs staff members, and 300 student leaders. Returns were received from 10 deans (66%), 173 student affairs staff members (76%), and 224 student leaders (75%), and a total of 407 returned questionnaires were returned (75%). In addition, questionnaires were submitted to 12 former deans of students and the returns totaled 8 (66%). The percentages were required in order to implement the purposes of this study, as stated in Chapter I.

The four scores that were generated from each respondent are (1) the real (perceived) initiating structure, (2) the real (perceived) consideration, (3) the ideal (perceived) initiating structure, and (4) the ideal (expected) consideration. The possible range of scores is from 0 to 60 points for each respondent.
Responses to the Initiating Structure Dimension of Leadership Behavior

Initiating structure refers to the behavior of the dean of students in attempting to establish well-defined patterns of organizations, channels of communication, and methods of achieving a goal. The mean and standard deviation scores for perceptions and expectations of each respondent group regarding initiating structure dimension of the deans of students' leadership behavior are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The Real and Ideal Initiating Structure Dimension for Deans of Students as Described by the Three Groups of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deans of Stu. (n=10)</th>
<th>Stu. Affairs Staffs (n=171)</th>
<th>Stu. Leaders (n=221)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>38.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the data in Table 2, the mean scores of the three respondent groups for the ideal dimension of initiating structure of deans of students are greater than the mean scores of the real dimension.
Responses to the Consideration Dimension of Leadership Behavior

The consideration dimension refers to behavior that indicates friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between deans of students and the other respondent groups. The mean and standard deviation scores for the perceptions and expectations of each respondent group regarding the consideration dimension of the deans of students' leadership behavior are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
The Real and Ideal Consideration Dimension for Deans of Students as Described by the Three Groups of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deans of Stu. (n=10)</th>
<th>Stu. Affairs Staffs (n=171)</th>
<th>Stu. Leaders (n=221)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>34.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the data in Table 3, the mean scores of all three respondent groups for the ideal consideration dimension of deans of students are greater than the mean scores of the real dimension.

In summary, as indicated by the data in Tables 2 and 3, the mean expectations (ideal) of all three respondent groups are greater than the mean perceptions (real) of the
leadership behavior of deans of students for both initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

Presentation and Analyses of the Data as Related to the Research Hypotheses

The data are presented in the order in which the null hypotheses were developed from the research hypotheses as stated in Chapter I. A t test was used to test hypotheses 1 through 8 at the .01 level of significance. A significant t value was used to determine the differences between deans of students and student affairs staff members, and between deans of students and student leaders on the real and ideal dimensions and between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. A two-way analysis of variance was used to test hypotheses 9 through 12 at the .05 level of significance for a two tailed test. Therefore, the significant F Ratios were obtained from the analyses to determine the differences between the student leaders and student affairs staff members on the real and ideal dimensions, and between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

Moreover, in this study the null hypotheses, as opposed to the research hypotheses, were written as statistical hypotheses. A null hypothesis specifies no difference between variables; if a null hypothesis can be rejected on the basis of the data, the alternative hypothesis is assumed to be supported.
Research Hypothesis One

Research hypothesis one predicts that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff members regarding leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table 4 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans of students and student affairs staff members on the real initiating structure dimension. Therefore, hypothesis one is retained. The perceptions of the deans of students can be assumed to be different from those of the student affairs staff members as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real initiating structure dimension.

Table 4

Differences between Perceptions of Deans of Students and Student Affairs Staff Members for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. Affairs Sta.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
Research Hypothesis Two

Research hypothesis two predicts that there will be a difference between the respective 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. The data in Table 5 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans of students and student affairs staff members on the ideal initiating structure dimension. Therefore, hypothesis two is rejected. The expectations of the deans of students are no different from those of the student affairs staff members as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal initiating structure dimension.

Table 5

Differences between Expectations of Deans of Students and Student Affairs Staff Members for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. Affairs Sta.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Three

Research hypothesis three predicts that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student affairs staff members regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. The data in Table 6 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans of students and student affairs staff members on the real consideration dimension. Therefore, hypothesis three is retained. The perceptions of the deans of students can be assumed to be different from those of the student affairs staffs members as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real consideration dimension.

Table 6
Differences between Perceptions of Deans of Students and Student Affairs Staff Members for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. Affairs Sta.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
Research Hypothesis Four

Research hypothesis four predicts that there will be a difference between the respective 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. The data in Table 7 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans of students and student affairs staff members on the ideal consideration dimension. Therefore, hypothesis four is retained. The expectations of the deans of students are different from those of the student affairs staff members as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal consideration dimension.

Table 7

Differences between Expectations of Deans of Students and Student Affairs Staff Members for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. Affairs Sta.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
Research Hypothesis Five

Research hypothesis five predicts that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table 8 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans of students and student leaders on the real initiating structure dimension. Therefore, hypothesis five is retained. The perceptions of the deans of students can be assumed to be different from those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real initiating structure dimension.

Table 8

Differences between Perceptions of Deans of Students and Student Leaders for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leaders</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001
Research Hypothesis Six

Research hypothesis six predicts that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table 9 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans of students and student leaders on the ideal initiating structure dimension. Therefore, hypothesis six is retained. The expectations of the deans of students are different from those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal initiating structure dimension.

Table 9

Differences between Expectations of Deans of Students and Student Leaders for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leaders</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>42.91</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
Research Hypothesis Seven

Research hypothesis seven predicts that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. The data in Table 10 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans of students and student leaders on the real consideration dimension. Therefore, hypothesis seven is retained. The perceptions of the deans of students can be assumed to be different from those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real consideration dimension.

Table 10

Differences between Perceptions of Deans of Students and Student Leaders for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leaders</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: **.001
Research Hypothesis Eight

Research hypothesis eight predicts that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of deans of students and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. The data in Table 11 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans of students and student leaders on the ideal consideration dimension. Therefore, hypothesis eight is rejected. The expectations of the deans of students are the same as those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal consideration dimension.

Table 11

Differences between Expectations of Deans of Students and student Leaders for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leaders</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Nine

Research hypothesis nine states that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of student affairs staff members and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table 12 indicate that there are statistically significant main effects in the group of the universities and the group of the student affairs staff members and the student leaders, and that there is an interaction between these two groups. Therefore, hypothesis nine is retained. The perceptions of the student affairs staff members are different from those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real initiating structure dimension.

Table 12

Differences between Perceptions of Student Affairs Staff Members and Student Leaders for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>6170.36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>411.35</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>5157.36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>368.38</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs &amp; Students</td>
<td>1121.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1121.28</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1541.53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001
Research Hypothesis Ten

Research hypothesis ten states that there will be a difference between the respective ratings of student affairs staff members and of student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of deans of students in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table 13 indicate that there is no statistically significant main effects in the group of the universities and the group of the student affairs staff members and the student leaders, and that there is no interaction between these two groups. Therefore, hypothesis ten is rejected. The expectations of the student affairs staff members are the same as those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal initiating structure dimension.

Table 13

Differences between Expectations of Student Affairs Staff members and Student Leaders for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>985.22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.68</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>954.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68.20</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffs &amp; Students</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>370.47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Eleven

Research hypothesis eleven states that there will be a difference between the respective 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. The data in Table 14 indicate that there are statistically significant main effects in the group of the universities and the group of the student affairs staff members and the student leaders, and that there is no interaction between these two groups. Therefore, hypothesis eleven is retained. The perceptions of the student affairs staff members are different from those of the student leaders with regard to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real consideration dimension.

Table 14
Differences between Perceptions of Student Affairs Staff Members and Student Leaders for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>3939.72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>262.64</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>3084.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>220.32</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs &amp; Students</td>
<td>861.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>861.56</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>579.96</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001
Research Hypothesis Twelve

Research hypothesis twelve states that there will be a difference between the respective 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. The data in Table 15 indicate that there are no statistically significant main effects in the group of the universities and the group of the student affairs staff members and the student leaders, and that there is no interaction between these two groups. Therefore, hypothesis twelve is rejected. The perceptions of the student affairs staff members are the same as those of the student leaders as related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the ideal consideration dimension.

Table 15

Differences between Expectations of Student Affairs Staff Members and Student Leaders for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>338.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>329.21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs &amp; Students</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>305.71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Analyses of the Data as Related to the Study

The first additional study compares the perceptions and expectations of the 10 current and the 8 former deans of students to assess a possible difference between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. The results of this particular analysis are not directly related to the overall design of the study, but are presented as valuable information in comparing the current and former leadership concepts of the deans of students. A $t$ Test was used to test the hypothesis. As the data in Tables 16 and 17 indicate there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the current and former deans of students on the initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

Table 16

Differences between Perceptions of Current and Former Deans of Students for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Dean of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Dean of Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17

**Differences between Perceptions of Current and Former Deans of Students for Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Dean of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Dean of Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the data in Tables 18 and 19 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of the current and former deans of students on the consideration dimension.

### Table 18

**Differences between Expectations of Current and Former Deans of Students for Initiating Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Dean of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Dean of Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Differences between Expectations of Current and Former Deans of Students for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Student Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>2-Tail Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Dean of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Dean of Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second additional analysis compares public universities and private universities (See Appendix A) to ascertain if a difference exists between the perceptions and expectations of the student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Since the results of this additional analysis are not directly related to the design of this study, they are presented as a reference for future study. The summaries of data analyses are shown in Appendix N, which includes Tables 20, 21, 22, and 23.

The third additional analysis compares the universities located in the capital (Taipei) area and the universities located in noncapital areas (See Appendix O) to ascertain a difference between the perceptions and the expectations of student affairs staff members and student leaders as related
to leadership behavior of the deans of students in the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. The results of this particular analysis are not directly related to the overall design of this study, but are presented as a reference for future study. The summaries of data analysis are shown in Appendix P, which includes Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27.

The fourth additional analysis calculates the demographical data of deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders in the collected demographical information (See Appendix H) to ascertain a possible particular finding in the distribution of the frequency for each item. Since the results of this additional analysis are not directly related to the design of this study, the data are presented as a reference for future study. The summaries of this data analysis are shown in Appendix K.

Summary of the Data from Interviews of Six Deans of Students

Owing to the lack of the literature related to this study in the ROC, interviews with the deans of students were arranged to gain first-hand information from the deans themselves. The results of the interviews are not directly related to the overall design of the study, but the results provide valuable information by giving an excellent
background about the leadership behavior of deans of students that is not in any published literature at the present time.

Difficulty was experienced in contacting the deans of students in the universities of the ROC due to student involvement in events on campus during the time the researcher had chosen to conduct the interview. At this point in time, a study of the deans of students in the ROC has not been pursued. However, following a successful effort to contact various deans of students an interest was expressed in the proposed study. Due to a desire to contribute opinions to the study, the deans agreed to assist in the project. Therefore, the research selected six deans of students from three public and three private universities. An established time was selected to conduct the interviews.

The time period of the interviews at the various campuses extended from one-half to one hour. Five structured questions (See Appendix Q) were asked of each dean. Since several deans requested that the researcher refrain from directly quoting various opinions given, the contents of the interviews, with the necessary statements deleted, is presented in the following summary.

The first question was "What is your opinion about the position of dean of students on the current campus?" All of the deans of students thought the position of dean was very
difficult. The deans were confronted by two different situations. At the present time, the college students did not want too many regulations, controls, and discipline on campus. The students demanded campus democratization to allow self-government and freedom of speech. However, the administration of the various campuses maintained that the critical role of a student was to concentrate on academic studies on campus, and that acceptable regulations should be executed to keep order on campus. The administration fears that if the student is delegated too much power in sharing the governance of the campus, campus ethics might be negatively influenced and students would possibly lose sight of the educational goals or purpose in attending the universities. While confronting the hazardous situations, most deans of students become a target of attack by the students and the administration. The students blamed the dean of students for not understanding the demands made by the students. On the other hand, the administrators often perceived that the dean of students was too lenient in solving the student problems on campus. Frequently, however, student events on campus occurred not only due to the behavior of the students but also due to the external social influences. Unfortunately, some campus events were beyond the jurisdiction of the dean of students, and the authority to expedite a solution to all situations had not been assigned to the dean of students. Nevertheless, in
order to reduce campus conflicts, the dean of students led his staff members in an adjustment to the policies of the student affairs office to adapt to the new needs of the student; meanwhile, he also had to maintain carefully traditional campus ethics and order. The responses of the deans indicate that the job of the dean of students has become more challenging and important.

The second question was "How do you lead the faculty who participate in student affairs?" Some deans of students answered that services were provided instead of leadership to the faculty members. In each university, certain faculty members were invited by the president to be class tutors who assisted the office of the Dean of Discipline and Guidance in advising students. Although these faculty members were administered by the dean of students, the dean of students could not actually use power and authority to guide the faculty who were also colleagues. Although the dean provided workshops, conferences or written information to assist the faculty members perform effectively, the dean of students was unable to enforce the completion of assigned tasks. The deans of students emphasized that counseling students was the responsibility of all the faculty and staff rather than the faculty who were assigned tutoring duties.

The third question was "How do you lead the students?" Basically, the role of the deans of students was perceived to be educators, counselors, and communicators. The
campuses of the ROC provided an academic learning environment. The deans of students reviewed the academic instructions offered to students as being on a parallel with other professors. In addition to teaching academic subjects, the deans of students also taught the students non-academic subjects: human relations and campus ethics. Instructions and formal requests to the students were viewed by the deans as a form of education to enable the students to not only achieve educational goals but also to develop all facts of a well-rounded complete person. The dean of students functioned in numerous roles to meet the needs of the students. The dean of students was a friendly, caring counselor to students who were experiencing emotional, academic, or living problems. The dean attempts to lead the students through understanding and trust. During the troubled times of student activists, the dean of students functioned as a buffer between the activists and the administration. A single respondent viewed the role of the dean of students as an executor of the law, ensuring that all students must observe campus regulations and ensure an orderly campus. The deans of students lead the students with patience, love, and trust.

The fourth question was "How do you lead the student affairs staff members?" Although there was a traditionally superior-subordinate relationship between the dean of students and the student affairs staff members, most of the
deans of students emphasized that they could not lead staff members through the power of a superior position. Since most of the staff members had worked for extended periods in the area of student affairs, the staff often knew the situation of student affairs better than the deans of students, who are newcomers. Therefore, the dean of students must play the role of coordinator executing tasks and maintaining a harmonious relationship. According to the deans, the deans of students must respect and support the staff members. The basis of the deans' of students leadership came from professional knowledge, successful social skills, and understanding interpersonal relationships. Most deans felt that they should be a moral model for staff members. Moreover, many deans felt that another effective way to receive cooperation from the staff was to improve the status and financial position of the members of the staff and assest various provisional staff become full-time professional employees. Staff development was also included in the responsibility as a part of the leadership position of the deans of students, who must help staff members improve abilities by holding internal workshops, seminars, or field trips, or by providing opportunities to participate in external training or conferences. However, all of the deans of students expressed concern that funds were not available for personnel training. All of the deans of students indicated
that no problem existed in the realm of interpersonal relationships with the staff members.

The fifth question was "What kind of qualities should a dean of students have?" Although each dean of students experienced similar answers, all of the opinions may be summarized as follows: (1) a dean of students should have enough administrative experience to handle different situations; (2) a dean of students should have good leadership skills in order to lead the faculty, staff, and students effectively; (3) a dean of students should possess adequate professional knowledge or skills to earn the respect of the followers; (4) a dean of students should possess a basic educational or counseling background, or training, in order to guide students to succeed in campus life; (5) a dean of students should maintain an interest in order to enjoy the challenge of a complex and difficult job; (6) a dean of students should have an open personality, be a change agent and more easily communicate with the campus members; (7) a dean of students in the ROC should be a Confucian and maintain traditional Chinese ethics and values on campus to cultivate a desire in the students to become whole persons; and (8) a dean of students should exhibit a patriotism and encourage love of country and a desire to reject Communism.
Officer of the Ministry of Education Interview

Because the quality of all deans of students in the ROC must be certified by the Ministry of Education, an interview with an officer who directed this affair for the Ministry of Education can yield valuable information for this study. Chi-Ton Yang, a professor of education and former chairman of the student counseling center at National Chengchi University, is the standing committeeman of the Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education in the Ministry of Education. The committeeman is responsible for the student affairs of all colleges and universities in the ROC. Therefore, the opinion of Chin-Ton Yang is very important to this study.

Yang advised that in doing this study the researcher must be particularly careful to consider the political climate on campus at the time of the study. Since many student activists have appeared recently on different campuses, the positions of the deans of students have become vulnerable to criticism. Although each dean of students has offered assistance to the activists, most student activists refused to communicate with the office of student affairs. As a result, the other administrators viewed the dean's actions as too lenient to deal with the situation. Yang explained that most campus problems came not only from the students but also from social influences; therefore, the problems could not be resolved by the deans of students alone. Yang said that the deans of students were frustrated
by the lack of recognition. As a result, many deans of students were contemplating a professional change.

Yang indicated that in order to help the deans of students overcome problems and increase self-confidence the following changes would be helpful: (1) honor deans of students who performed well; (2) provide leadership training programs; (3) conduct workshops for the student affairs staff members in order to improve their work skills and generate new ideas; and (4) provide more money to the office of the student affairs to assist in the development of activities to improve effectiveness on the campuses.

Finally, Yang emphasized that the deans of students should use the concept of counseling rather than discipline, in order to encourage students' acceptance of aid from the deans. Yang also indicated that in facing the current situation, the deans of students must use strong leadership to overcome any weakness of the traditional campus management of student affairs. Leading staff members to accomplish jobs is not the only responsibility of the deans of students; the deans must also bring new ideas to influence the faculty, staff, and students to develop a new perspective on student affairs. In conclusion, Yang thought that the role of the deans of students in the colleges and universities has increased in importance, and Yang expressed the wish that there would be additional studies related to student affairs.
Summary

The analysis of data obtained for this study reveals that Hypotheses Two, Ten, and Twelve have no statistically significant differences; therefore, these hypotheses are rejected. Hypotheses One, Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven, Eight, Nine, and Eleven have statistically significant differences; therefore, these nine hypotheses are retained. Furthermore, the data also show that the perceptions and expectations of the current and former deans of students show no significant differences in the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

The data from the interviews presented the opinions of six deans of students. The deans of students viewed the complexities of student affairs as arduous. As a mentor, the deans of students perform as educators, counselors, and communicators to guide the students. In addition, the deans coordinate the functions of staff members. On the other hand, services superceded leadership as guidance of the faculty. The qualities of a dean of students included (1) administrative experience, (2) good leadership skills, (3) professional knowledge and skills, (4) educational or counseling background, (5) job interest, (6) open personality, (7) Confucian-oriented, and (8) patriotism. In addition, an officer in the Ministry of Education emphasized that the current deans of students should use counseling and strong leadership to balance student wishes and administration requirements.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, 
AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

This study was designed to explore the perceptions of the leadership behavior of deans of students at selected universities in the Republic of China. The leadership behavior of deans of the students was defined in terms of the initiating structure and the consideration dimensions. Initiating structure refers to the leadership behavior of the deans of students in their attempts to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. The consideration dimension refers to behavior that indicates friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leaders and members of a group. These two dimensions were analyzed under both the actually perceived, or "real," behavior, and the expected, or "ideal," behavior.

Twelve research hypotheses were established as guidelines for the study. The research instrument used was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The population of the study was 15 universities in the ROC. The data for the study were collected from 10 deans of students,
8 former deans of students, 173 student affairs staff members, and 224 student leaders. All respondents were asked, through the use of the LBDQ, to perceive how the deans of students behaved (real behavior) and how they should behave (ideal behavior).

The data, both real and ideal, given by student affairs staff members and student leaders were analyzed in order to test the significant differences between the perceptions and expectations of each group as well as the significant differences between the real and ideal perceptions and expectations of each group. The differences were found in the computations through the use of two statistical techniques: the F Ratio, which was reported at the .01 level of confidence, and a two-way ANOVA, which was reported at the .05 level of confidence.

Statistical analysis was used to test each of the twelve hypotheses formulated for the study. The findings which resulted from the test are as follows.

1. There is a difference between the perceptions of the deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension. 

2. There is no difference between the expectations of the deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension.
3. There is a difference between the perceptions of the deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension.

4. There is a difference between the expectations of the deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension.

5. There is a difference between the perceptions of the deans of students and student leaders regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension.

6. There is a difference between the expectations of the deans of students and student leaders regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension.

7. There is a difference between the perceptions of the deans of students and student leaders regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension.

8. There is no difference between the expectations of the deans of students and student leaders regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension.

9. There is a difference between the perceptions of the student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding
the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension.

10. There is no difference between the expectations of the student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension.

11. There is a difference between the perceptions of the student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding the real leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension.

12. There is no difference between the expectations of the student affairs staff members and student leaders regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension.

An additional analysis showed that both current and former deans of students project the same perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior on the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

A summary of the interviews presented the fact that the position of deans of students is very important to the university of the ROC; that the deans of students employ different leadership behaviors to lead different groups; and that a role of strong leadership is recommended for all deans of students.
Discussion of Findings

The following findings were derived from a statistical analysis of the data from the questionnaire, and from the descriptive data from the interviews.

1. Interviews with the deans of students revealed that the deans of students preferred to keep a harmonious relationship with student affairs staff members, and revealed a leadership behavior in the consideration dimension. On the other hand, the students viewed the deans in the roles of teachers, counselors, and communicators as functioning in the initiating structure dimension. An officer in the Ministry of Education emphasized that the deans of students should adopt a policy of strong leadership with a high emphasis on consideration and initiating structure in order to deal with problems.

2. The data in Tables 16, 17, 18, and 19 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions and expectations of the current and former deans of students on the real and ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions. The result indicates that although the current campus situation is different from that before 1986, the leadership behavior of the current deans of students is parallel to the behavior of the former deans of students. The findings indicate that current campus events have not influenced the leadership behavior of the deans of students. The fact that the current and former deans of
students have 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?

3. Hypothesis two indicated that there is no difference between the expectations of the deans of students and student affairs staff members regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the initiating structure dimension. The findings indicate that the deans of students and student affairs staff members hold similar views about expectations of the ideal work situation. However, hypothesis one indicated that there is a difference between the perceptions of the two groups in the real initiating structure dimension. Since the student affairs staff members have a lower regard for the leadership behavior of deans of students in the real initiating structure dimension, the student affairs staff members exhibited dissatisfaction with the deans of students' perceived leadership behavior. However, on the other hand, the student affairs staff members' concept of leadership may not be consistent with the high self-concept of the deans of students. Staff members may not understand the level of the leadership behavior of deans of students in the demands for higher initiating structure behavior.
4. Hypotheses three and four indicated a difference between the perceptions and expectations of the deans of students and the student affairs staff members related to the real and ideal leadership behavior of the deans of students in the consideration dimension. The two hypotheses suggested that opposing concepts of leadership exist between the deans of students and the student affairs staff members, in the consideration dimension. The leadership behavior concept, as viewed by the dean of students, is not consistent with the leadership behavior concept of the student affairs staff members. Additional interpersonal contact between the deans and staff members will promote a better understanding and assist in the development of a closer relationship.

5. Hypotheses five and six indicated that differences exist between the perceptions and expectations of the deans of students and student leaders regarding the real and ideal leadership behavior of deans of students in the initiating structure dimension. The findings of the two hypotheses indicate that student leaders disagree with deans of students in perceptions and expectations on the initiating structure dimensions. Due to traditional Chinese culture, figures in authority positions must maintain a reserved relationship between teachers and students. Since the deans of students treat the student leaders as students, communication between the deans of students and student
leaders is difficult to maintain on the same level. The two
groups, deans and student leaders, hold different concepts
of leadership behavior in the initiating structure.

6. Hypotheses seven and eight indicated that
differences exist between the perceptions of deans of
students and student leaders in the real consideration, but
that no difference exists in the ideal dimension. A
comparison of the two hypotheses reveals that student
leaders agree with the deans of students about the
expectations of leadership behavior in the ideal
consideration, but that disagreement exists in the
perceptions in the real consideration; student leaders
perceived the dean of students as showing a lower
consideration than that perceived by the dean, due to the
fact that some deans of students present an authoritative
leadership style to the student leaders.

7. Hypotheses ten and twelve indicated that there is no
difference between the expectations of the student affairs
staffs and student leaders regarding the ideal leadership
behavior of deans of students in the initiating structure
and consideration dimensions. The findings suggest that the
two groups have the same expectations of the leadership
behavior of the deans of students. However, data for
hypotheses nine and eleven present opposite results, and
suggest that the two groups have different perceptions about
the leadership behavior of the deans of students in the two
dimensions. The two opposite situations can be explained in that the two groups have different relationships to the deans of students. The student affairs staff members are the subordinates of the deans of the 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. Based on the two different relationships, the deans of students treat each group with a correspondingly different leadership behavior, which explains why the student affairs staff members and student leaders expressed different perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students.

8. According to the data in Tables 2 and 3, the mean scores of the three respondent groups for the ideal initiating structure and consideration dimensions of deans of students are greater than the mean scores in the real dimension. The findings indicate that the three groups are in favor of a high initiating structure and high consideration regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of the students. The findings also indicate that a high initiating structure and high consideration of leadership behavior are the ideal leadership behaviors for the deans of students. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of the studies on educational administration in the ROC (See Chapter II: Leadership Studies of the Educational
Moreover, the study of Halpin (1966) pointed out that effective leadership behavior is associated with high performance on initiating structure and consideration dimensions; therefore, the two dimensions, high initiating structure and high consideration, form the basis of the effective leadership behavior of the deans of students.

9. Tables 2 and 3 show that the mean scores of the three groups in the real initiating structure are greater than the mean scores in the real consideration. The inference is that all three groups believe that the performance of the deans of students on initiating structure was higher than the performance of the three groups in consideration, suggesting that deans of students present a high initiating structure on leadership behavior. However, the finding does not agree with information revealed in personal interviews. The deans of students' concept of leadership functioning tended toward high consideration. Other studies in the ROC have also presented the educational administration as tending toward high consideration (See Chapter II: Leadership Studies of the Educational Administration in the ROC). Generally, a job in educational administration is routine and perfunctory; therefore, the administrators easily express consideration on leadership behavior. But in the universities, the jobs of deans of students are different from general educational
administrators because new situations may occur on campus at any time and the dean of students has to face the new challenges. When student affairs staff members and student leaders come to see their dean of students, they usually have problems which need to be resolved immediately. Under the pressure, the deans of students can not have much time to think about leadership behavior, and initiating structure will be applied by the deans of students for the sake of solving the problems effectively. In fact, some researchers (Halpin, 1956) indicate that the initiating structure can be engaged in with no sacrifice of consideration. Furthermore, when the student affairs staff members are unable to handle the situations, the high initiating structure of the deans of students is necessary for dealing with the problems.

10. In Tables 2 and 3, the mean scores of the deans of students are higher than the mean scores of the student affairs staff members and student leaders in the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. The situation can be explained by the fact that the deans of students set for themselves higher standards of initiating structure and consideration than either the student affairs staff members or student leaders. Because the deans of students come from among the faculty members, the deans possess a professional dignity which leads them to hold higher self-expectations. It can be assumed that the deans of students want to be good leaders, and that the deans believe that they are good leaders.
Conclusions

Based on the discussion of the findings in this study, the conclusions are as follows.

1. Although the past and present campus situations differ, the current and former deans of students in the universities of the ROC have the same perceptions and expectations of their leadership behavior in the initiating structure and consideration dimension.

2. The effective leadership behavior of the deans of students is associated with high scores on initiating structure and consideration, and thus is consistent with the other studies of educational administration in the ROC.

3. Due to different roles, student affairs staff members and student leaders have different perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students on the real initiating structure and consideration dimensions. The deans of students should use different leadership behaviors to lead the members of the two groups.

4. The deans of students know what good leadership is, and tend to be good leaders. However, the student affairs staff members and student leaders hold opposing perceptions of the leadership behavior of the deans of students. The deans should, therefore, spend time understanding the perceptions of these two groups regarding the leadership behavior of the deans of students.

5. The deans of students and student affairs staff
members have the same expectations about the leadership behavior on initiating structure, but students affairs staff members do not agree with the deans about the actual behaviors of the deans of students. In addition, the concepts of consideration are different between the two groups, and apparently the deans of students do not appropriately apply correct leadership behavior on consideration to the student affairs staff members. The deans of students showed high consideration during their interviews, but the student affairs staff members did not view the deans' concern in the real situations.

6. The deans of students lead student leaders as teachers lead students; the deans want to help and educate their students. However, the student leaders are not satisfied with the leadership behavior of deans of students on the initiating structure, because student leaders see the leadership behavior of the deans of students toward student leaders as authoritative. Therefore, the deans of students need to improve their communication skills in order to present their leadership behavior appropriately.

7. The deans of students perceive a tendency toward high initiating structure and high consideration as related to personal leadership behavior. If the followers—student affairs staff members and student leaders—do not have the same level of perception of the deans' leadership behavior, the deans' of students performance in the leadership behavior can be influenced.
Implications

The following implications are suggested based upon the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. The findings of this study can provide information to help the current deans of students to understand or evaluate leadership behavior. If the deans want to improve or enhance their leadership behavior, they will know which approach they should adopt. Self-study is therefore necessary for the deans of students. Although there is a dearth of literature related to student affairs, books, journals, and other materials written on higher education, counseling, psychology, management, politics, and general living are available in order to better understand the trends, values and thoughts of the student affairs staff members and students. Self-study will increase the perceptions of the deans of students, influencing their ability to apply appropriate leadership behavior. However, although a well-designed leadership training program may assist deans of students to perform at a superior level in initiating structure and consideration dimensions, the deans of students may not apply these leadership skills in daily situations. Leadership training, therefore, is not a panacea to improve the leadership behavior of the deans of students, but may lead to effective leadership skills. The findings suggest that if the deans of students perceive inappropriate self-behavior, an adjustment should be made to
adapt to the different situations to promote effective leadership.

2. The findings of this study will assist new deans of students to know appropriate leadership behavior of a dean of students. Consequently, deans can be guided in performing appropriate leadership behavior and possibly avoid numerous mistakes and achieve success.

3. The findings in this study suggest that a better understanding of the problems associated with deans of students by the presidents of various universities should be developed in order to improve interpersonal relationships, direction, support, and cooperation with the office of president.

4. The findings of this study will assist the Ministry of Education in designing appropriate workshops, seminars, conferences or training programs for the deans of students to enable the deans of students to learn from professionals in the area of student affairs and to exchange viewpoints with other deans of students.

5. The findings also indicate that the Ministry of Education should honor the deans of students who have performed effectively. Since the tasks of the deans of students are different and because the student affairs staff members and student leaders did not agree about the quality of the deans' performance, the situation might be frustrating to some deans of students who had done their
best in their jobs. Proper rewards can thus motivate the deans of students and give them confidence in what they have accomplished.

6. The findings of this study provide information for future staff development and student leadership training. The deans of students should plan staff development carefully, through workshops, seminars, and training programs, in order to help the staff members gain proper perspectives. Staff development must be supported by the deans of students so that both the deans of students and the student affairs staff members will hold a consistent role concept. The student leaders need leadership training to learn to be good leaders and communicators. The student leaders may improve perceptions and gain empathy for the leadership of the deans of students. Staff development and student leadership training will be useful in enhancing the leadership of the deans of students.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. This study is the first study of the deans of students in the ROC. Although the findings cannot provide complete information on the leadership behavior of the deans of students, this study does present a new approach to the study of student affairs in the ROC. Further studies are recommended to explore more facts related to the deans of students.

2. The deans of students or the other administrators
can use this study as a model to conduct further research in the institutions and to gain information about the appropriate ways to perform leadership behavior.

3. Since the present study was limited to deans of students, student affairs staff members, and student leaders, further study to ascertain the perceptions and conceptions of presidents, other administrators, and faculty members concerning the leadership behavior of the deans of students is recommended.

4. An in-depth interview technique should be extended to all deans of students to obtain detailed information related to the leadership behavior of the deans of students.

5. The present study could be replicated in other groups such as colleges, junior colleges, or normal colleges to discover whether the same findings would be found.

6. This study suggests further research to develop a program of academic training for deans of students, student affairs staffs, and graduate students.

7. A similar study could be conducted using different self-constructed or standardized leadership instruments.

8. Further study might investigate the leadership behavior of the deans of students as related to the organizational climate and system, and applied to training programs.

9. Further study related to the roles, responsibilities, and functions of the deans of students
should be conducted to aid the deans of students in self-
analysis.

10. A comparative study of the leadership behavior of
the deans of students between the ROC and the United States
could explore cultural implications in leadership behavior
since the instrument used in this study seems to have a
certain cultural bias due to its original national
composition.
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List of Sixteen Universities in the Republic of China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Staffs</th>
<th>No. of Graduate Schools</th>
<th>No. of Departments</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chengchi Univ.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tsinghua Univ.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taiwan Univ.</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Taiwan Normal Univ.</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chengkung Univ.</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chunghsing Univ.</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chiautung Univ.</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Central Univ.</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chungshan</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tunghai Univ.</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fujen Univ.</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Soochow Univ.</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Chungyuan Univ.</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tanchiang Univ.</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Univ. of Chinese Culture</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Fengchia Univ.</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,727</td>
<td>4,381</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Statement of Policy for the
Leader Behavior Description
Questionnaire
STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms.

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at the Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Use:** The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than the Ohio State University.

2. **Adaptation and Revision:** The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific research project may be duplicated.

3. **Duplication:** Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. **Inclusion in dissertations:** Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertation when filed with the university Microfilms service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. **Copyright:** In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--, by the Ohio State University."

6. **Inquiries:** Communications should be addressed to:
   College of Admin Science
   Support Services
   The Ohio State University
   1775 College Road
   Columbus, OH 443210 U.S.A.
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APPENDIX C

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
-REAL DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five numbers following the item to show the answer you have selected.

0-----Never
1-----Seldom
2-----Occasionally
3-----Often
4-----Always

1. He makes his attitudes clear to the group. 0 1 2 3 4

2. He tries out his new ideas with the group. 0 1 2 3 4

3. He rules with an iron hand. 0 1 2 3 4

4. He criticizes poor work. 0 1 2 3 4

5. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. 0 1 2 3 4

6. He assigns group members to particular tasks. 0 1 2 3 4

7. He works without a plan. 0 1 2 3 4

8. He maintains definite standards of performance. 0 1 2 3 4

9. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. 0 1 2 3 4

10. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. 0 1 2 3 4

11. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. 0 1 2 3 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>He lets group members know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>He does personal favors for group members.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>He does little things to make it pleasant to be member of the group.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>He is easy to understand.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>He finds time to listen to group members.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>He keeps to himself.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>He refuses to explain his actions.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>He acts without consulting the group.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>He is slow to accept new ideas.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>He treats all group members as his equals.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>He is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>He is friendly and approachable.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>He makes group members feel at ease when talking with him.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

-IDEAL DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five numbers following the item to show the answer you have selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0------Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1------Seldom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2------Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3------Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4------Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. He makes his attitudes clear to the group. 0 1 2 3 4
2. He tries out his new ideas with the group. 0 1 2 3 4
3. He rules with an iron hand. 0 1 2 3 4
4. He criticizes poor work. 0 1 2 3 4
5. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. 0 1 2 3 4
6. He assigns group members to particular tasks. 0 1 2 3 4
7. He works without a plan. 0 1 2 3 4
8. He maintains definite standards of performance. 0 1 2 3 4
9. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. 0 1 2 3 4
10. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. 0 1 2 3 4
11. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. 0 1 2 3 4
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>He lets group members know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>He does personal favors for group members.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>He does little things to make it pleasant to be member of the group.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>He is easy to understand.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>He finds time to listen to group members.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>He keeps to himself.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>He refuses to explain his actions.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>He acts without consulting the group.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>He is slow to accept new ideas.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>He treats all group members as his equals.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>He is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>He is friendly and approachable.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>He makes group members feel at ease when talking with him.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter of Permission from

Ohio State University
October 1, 1987

Mr. Chin Kuei Chen  
P.O. Box 6581 NTSU  
Denton, TX  76203

Dear Mr. Chen:

You have our permission to translate the LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE into Chinese and to use it in your dissertation. Please follow the guidelines listed in the attached Statement of Policy regarding Copyright. Please note that the Copyright must also be translated into Chinese.

I do not know of anyone who has used this instrument in Chinese. In regards to reliability and validity, please see the attached.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara L. Roach  
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BLR
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Jury Panel for Instrument Validation

1. Chang, Ruen-Shu
   Professor in the Graduate School of Public Administration and Chairman of the Center for Public and Business Administration Education, Taipei, National Chengchi University

2. Huang, Kuo-Long
   Professor of Psychology, Taipei, National Chengchi University

3. Huang, Kuo-Yann
   Professor of Psychology and President of National Chiayi Normal College, Chiayi, Taiwan.

4. Huang, Ping-Huang
   Professor in the Graduate School of Education, Taipei, National Chengchi University

5. Yin, Yun-Mei
   Associate Professor of Western Languages and Literature, Taipei, National Chengchi University
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Letter of Introduction to the Director of the Committee on School Discipline and Moral Education at the Ministry of Education in the Republic of China
To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that Mr. Chin Kuei Chen is a candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in Higher Education Administration at North Texas State University. Up to the present, Mr. Chen has successfully completed all of his academic course work and has recently been approved to proceed with his dissertation.

The topic of Mr. Chen's dissertation research is "A Study of the Perceptions of the Role of Deans of Students at All Universities in the Republic of China." As Mr. Chen's major professor, I believe that his study will contribute to the higher education of the Republic of China. Your assistance and cooperation leading to the success of his study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John Paul Eddy
Professor
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The Chinese Translation of the LBDQ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>領導行為描述問卷（一）</th>
<th>編號：202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我認爲訓導長</td>
<td>從不</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.他讓團體成員很清楚的了解他的態度。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.他和團體成員一起試行他的新觀念。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.他以鐵腕作風管理事務。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.他批評做到不好的工作。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.他以一種不容懷疑的態度說話。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.他指定團體成員去做特定的工作。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.他做事沒有一套計畫。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.他保持一定的工作標準。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.他強調工作要如期完成。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.他鼓勵使用統一的程序。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.他確定團體成員了解他在組織中的角色。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.他要求團體成員遵守法令和規章。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.他讓團體成員知道他對大家的期望。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.他用心去使團體成員竭盡所能的工作。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.他留意團體成員之間的工作協調。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.他私下施惠團體成員。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.他體察細微，使成員樂於成爲團體中的一份子。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.他容易讓人瞭解。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.他抽空聆取團體成員的意見。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.他與團體成員保持距離。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.他留意每位團體成員的福利。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.他拒絕解釋他的作爲。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.他做事不與團體成員商量。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.他遲於接受新觀念。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.他平等對待團體成員。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.他願意改善現狀。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.他待人和氣，平易近人。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.他和團體成員交談時，讓人覺得輕鬆自在。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.他將團體成員的建議付諸實施。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.他在實施重要事項之前，先徵得團體成員的同意。</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
領導行爲描述問卷 (2)  
編號：203

一、理想行爲

我認為理想中的領導

1. 他讓團體成員很清楚地了解他的態度。
   從不 很少 有時 時常 総是
   0  1  2  3  4

2. 他和團體成員一起試行他的新觀念。
   0  1  2  3  4

3. 他以嚴厲作風管理事務。
   0  1  2  3  4

4. 他批評做的不好的工作。
   0  1  2  3  4

5. 他以一種不容懷疑的態度說話。
   0  1  2  3  4

6. 他指定團體成員去做特定的工作。
   0  1  2  3  4

7. 他做事沒有計劃。
   0  1  2  3  4

8. 他保持一定工作標準。
   0  1  2  3  4

9. 他強調工作要如期完成。
   0  1  2  3  4

10. 他鼓勵使用統一的程序。
    0  1  2  3  4

11. 他確定團體成員了解他在組織中的角色。
    0  1  2  3  4

12. 他要求團體成員遵守法令和規章。
    0  1  2  3  4

13. 他讓團體成員知道他對大家的期望。
    0  1  2  3  4

14. 他用心使團體成員竭盡所能的工作。
    0  1  2  3  4

15. 他留意團體成員之間的工作協調。
    0  1  2  3  4

16. 他私下施惠團體成員。
    0  1  2  3  4

17. 他體察細微，使成員樂於成爲團體中的一份子。
    0  1  2  3  4

18. 他容易讓人瞭解。
    0  1  2  3  4

19. 他抽空聆聽團體成員的意見。
    0  1  2  3  4

20. 他與團體成員保持距離。
    0  1  2  3  4

21. 他留意每位團體成員的福利。
    0  1  2  3  4

22. 他拒絕解釋他的作爲。
    0  1  2  3  4

23. 他做事不與團體成員商量。
    0  1  2  3  4

24. 他遲於接受新觀念。
    0  1  2  3  4

25. 他平等對待團體成員。
    0  1  2  3  4

26. 他願意改善現狀。
    0  1  2  3  4

27. 他待人和氣，平易近人。
    0  1  2  3  4

28. 他和團體成員交談時，讓人覺得輕鬆自在。
    0  1  2  3  4

29. 他將團體成員的建議付諸實施。
    0  1  2  3  4

30. 他在實施重要事項之前，先徵得團體成員的同意。
    0  1  2  3  4
APPENDIX H

Demographic Sheet for

(a) Dean of Students
(b) Student Affairs Staff member
(c) Student Leader
(a) 基本資料表

請在適當位置上打√表示或填上適當資料:

1. 性別：男_____、女_____。
2. 年齡：_____歲。
3. 在職年資：_____年。
4. 學歷：學士_____、碩士_____、博士_____。
5. 服務學校：公立_____、私立_____。

請問您是否願意得到乙份本研究結果的摘要？

願意_____、不願意_____。

如果願意，請填妥下方資料：

姓名：________________________

通訊處：_____________________

電話：_______________________
(b) 基本資料表

請在適當位置上打✓表示或填上適當資料：

1. 性別：男____、女____。

2. 年齡：____歲。

3. 在職年資：____年。

4. 學歷：高中____、專科____、學士____、碩士____、博士____。

5. 服務學校：公立____、私立____。
(c) 基本資料表

請在適當位置上打 ✓ 表示或填上適當資料：

1. 性 別：男 _____ \ 夫 _____。

2. 年 齡：_____ 歲。

3. 年 級：大 _____。

4. 就讀院別：______ 學院（例如：法學院、工學院等）。

5. 社團年資：______年。

6. 就讀學校：公立 _____ \ 私立 _____。
1. 本問卷共三份：問卷甲描述訓導長的實際領導行爲，問卷乙描述理想中的訓導長領導行爲。

2. 本份問卷均為三十個項目，請根據您客觀的觀察，在每個項目的後面圈選 0、1、2、3、4 等數字，這些數字顯示訓導長表現於每項的頻率。

   0 表示「從不這樣」
   1 表示「很少這樣」
   2 表示「有時這樣」
   3 表示「時常這樣」
   4 表示「總是這樣」

3. 詢卷中出現「團體成員」字樣，其意義根據填寫者有不同：

   (1) 若填寫者為訓導長「團體成員」則指訓導工作人員及學生社團負責人。

   (2) 若填寫者為訓導工作人員，「團體成員」則指訓導工作人員。

   (3) 若填寫者為學生社團負責人，「團體成員」則指學生社團負責人。

4. 例題：我認爲訓導長

   (1) 他自己讓團體成員很清楚的了解他的態度  

       0  1  2  3  4

       如果您圈 4，表示您認爲訓導長總是這樣表現。

5. 請您仔細閱讀項目後，逐一作答，不要遺漏。

6. 問卷甲、乙請分開作答。

7. 問卷上之編號僅供抽樣分類及問卷回收記錄使用。

8. 所填基本資料表及問卷分析後即銷燬，絕對保護資料的隱密性。
APPENDIX J

Cover Letter to

(a) Dean of Students
(b) Student Affairs Staff Member
(c) Student Leader
(a)
尊敬的訓導長：

我是美國北德州大學高等教育博士候選人，因爲個人所學鮮定博士論文題目為「中華民國大學訓導長角色認知的研究」，主要研究方向為訓導長領導行爲的分析。由於研究設計上的需要，懇請您抽空填答所附之問卷，俾助本研究之完成。本研究結果除供學術參考外，並盼能有助於我國高等教育訓導工作之改進。

本研究的問卷設計為一式兩份：問卷甲描述您的實際領導行爲，問卷乙則描述您理想中的領導行爲。您及其他訓導長的看法將與各校訓導工作人員及學生社團負責人對訓導長領導行爲的看法加以比較，透過彼此間看法的異同，找出適當的領導行爲。此研究只分析領導行爲，而不涉及領導行爲的好壞及對錯。請您分別填寫兩份問卷及基本資料，再封入所附信封，在11月28日前交還給問卷給您的先生。

目前我國社會處於轉型時期，大學訓導工作正面臨新的轉變，訓導長的領導角色也益發重要。您在工作崗位上所付出的心血，對於我國的高等教育實有莫大的貢獻，令人感到欽佩，因此個人願藉此研究表示對我國訓導工作的關懷，也希望透過研究建議一些意見，提供您在工作上的參考。在您百忙中麻煩您填寫問卷，請容我先向您致歉並請求您的支持，如蒙指教請打電話(02)713-7423與我聯繫，感謝您的協助。敬頌
教安！

學生
陳金貴 敬上

民國76年11月20日
敬愛的訓導工作人員：

我是美國北德州大學高等教育博士班學生，目前正撰寫博士論文，題目為「中華民國大學訓導長角色認知的研究」。主要研究方向為訓導長領導行為的分析。由於研究設計上的需要，懇請您能協助填答所附之問卷及基本資料，俾助本研究之完成。本研究結果除供學術參考外，並盼能有助於我國高等教育訓導工作之改進。

本研究的問卷設計為一式兩份：問卷甲描述您實際上感受的訓導長領導行為，問卷乙則描述您理想中的訓導長領導行為。您及其他各校訓導工作人員的看法，將與各校訓導長及學生社團負責人的看法相比較，透過彼此間看法的異同，找出訓導長的適當領導行為。此研究只分析領導行為，而不涉及領導行為的好壞及對錯。請您分別填寫兩份問卷及基本資料，再封入所附信封，交還給送問卷給您的先生或小姐，請您在11月28日前完成。

目前我國社會處於轉型期間，大學訓導工作正面臨新的轉變，因此您的工作也變得更加繁重，您在工作崗位上的努力，對於校園安定有莫大貢獻，令人欽佩。為了使我們的校園更美好，請您支持本研究，提供您的看法，幫助大學訓導工作做得更好。也幫助我國大學訓導長更合適的扮演他的領導角色。如果有任何疑問，請打電話 (02)713-7423 與我聯繫。謝謝您的合作！敬頌時祺！

學生
陳金贵

民國76年11月20日
親愛的同學：

我是美國北德州大學高等教育博士班學生，目前正撰寫博士論文，題目為「中華民國大學訓練長角色認知的研究」。主要研究方向為訓練長領導行为的分析。由於研究設計上的需要，懇請您能協助填答所附之問卷及基本資料，俾助本研究之完成。本研究結果除供學術參考外，並盼能有助於我國高等教育訓練工作之改進。

本研究的問卷設計為一式兩份：問卷甲描述您實際上感受的訓練長領導行為，問卷乙則描述您理想中的訓練長領導行為。您及其他校學生社團負責人的看法將與各校訓練長及訓練處工作人員的看法相比較，透過彼此間看法的異同，找出訓練長的適當領導行為。此研究只分析領導行為，而不涉及領導行為的好壞及對錯。請您分別填寫兩份問卷及基本資料，再封入所附信封，交還給送問卷給您的先生或小姐，請您在11月28日前完成。

目前我國社會處於轉型時期，大學訓練工作也面臨新的轉變，因此每一位學生社團負責人有責任幫助他的校園成爲更理想的學習環境，您對本研究的合作將有助於高等教育訓練工作的改進，也幫助我國大學訓練長更合適的扮演他的領導角色。如果有任何疑問，請打電話（02）713-7423與我聯繫。谢谢您的合作！敬祝

學祺！

陳 金 貴 敬上

民國 76 年 11 月 20 日
APPENDIX K

Demographic Information of
(a) Deans of Students
(b) Student Affairs Staff Members
(c) Student Leaders
(a) Demographic Information of Deans of Students

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>35-40</th>
<th>41-51</th>
<th>51-61</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Academic Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Demographic Information of Student Affairs Staff Members

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>13-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>21-33</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Academic Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>High Sch.</th>
<th>Junior College</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Miss. Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Missing Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Missing Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>Miss. Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Missing Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Major Fields (Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Liber.</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Busi.</th>
<th>Scien.</th>
<th>Engin.</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>Miss. Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percen.</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Demographic Information of Student Leaders: Continued

5. Length of Services in Student Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>Missing Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percen.</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Missing Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

Names and Universities of Six Deans of Students

Interviewed for the Study
Names and Universities of Six Deans of Students Interviewed for the Study

1. Hsieh, Jui-Chih  
   Professor & Dean of Students  
   Taipei, National Taiwan Normal University

2. Huang, Chi-Fang  
   Professor & Dean of Students  
   Taipei, National Taiwan University

3. Lee, Fu-Tien  
   Professor & Dean of Students  
   Taipei, University of Chinese Culture

4. Yang, Feng-Tai  
   Professor & Dean of Students  
   Taipei, National Chengchi University

5. Yang, Li-Hsien  
   Professor & Dean of Students  
   Taipei, Tanchiang University

6. Yao, Pi-Te  
   Professor & Dean of Students  
   Taipei, Soochow University
APPENDIX M

Names and Universities of Former Deans of Students
Surveyed for the Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chou, Tao-Chi</td>
<td>Professor of Political Science</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jui, Ho-Cheng</td>
<td>Professor of East Asian Studies</td>
<td>National Chengchi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko, Wo</td>
<td>Professor of General Studies</td>
<td>National Chiautung University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Chien-Ch'iu</td>
<td>Professor of Philosophy</td>
<td>Fujen University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Hsien</td>
<td>Professor of Chinese Literature</td>
<td>National Taiwan Normal University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Wen-Feng</td>
<td>Professor of General Studies</td>
<td>Tanchiang University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao, Pen-Chiun</td>
<td>Professor of General Studies</td>
<td>National Chunghsing University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Chih-Wen</td>
<td>Professor of Law</td>
<td>University of Chinese Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Chio-Min</td>
<td>Professor of Nuclear Engineering</td>
<td>National Tsinghua University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen, Chin-Hen</td>
<td>Professor of History</td>
<td>National Chengchi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin, Chien-Chung</td>
<td>Professor of Anthropology</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu, K'uan-Szu</td>
<td>Professor of Political Science</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

Statistical Analyses of Data Summaries for Differences between the Public and Private Universities
Table 20

Differences between Perceptions of Public and Private Universities for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1349.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>673.91</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>334.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>334.83</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1105.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1105.97</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05  ***P<.001

Table 21

Differences between Expectations of Public and Private Universities for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22
Differences between Perceptions of Public and Private Universities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>856.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>428.02</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs &amp; Students</td>
<td>833.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>853.72</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***P<.001

Table 23
Differences between Expectations of Public and Private Universities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs &amp; Students</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O

The Location of the 15 Universities in the Republic of China Involved in the Study
The Location of the 15 Universities in the Republic of China

I. Capital Area
   1. National Chengchi University
   2. National Taiwan University
   3. National Taiwan Normal University
   4. Fujen University
   5. Soochow University
   6. Tanchiang University
   7. University of Chinese Culture

II. Noncapital Area
   8. Chungyuan University
   9. Fengchia University
  10. National Central University
  11. National Chengkung University
  12. National Chiautung University
  13. National Chunghsing University
  14. National Tsinghua University
  15. Tunghai University

Location
Taipei
Taipei
Taipei
Taipei
Taipei
Taipei
Taipei
Taoyuan
Taichung
Taoyuan
Tainan
Hsinchu
Taichung
Hsinchu
Taichung
APPENDIX P

Statistical Analyses of Data Summaries for Differences between the Universities in the Capital and Noncapital Areas of the Republic of China
### Table 24

**Differences between Perceptions of the Universities in the Capital and Noncapital Areas of the ROC for Initiating Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td>1042.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>521.01</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncapital Area</td>
<td>989.885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>989.88</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>271.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>271.70</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***P < .001

### Table 25

**Differences between Expectations of the Universities in the Capital and Noncapital Areas of the ROC for Initiating Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncapital Students</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Differences between Perceptions of the Universities in the Capital and Noncapital Areas of the ROC for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>889.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>444.93</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncapital Area</td>
<td>832.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>832.49</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001

Table 27

Differences between Expectations of the Universities in the Capital and Noncapital Areas of the ROC for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncapital Area</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q

Interview Questions of Six Deans of Students
Interview Questions of Six 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?
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