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The problem with which this study is concerned is to compare the perceptions and expectations of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons at Silpakorn University in Thailand. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was employed to assess the leadership behavior of the academic department chairpersons in terms of initiating structure and consideration. The populations included 6 deans, 31 chairpersons, and 255 faculty members who were employed at Silpakorn University during the 1982-1983 school year.

Analysis of the data reveals that (a) the perceptions of the chairpersons are greater than those of the faculty members with regard to the real leadership behavior of the academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension, (b) the perceptions of the chairpersons are greater than those of the deans and faculty members with regard to the real leadership behavior of the academic
department chairpersons in the consideration dimension, and (c) the expectations of the deans are greater than those of the chairpersons and faculty members with regard to the ideal leadership behavior of the academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension. It is concluded, therefore, that the chairpersons need to reevaluate their leadership behavior in relation to both deans and faculty members in order to fulfill the organizational goals and personal needs.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Colleges and universities, like all other organizations, cannot exist without some subdivisions or units. The academic department is one of the basic administrative units in higher education institutions. Probably 80 percent of all administrative decisions take place at the departmental level rather than at the higher levels of responsibility and policy formation (7, p. 158). The department is the instigating unit for the recruitment of new personnel, for decisions on promotion of faculty and staff, and budgets, including salary recommendations; the department is also the chief initiator of new courses and programs. The department handles most aspects of student relations and makes decisions on such vital matters as semester schedules, teaching loads, and assignments of courses, sections, and facilities (4, p. 240).

Since the department is so important in institutions of higher education, it follows that the department chairperson has a concomitant importance. The leadership of department chairpersons has an integral part in shaping the nature of the institution. The chairperson is responsible to the dean primarily for institutional matters and to the
faculty members for educational matters. Deans and faculty members impose their expectations upon chairpersons regarding their behavior as leaders. When these expectations are contradictory or inconsistent, the chairperson is placed in a position of role conflict that can be solved only by the clarification and harmonization of these expectations with reality (1, p. 291).

Hersey and Blanchard (8, p. 83) state that the successful organization has one major attribute that sets it apart from unsuccessful organizations—dynamic and effective leadership. Hughes says,

There appears to be sufficient warrant to assert that effective department leadership in academic governance provides one of the significant keys to the accomplishment of the institution's mission, i.e., effective teaching and meaningful learning. . . . It is surprising that little attention has been given to the question of department leadership (9, p. 69).

Miller (12, pp. 77-78) recommends that research and evaluation include all segments of the collegiate enterprise: students, faculty, staff personnel, and administrators. Although much research literature is available on the experiences of students and faculty, very little research has been done on staff personnel, and still less on the evaluation of higher education administrators. Consequently, even less literature is available about the university division or department chairperson. This situation is even worse in the higher education institutions of Thailand (10, p. 74; 15, pp. 99-106).
Therefore, a study of leadership as it pertains to the behavior of academic department chairpersons in Thailand needs to be carried out. This study focuses on the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons at Silpakorn University in Thailand as perceived and expected by deans, chairpersons, and faculty members.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study is concerned is the perceptions and expectations of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons at Silpakorn University in Thailand.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To determine whether differences exist between the perceptions of the deans and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of chairpersons;

2. To determine whether differences exist between the expectations of the deans and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of chairpersons;

3. To determine whether differences exist between the perceptions of the deans and chairpersons regarding the leadership behavior of chairpersons;
4. To determine whether differences exist between the expectations of the deans and chairpersons regarding the leadership behavior of chairpersons;

5. To determine whether differences exist between the perceptions of the faculty members and chairpersons regarding the leadership behavior of chairpersons;

6. To determine whether differences exist between the expectations of the faculty members and chairpersons regarding the leadership behavior of chairpersons.

Hypotheses

To carry out this study, the following hypotheses were tested using data collected by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

1. There will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure;

2. There will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure;

3. There will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration;
4. There will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration;

5. There will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure;

6. There will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure;

7. There will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration;

8. There will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration;

9. There will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure;
10. There will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure;

11. There will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration;

12. There will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration.

Background and Significance of the Study

Thailand, which is bounded by Malaysia to the south, Burma to the west, Laos to the north and northeast, and Cambodia to the east, is situated in the Indochinese Peninsula of Southeast Asia. In 1982, Thailand had a population of approximately 48.8 million. The national language is Thai. The traditional religion is Buddhism.

Higher education in Thailand began with the establishment of Chulalongkorn University in 1917 by amalgamation of the Royal Medical School, the School of Civil Servants, and the Engineering School (10, p. 1). In 1933, Thammasat University, which had been the University of Moral and Political Sciences, was opened as a center specializing in law,
economics, politics, and related courses in social sciences. In 1942, the School of Medicine of Chulalongkorn University became the separate University of Medical Sciences; it is called Mahidol University.

In 1943, Kasetsart University was established, which specializes in agricultural science. Also in 1943, Silpakorn University was established for the study and preservation of the art and archeological artifacts of Thailand (11, p. 4078). These original institutions of higher learning are centered in Bangkok and are designed to train government servants.

In 1954, the College of Education, which received university status in 1974 as Srinakhrinwirot University, was inaugurated. It has four campuses in Bangkok and four in the provinces (14).

During the late 1950s and early 1960s, efforts were made to expand undergraduate programs, introduce graduate programs, and improve the quality of teachers. Teacher training colleges were established in rural areas, and the concept of regional institutions outside the Bangkok area was introduced (10).

In 1964, the Chiangmai University opened in the north; Khon Kaen University opened in the northeast in 1965; the Prince of Songkla University was established in the south in 1967. To meet the increasing demand for higher education, several private colleges were also established, and a
specialized institution, the National Institute of Development Administration, founded in 1966, offers programs at the graduate level in public administration, business administration, economic development, and applied statistics (14).

In 1971, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology came into existence through a merger of the North Bangkok Institute of Technology, the College of Telecommunication, and the Thonburi College of Technology. It offers bachelor's degree programs in technology and produces teachers of vocational education (15, p. 9). In 1972, the "open admissions" Ramkhamhaeng University was founded.

In 1975, the Chiangmai College of Agriculture, formerly under the Department of Vocational Education, Ministry of Education, was reorganized. It was also upgraded as the Institute of Agricultural Technology (14, p. 5). In 1980, Sukhothaithammathirat University, a British type of open university, was inaugurated that emphasizes the use of mass media and correspondence learning methods.

At present, Thailand has 14 government universities. There are also 10 private colleges, 28 colleges of technology and vocational education, 32 vocational and technical colleges, 3 commercial colleges, 13 agricultural colleges, 36 teacher training colleges, 7 physical education colleges, 1 dramatic arts college, 1 fine arts college,
7 nursing colleges, 17 government specialized institutions, and 4 private specialized institutions. (See Appendix F.)

Traditionally, the institutions of higher learning in Thailand have been established for different purposes and have performed different functions. Some institutions have been assigned to limit their responsibility to certain academic areas while others have a wider range of responsibility. Today, the institutions that were oriented toward certain specialized fields of study are moving toward the concept of the multiuniversity; nevertheless, they still maintain their identities in their former specializations.

The Office of University Affairs and various departments of the Ministry of Education are responsible for all government and private universities, colleges, and institutions. Each Thai university is supervised by the university council, the equivalent of a board of trustees or board of regents. The university rector (president), the deans, and a representative of the faculty senate are members of the council. The other council members are selected from the community at large. The number of outsiders is no more than ten, while the insiders can be as many as twenty (10, p. 16).

Basically, the institutions of higher learning in Thailand have been molded and influenced by Western European and American universities; as such, a university is administered by a rector; each university consists of
different faculties (colleges); the chief administrator of a faculty is a dean; each faculty consists of different departments, each of which has a department chairperson who serves as the chief administrator of the department. Generally, the chairperson is selected by faculty members within each department and appointed by the dean. The term of appointment is usually two to four years.

Silpakorn University

Presently, Silpakorn University has campuses in two different locations, Bangkok and Nakhon Pathom. The Bangkok campus was opened in 1943 with four faculties and a graduate school. The Nakhon Pathom campus, located 35 miles west of Bangkok, was opened in 1968 with three faculties. Each faculty has several departments as shown in Appendix G.

Silpakorn University has grown slowly compared to other universities in Thailand. Its enrollment in 1981 was 2,744. Although teaching, research, public services, and cultural preservation are considered the four functional components of higher education institutions in Thailand (10, p. 27), most universities are unable to perform functions other than instruction. In general, the university's academic staff is only slightly involved in doing research. The research activities of the university were directly related to its graduate programs, almost all of which require theses based on research findings as partial fulfillment for graduate degrees. The research team of the Office of the National
Education Commission has recommended that research work by faculty members should be encouraged at Silpakorn University (10, p. 75).

Very few research studies have been done at the university level on the leadership behavior of Thai administrators, and none has been made on the academic department chairpersons. According to Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (3, p. 276), most colleges and universities consider the role of the department chairpersons to be an important one. Deans and faculties look at department chairpersons to interpret departmental needs in accordance with the goals and priorities of their institutions.

Nicoll states that "department chairmen are usually expected to be both administratively responsible to the administration and representative of and responsive to their departmental colleagues" (13, p. 82). Heimler (7, p. 59) also indicates that chairpersons serve as the primary means of communication between faculty and administration.

Therefore, a study of the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons as perceived and expected by themselves, deans, and faculty members at Silpakorn University could be considered a starting point for the study of the leadership behavior of other higher education administrators in Thailand. It is hoped that this study may contribute to the advancement of Silpakorn University as well as help academic department chairpersons to be aware of
their behavior and interpersonal relations with their deans and faculty members. It is also hoped that the outcome of this study, because of the similarities of the Thai university organization, may provide some information which can be used to guide university personnel in departmental self studies, organizational development, and evaluation.

Definition of Terms

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

1. **Perception** is an immediate or intuitive cognition or judgment. In this study, deans, chairpersons, and faculty members describe the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in terms of how they actually behave as leaders.

2. **Expectation** is the desirable or appropriate behavior that is associated with a certain role. In this study, deans, chairpersons, and faculty members describe the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in terms of how they believe the chairpersons should behave as leaders.

3. **Leadership behavior** is defined in terms of the two dimensions—initiating structure and consideration—of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

4. **Initiating structure** refers to the leader's behavior in the delineation of relationships between himself and members of his group, and in the establishment of
well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done (5, p. 1).

5. Consideration refers to behavior that is indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader and the members of his group (5, p. 1).

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to an investigation of the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons as perceived and expected by deans, chairpersons, and faculty members at Silpakorn University in Thailand.

The Survey Instrument

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which was developed by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University (6), is the basic instrument that was used to obtain the information from the respondents for this study. The LBDQ is composed of thirty short, descriptive statements that reflect the real and ideal ways in which leaders behave.

Procedures for Collection of Data

The data for this study were collected as follows.

1. Permission to collect data and administer the questionnaire was requested from and granted by the rector of Silpakorn University.
2. A letter explaining the purposes of the study and copies of the questionnaire were sent to two assistant researchers in Thailand.

3. The assistant researchers administered the questionnaire to the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members at Silpakorn University.

4. The assistant researchers collected the completed copies of the questionnaire from the respondents and returned them to the researcher at North Texas State University.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The questionnaires were manually checked for accuracy of completion. Data from the instruments were tabulated and analyzed by computer.

Analysis of variance was selected for use as the appropriate statistical technique to test the hypotheses. This is a statistical analysis that uses the mean and mean squares of two groups as a basis for comparing the groups on the chosen dimensions. An F-ratio was used to determine the differences between respondent groups on the real and ideal dimensions, and between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance for a two-tailed test.
Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, purposes of the study, the background and significance of the study, definition of terms, and limitation of the study. It also contains the hypotheses that provide the direction of the study. Chapter II contains a review of selected relevant literature and research which focuses on the leadership behavior studies that have used the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire. 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 an analysis of the data and interpretations of the results of the analysis. Chapter V summarizes the major findings, and presents the conclusions and recommendations for future research.


CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature is divided into five sections. The first section includes the definitions of leadership, the second section briefly reviews the theories of leadership, and the third section describes the styles of leadership. Section four presents a review of the relevant research findings in higher education that pertain to the leadership behavior of educational administrators who responded to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The last section discusses leadership behavior studies in Thailand.

Definitions of Leadership

There is no clearcut agreement on the meaning of leadership under all circumstances. Most definitions take on the focus of the persons who have attempted to define what leadership actually is.

According to Mumford, leadership is "the preeminence of one or a few individuals in a group in the process of control of societal phenomena" (34, p. 216). Blackmar (2, p. 626) views leadership as a group expression of power
through centralizing efforts in one person. Supporting the concept of leadership, Bernard says,

Leadership is necessary as a means of focusing the attention of a constituency or group upon an issue or a piece of work which needs to be done. Leadership is nothing other than this process of focusing attention and releasing the energies of people in the desired direction (1, p. 484).

Pondy, however, moves in a slightly different direction; he defines leadership as "social influence exercised by a person in some position of superior authority over some subordinate" (38, p. 87). This same idea is expressed by Koontz and Donnell, who view leadership as "the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly toward the achievement of group goals" (26, p. 439). Tead also indicates that leadership is "the activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable" (47, p. 20).

Gibb maintains that leadership is an aspect of organization and could operationally be considered as "the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement" (11, p. 42). Terry adds the element of interaction to the aspect of influence; he believes that leadership is "the relationship in which one person, the leader, influences others to work together willingly on related tasks to attain that which the leader desires" (48, p. 412). Hollander, supporting the idea of influence and interaction, summarizes
leadership as "a process of influence which involves an ongoing transaction between a leader and followers" (20, p. 16).

Cribbin confirms some of the previously mentioned ideas concerning leadership, and he stresses that leadership can be described as a process of influence on a group in a particular situation, at a given point in time, and in a specific set of circumstances that stimulates people to strive willingly to attain organizational objectives, giving them the experience of helping attain the common objectives and satisfaction with the type of leadership provides (7, p. 9).

Theories of Leadership

The concept of leadership and leadership behavior have been subjected to considerable research and study; as a result, there are today numerous theories of leadership being expounded that include differences in opinion, methodology, explanations, and conclusions. Each has its advocates who profess that their particular theory is the right and proper one. Although more is known today about leadership than ever before, there is still no complete and integrated theory of leadership that represents the totality of the concept.

In this review, three theories of leadership will be discussed that represent a large portion of the research being done in this area and also illustrate diverse and valid approaches to the study of leadership. Included are
(a) the trait approach, (b) the situational approach, and (c) the behavioral approach.

**The Trait Approach**

Before World War II, studies of leadership sought to isolate unique physical, mental, or personality traits that could differentiate the effective leaders from other members of the group. The earliest trait theorists held that since traits are inherited, certain people are born to be leaders; furthermore, since traits are carried in the genes, persons who are sufficiently endowed with the required traits could lead others better than those who are less well endowed (42, p. 146). Lengthy lists of traits were derived from extensive self-reports of leaders and descriptions of leaders by others. The lists included personality traits, social traits, and personality characteristics (22, p. 6). Later theories acknowledged that traits could be acquired not by inheritance alone, but by learning and experience. Although this assumption seemed logical, it did not prove to be practical in application. Studies of successful leaders nearly always indicated the presence of similarities in personality and character traits, but since these traits existed in people to varying degrees, no satisfactory explanation of leadership could be developed (45, pp. 83-102).
Davis, however, specifies the following four traits that seem to have an impact on effective organizational leadership:

1. Intelligence: Research generally shows that the leader tends to have higher intelligence than the average intelligence of his followers;

2. Social maturity and breadth: Leaders tend to have broad interests and activities. They are emotionally mature and have high frustration tolerance;

3. Inner motivation and achievement drives: Leaders tend to have a strong personal motivation to keep accomplishing something. They work hard more for the satisfaction of inner drives than for external rewards. They also tend to accept responsibility;

4. Human relations attitudes: Successful leaders realize that they get their job done through people and therefore try to develop social understanding and appropriate skills. They preserve and develop human dignity and mutual interest among their people (8, pp. 103-104).

Stogdill examined 124 studies on the relationship of the personal factors that are associated with leadership. In summary, he says that the following factors have been found to be associated with leadership:

1. Capacity (intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, judgment);

2. Achievement (scholarship, knowledge, athletic accomplishment);

3. Responsibility (dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, desire to excel);

4. Participation (activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor);

In opposition to the traits approach, Sisk lists the shortcomings of this approach when it is used as a means for analyzing and understanding leadership:

(1) Trait studies, as a general rule, do not assign weighting to each of the traits so that the relative importance of each trait as it contributes to leadership can be determined. (2) There is considerable overlap between the various traits mentioned. Seldom are they mutually exclusive. Also, there are many instances of conflicting or incompatible traits. . . . (3) An analysis of personality traits made no differentiation between those traits of value in acquiring leadership positions and those traits necessary to hold or maintain leadership. (4) Trait analysis is based upon the rather shaky assumption that personality is a composite of discrete traits, rather than viewing personality as an integrated functioning whole with a continually shifting pattern of characteristics both in respect of their significance and to their strength. (5) The trait approach to leadership ignores situational factors in the environment that influence the effectiveness of leadership (43, p. 397).

Even though the trait approach has lost favor, Lipham notes that

The current view is that there are several patterns of personality variables that differentiate leaders from followers and that such patterns are situationally relevant, if not situationally specific. The extreme reaction to the so-called failure of the traitist approach has abated and researchers are examining in fresh perspective the relationship of the psychological dimension to sociological, cultural, and other dimensions of leadership in specific situational contexts (28, p. 3).

The Situational Approach

Subsequent to the increased dissatisfaction with the trait approach to understanding leadership, attention turned to the study of situations and the belief that leaders are the product of given situations. Many of the situational
studies were made in the belief that leadership is strongly affected by the situations from which the leader emerges and in which he operates. Thus, in different situations leaders may show dissimilar characteristics (19, p. 141). Terry (48, p. 421) notes that leadership is made up of four variables: (a) the leader, (b) the followers, (c) the organization, and (d) the social, economic and political influences.

Gibb believes that leadership is always relative to the situation and that the situational approach to the study of leadership involves four elements

(1) the structure of interpersonal relations within a group, (2) group of syntality characteristics such as those defined by the group dimensions already discussed, (3) characteristics of the total culture in which the group exists and from which group members have been drawn, and (4) the physical conditions and the task with which the group is confronted (11, p. 246).

Gibb (11, pp. 267-268) further states that leadership is a complex social phenomenon that cannot be treated meaningfully when conceived of as an isolated trait or entity which is viewed apart from situational factors. Sanford (39, p. 158) states that the leader, the situation, and the follower are three basic and delineable factors that must be present in any leadership phenomenon if the most meaningful and general conclusions about leadership are to be reached. Shartle (41, p. 110) believes that leadership performance depends not only on the outcome but is also related to the particular situation in which the leader finds himself.
Fiedler (10, p. 151) combined the trait and situational approaches and developed a contingency theory of leadership. According to Fiedler, people become leaders not only because of the attributes of their personalities but also because of various situational factors and the interaction between the leaders and situations. He concludes that leadership performance depends then as much on the organization as it depends on the leader's own attributes. Except perhaps for the unusual case, it is simply not meaningful to speak of an effective leader or an ineffective leader; we can only speak of a leader who tends to be effective in one situation and ineffective in another. If we wish to increase organizational and group effectiveness we must learn not only how to train leaders more effectively but also how to build an organizational environment in which the leader can perform well (10, p. 261).

The evidence suggests that "leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations" (44, p. 65). Although many theorists insist that situations present opportunities for acquisition of leadership, the situation is not in itself sufficient to account for leadership ability. Halpin believes that understanding of leadership will be greatly increased if the concentration is placed upon an analysis of the "behavior of leaders" (15, p. 81).

Thus, the situational approach tends to maintain that leadership is determined not so much by the characteristics of individuals as by the requirements of social situations. The concept of this approach is that human behavior always
occurs phenomenologically within some situations. This behavior is determined or influenced by the forces operative in the situation as perceived by individuals within groups.

The Behavioral Approach

The most recent approach to the study of leadership focuses upon observation of the behavior of leaders in certain situations. The assumption is not necessarily made that leadership behavior exhibited in a given situation will transfer to other situations; instead, this becomes a variable for investigation. Basically, the behavioral approach does not posit that leadership behavior is determined either innately or situationally (28, p. 4).

Most research concerning the behavior of leaders is derived from concepts developed by the members of the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University (14) who also developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ provides a technique whereby group members may describe the leadership behavior of designated leaders in any formal organization (14,, p. 1).

Halpin (14, p. 1) states that he and Winer, through a process of factor analyses of responses of 300 B-29 crew members who described the leadership behavior of their 52 aircraft commanders in the LBDQ, identified initiating structure and consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leadership behavior. In essence, the behavioral approach to leadership has been concerned primarily with a description
rather than an evaluation of what the leader does. Halpin provides an explanation of the major methodological advantages of the analysis of the behavior of leaders:

In the first place we can deal directly with observable phenomena and need make no prior assumptions about the identity or structure of whatever capacities may or may not undergird these phenomena. Secondly, this formulation keeps at the forefront of our thinking the importance of differentiating between the description of how leaders behave and the evaluation of the effectiveness of their behavior in respect to specified performance criteria (15, p. 86).

Cribbin suggests that "the practicing executive is perhaps better advised to deal with observed behavior than with abstract traits that seem simple but actually represent a semantic quagmire" (7, p. 30).

Lipham makes the following generalizations from research based on the behavioral approach:

The leader-follower relationship represents a delicate mix of personal and situational variables; the personal and situational variables do not operate singly but in discernible patterns and combinations; the patterns and combinations of variables, including leader behavior, may be misperceived by either the leader or the followers; the degree or extent of misconception appears to be meaningfully and systematically related to a variety of organizational, group, or individual variables. More importantly, however, the behavioral approach to the analysis of leadership provides a perspective from which to view the definitions of leadership (28, p. 5).

In essence, the behavioral approach to leadership tends to focus upon the search for significantly behavioral dimensions to be used in describing and delineating leadership behavior. Situational approach, on the other hand, focuses on those relationships and variables in social and
environmental situations that appear to generate leadership behavior.

**Styles of Leadership**

Fiedler defines leadership style as "the underlining need-structure of the individual which motivates his behavior in various leadership situations. Leadership style thus refers to the consistency of goals or needs over different situations" (10, p. 36). Different styles of leadership could result in very different types of relationships between the leader and his followers.

The three styles of leadership that were identified by Lippitt and White are the democratic, the authoritarian, and the laissez-faire styles (29). In the democratic style, group decisions are made by majority vote, equal participation is encouraged, and criticism and punishment are minimal. The democratic leaders seek to lead mainly by persuasion and example rather than by force, fear, status, or power. Democratic-style leaders consider the opinions and feelings of their followers, make them feel important, and attempt to put group and individual goals above their own personal objectives; they encourage participation in decision making (30, p. 291).

In contrast, with authoritarian style leadership, in which all decisions are made by the leader, the group is required to follow prescribed procedures under strict discipline, and the behavior and thinking of the group are
dominated by the leader. The leader strongly insists on getting his own way, feeling little or no need to know the ideas or feelings of others. Often, the authoritarian leader takes the credit for accomplishments but puts the blame for failure on his followers (30, p. 291).

The laissez-faire style of leadership scores lowest on all accounts. The leadership of the leader is kept at a minimum, which allows the group to work essentially without guidance.

Of these three styles of leadership, Lippitt and White conclude that democratic leadership produces less aggressive behavior among a group, less dependence on the leader, and more group initiative. They also conclude that a group behaves more productively under democratic leadership than under the other two types of leadership (29, pp. 362-366).

Tannebaum and Schmidt (46, pp. 95-101) argue that leaders should not choose a strict authoritarian or democratic style but instead, should be flexible enough to cope with different situations. Leadership actions are related to the degree of authority used by leaders and to the amount of freedom available to subordinates in reaching decisions.

Three other distinct styles of leadership, which are described by Moser (33, p. 2) are the nomothetic style, the idiographic style, and the transactional style. The nomothetic style is characterized by behavior that stresses goal
accomplishment, rules, regulations, and centralized authority at the expense of the individual.

The second style, idiographic, stresses the individuality of people, minimum rules and regulations, decentralized authority, and highly individualistic relationships with subordinates. The third style, transactional, stresses goal accomplishment, which also stresses individual need fulfillment (33, p. 2).

McFarland (30, p. 293) discusses styles of leadership as being formal and informal. Formal leaders are those who are given the right to direct and control the activities of subordinates. They are vested with the authority to carry out their functions and duties. By and large, they execute their responsibilities through the mechanisms of the organization's structure. Informal leaders, on the other hand, are those who exercise a considerable influence within their group over the behavior of other individuals in the group, without the use of positional or delegated authority, formal communications, or orders. The informal leader can initiate significant actions among his colleagues, and he can block actions of an individual or the group as a whole.

Miller comments that the styles are not necessarily discrete entities but rather serve as a point of emphasis. He advises that "a person might want to develop a matrix of styles depending upon the need and circumstances of the given situation" (31, p. 38). He, therefore, labels seven
types of personal leadership styles as paternalistic—authoritarian, intuitive-rationalistic, charismatic, bureaucratic-managerial, pragmatic-functional, political-legalistic, and personalistic-humanistic. He concludes that "the personality is the key to administrative behavior" (31, p. 41).

Research on Leadership Behavior

This section focuses on a review of research findings relevant to the measurement of leadership behavior as described in the Manual for Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (14), hereafter referred to as the LBDQ, on two dimensions—initiating structure and consideration. Several research studies on the leadership behavior of leaders in various types of organizations (education, military, industry) have been reported in which the LBDQ was employed. This section presents only the leadership behavior studies in higher education institutions that used the LBDQ to study the leadership behavior of administrators.

In 1955, Hemphill (18, p. 399) employed the LBDQ to study the relationship between the characteristics of the faculty members of twenty-two departments in a liberal arts college and the administrative reputations of the departments. Each faculty member described his department chairman and indicated his concept of the ideal chairman. Each member also ranked the five best and worst departments according to the quality of leadership and administration.
One of the findings indicates that the departments that have best reputations for good administration also have chairmen who are described as above average on both initiating structure and consideration and who more closely meet the expected behavior of an ideal chairman.

In 1962, Carson (4) employed the LBDQ to study the differences in perceptions of and expectations for style of leadership behavior of junior college deans at twenty junior colleges in the Southeastern United States as viewed by student leaders in comparison to the department heads, presidents, and deans themselves. He found that student leaders within institutions tend to agree among themselves regarding their perceptions of and expectations for the leadership behavior of the dean on both the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. However, student leaders and department heads do not agree in their perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior of deans on both initiating structure and consideration. Although student leaders perceive significantly less consideration in the leadership behavior of deans than do other groups, there are no significant differences in the expected amount of consideration among the groups. The difference in the amount of initiating structure perceived and expected by student leaders and other groups is significant only for presidents.
Additional findings by Carson indicate that although student leaders perceive the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration of deans to be almost equal, they expect significantly more consideration than initiating structure. Student leaders expect significantly more of both initiating structure and consideration than they perceive in the deans' leadership behavior. Because student leaders and department heads expect significantly more of both initiating structure and consideration than they perceive in the deans' behavior and because they perceive and expect less of both dimensions than do presidents, Carson recommends that deans need to put greater emphasis on both dimensions in their interpersonal relations with students and department heads.

In 1966, Verbeke (50) investigated the leadership behavior of junior college academic deans as viewed by 22 presidents, 22 deans, and 175 faculty members in twenty-two two-year junior colleges in Pennsylvania and New York. It was found that there are some important disagreements between the three reference groups' ratings of academic deans in both initiating structure and consideration. The great discrepancies exist between faculty members and the deans; the faculty members perceive and expect more consideration than initiating structure and in the leadership behavior of academic deans. Verbeke concludes that the major role-conflict facing deans might be between them and their
faculty members. Thus, he recommends that deans seek an understanding of these differences and utilize the understanding in appropriate ways for achieving organizational goals.

In 1967, Moloney (32) investigated the relationship between the perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior of deans as seen by their vice-presidents, themselves, and selected faculty members. The results from the data analysis indicate that there were significant relationships between the perceptions of deans and faculty and between vice-presidents and faculty on the consideration dimension for the deans' perceived leadership behavior. Further analysis shows that there were no significant relationships among any of the three groups on expected leadership behavior. Each of the three respondent groups shows significant differences between their perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior of the deans.

In 1969, Lindermuth (27) made a study of self-perceptions held by academic deans and the perceptions held of them by others. The LBDQ was administered to presidents, academic deans, administrators, division and department chairmen, and faculty members to assess the leadership behavior of the academic deans in terms of initiating structure and consideration. Lindermuth concludes that the deans' perception of their leadership differs significantly from the perceptions of the other respondent groups. As
groups, the respondents to the leadership behavior of the academic deans agreed on the perceived amounts of initiating structure and consideration. The most apparent agreement was observed from ratings between groups, particularly on the element of consideration. Academic deans disagree more among themselves on their perceived balance between initiating structure and consideration than do the members of all other respondent groups.

In 1969, Schroeder (40) investigated the leadership behavior of department chairman as described by 52 deans, 118 chairmen, and 161 faculty members in seventeen state institutions of higher education. He found that chairmen scored themselves significantly higher than the faculty on both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions of leadership behavior. He also found that faculty members, more so than deans, expect more consideration from the ideal chairman. Conversely, the deans expect more initiating structure from the ideal chairman than do the faculty. The findings also reveal that chairmen display significantly more ideal initiating structure than desired by the faculty members, but ideal consideration is viewed similarly by both groups.

In 1973, Wagner (51) analyzed the LBDQ data he collected from twenty-five administrative departments at Michigan State University. The results reveal that there were no differences between the scores of the leaders on the
LBDQ and the scores of their subordinates with regard to their perceptions of the leadership behavior of the college administrators. In addition, a comparison of sample means and standard deviations indicates that the LBDQ has the same degree of variability when employed in a higher education setting as it does when used in other types of organizations.

In 1973, Carlson (3) conducted a study of the leadership behavior of physical education department chairmen as perceived by themselves and their faculties in public institutions of higher education in the central district of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. He found no significant difference between the perceptions of the chairmen and faculties regarding the leadership behavior of chairmen. Consistently higher scores for consideration as compared to initiating structure indicates the importance of good human relations between chairmen and their faculties.

In 1974, Cox (6) investigated superiors' and subordinates' perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior of deans of instruction. Initiating structure and consideration were the two dimensions analyzed for both real and ideal behavior. Responses were received from 199 faculty members, 27 presidents, and 27 deans of the North Carolina Community College System. Cox found that faculty members do not agree with presidents concerning the real
leadership behavior of deans of instruction on the initiating structure dimension. However, faculty members agree with the presidents regarding the ideal leadership behavior of deans of instruction on initiating structure. On the dimension of construction, faculty members do not agree with presidents on the real and ideal leadership behavior of deans of instruction. The presidents feel more strongly than the faculty members that the deans should exhibit more leadership behavior that is indicative of the consideration dimension.

Cox (6) found that faculty members do not agree with the deans of instruction concerning the real leadership behavior of the deans of instruction on initiating structure. The faculty members perceive the deans as exhibiting behavior that is less indicative of initiating structure than they desire it to be. However, faculty members agree with the deans of instruction pertaining to the ideal leadership behavior of the deans on initiating structure. Faculty members do not agree with the deans of instruction concerning the real and ideal leadership behavior of the deans on consideration.

Cox (6) also found that presidents do not agree with the deans of instruction regarding the real leadership behavior of deans on initiating structure. However, presidents agree with the deans of instruction concerning the ideal leadership behavior of the deans on initiating
structure. Presidents agree with deans of instruction respecting the real leadership behavior of the deans on the consideration dimension, but they do not agree as to the ideal leadership behavior on this same dimension.

In 1975, Palmer (37) studied the leadership behavior of deans of instruction. The LBDQ was administered to 372 community college educators. The data reveal that presidents, deans of instruction, and division chairmen agree regarding the deans' real leadership behavior in terms of the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. However, the deans of instruction and faculty senate members do not agree as to the deans' real leadership behavior in terms of either initiating structure or consideration. All four respondent groups consider the real leadership behavior of the deans to be less than ideal in both dimensions. In the conclusions drawn from the study, it is evident that discrepancies exist between the viewpoints of superiors and subordinates in describing the leadership behavior of middle-level administrators.

In 1976, Nicol (36) investigated the perceptions and expectations of academic deans' leadership behavior in community colleges and university branch campuses as viewed by their immediate superiors (chief executive officers) and their faculties. Nicol concludes that faculties and chief executive officers differ in their perceptions and expectations of the leadership behavior of academic deans.
Faculties expect and perceive less initiating structure leadership behavior by the academic deans than do the chief executive officers. The chief executive officers perceive significantly more consideration by the academic deans than do faculties. Faculties expect and perceive less leadership behavior by the academic deans on both dimensions than do the deans. Conversely, deans expect and perceive significantly more leadership behavior on both dimensions than faculties. Nicol also indicates that chief executive officers and academic deans do not differ in their expectations and perceptions of the leadership behavior of the academic deans.

In 1977, Munsell (35) studied whether or not teaching faculty, central administrators, and division chairpersons envision different leadership role expectations in regard to division chairpersons at Northeastern Oklahoma State University. A total of 153 teaching faculty members, 20 central administrators, and 7 division chairpersons served as subjects for this study. The analysis of data reveals that there were no significant differences concerning the ideal division chairperson leadership role expectation for initiating structure and consideration behavior among the teaching faculty, central administrators, or division chairpersons. All three groups view the initiating structure and consideration dimensions as compatible forms of leadership behavior for the division chairpersons, and all
three groups associate effective ideal division chairperson leadership with high scores above the median on both dimensions. However, central administrators expect slightly more initiating structure behavior by the division chairpersons than is expected by faculty members and division chairpersons. Munsell also found that the teaching faculty expects slightly more consideration behavior than initiating structure behavior from division chairpersons.

In 1978, Grill (13) investigated the expectations and perceptions reported by presidents, members of boards of trustees, and administrative staff members concerning the leadership behavior of selected Christian college presidents. The data reveal that the presidents and staff members have similar expectations and perceptions relative to the ideal and real leadership behavior of Christian college presidents for initiating structure. The expectations of the trustees are significantly higher than either the presidents or staff members for the ideal leadership behavior of Christian college presidents for initiating structure although all three respondent groups have the same level of expectations for the ideal leadership behavior of Christian college presidents for consideration. The presidents report higher expectations for ideal consideration than initiating structure; the trustees have the same level of expectations in both dimensions although their perceptions are significantly higher than other
respondent groups for the real leadership behavior of Christian college presidents for initiating structure. The presidents and trustees have similar perceptions of the real leadership behavior of Christian college presidents for consideration, while staff members have lower perceptions.

Hatfield (17) studied the leadership behavior of art supervisors in selected southeastern states in relation to their responsibility, authority, and attitudes toward managerial concepts. The data reveal that even though art supervisors report high degrees of perceived authority, responsibility, and positive attitudes toward managerial concepts, there were no significant relationships with the initiating structure dimension of their leadership behavior. There were statistically significant relationships between attitudes toward staffing, motivating subordinates, delegating, planning, and organizing and the consideration dimension of their leadership behavior. However, responsibility and authority were not sufficient predictors of the consideration dimension of their leadership behavior.

In 1979, Harris (16) investigated community college academic deans' leadership behavior as perceived by their superordinates and faculty members in selected colleges in Florida. Based on an analysis of the data, Harris found that the perceptions of the presidents appear to be the same as other groups regarding the academic deans' leadership behavior but differ from the selected faculty members in the
expectations for the ideal academic deans' leadership behavior. The academic deans agree with other groups as to both the perceptions and expectations of their leadership behavior. The perceptions of selected faculty members appear to be the same as other groups but differ from the presidents in the expectations for the academic deans' leadership behavior.

In 1980, Karp (25) conducted a study to determine the multiple relationships of school size, school orientation, and the leadership behavior of the academic dean to school organizational climate as perceived by department chairpersons in a state college system. The LBDQ was used to measure the chairpersons' perceptions of the academic deans' leadership behavior. The findings indicate that the leadership behavior of academic deans on both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions has the most important positive influence among the variables on the intellectual achievements and individual growth of the schools' organizational climate.

In 1980, Johnson (24) investigated the leadership behavior of community junior college business instructors as perceived and expected by themselves and students. The findings reveal that the perceptions and expectations of business instructors and students do not agree regarding the business instructors' leadership behavior on both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. The
perceptions and expectations of students regarding the consideration dimension of business instructors' leadership behavior are greater than those of the business instructors, whereas the perceptions and expectations of business instructors regarding the initiating structure dimension of their leadership behavior are greater than those of the students. Business instructors' perceptions agree in reference to their leadership behavior when number of management-oriented courses and years of business management experience are considered. Their expectations also agree in reference to their leadership behavior when years of teaching experience, number of management-oriented courses, and business management experience are considered.

In 1981, Toulyati (49) investigated the expectations and perceptions of deans, chairmen, faculty members, and students of the leadership behavior of academic department chairmen at eighteen colleges and universities in Arkansas, Kansas, and Oklahoma. The LBDQ was employed to elicit the responses from the groups. The findings indicate that there are no significant differences between the perceptions of chairmen and deans as to both dimensions. Further, no significant differences were found between faculty members and chairmen for the ideal initiating structure. While faculty members disagree with chairmen only in their descriptions of the ideal consideration, the students disagree with chairmen in both dimensions of the leadership
behavior of academic department chairmen. Toulyati also found no significant differences between the descriptions of deans, chairmen, and faculty members with regard to real initiating structure, and no significant differences were found between the descriptions of chairmen, faculty members, and students with regard to real consideration. However, deans and students disagree with chairmen in their descriptions of real consideration and real initiating structure, respectively. While deans describe the real leadership behavior of the academic department chairmen as less considerate than is described by chairmen, students describe the real leadership behavior of academic department chairmen as being more initiating than is described by chairmen.

In 1982, Gonzales (12) investigated the leadership behavior of selected bilingual program directors in California. Forty-one directors of bilingual programs and 387 teaching staff members participated in this study. The data findings show that directors and teaching staff have a high perception of the consideration dimension of the directors' leadership behavior. Gonzales concludes that the leadership behavior of bilingual program directors contributes to the perceived ineffectiveness of the programs. He suggests that the directors of California's bilingual programs should be equally concerned with both the initiating structure and the consideration dimensions of their
leadership behavior if they are to be perceived as effective by the public.

Johns (23) conducted a study using the LBDQ to determine the leadership behavior of law school deans in the United States. Eighty-one deans and 1,001 faculty members from eighty-one schools approved by the American Bar Association participated in this study. The major finding reveals that the perceptions of the deans are significantly greater than those of the faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of the deans on both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Johns suggests that law school deans should utilize participative management, long-range planning, motivational techniques, and individualized leadership in dealing with their faculty members.

Leadership Behavior Studies in Thailand

The following LBDQ research studies are related to the study of leadership behavior of educational administrators in Thailand.

Cooparat (5) conducted a study in 1978 to determine the relationship between the leadership behavior of elementary school principals and the organizational climate of schools in Bangkok-Thonburi metropolitan area using the LBDQ to assess the principals' leadership behavior. The findings reveal that the observed behavior of the elementary school
principals on both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions has a relationship with the organizational climate. She also found that the elementary schools whose principals scored high on both dimensions are perceived by teachers as having a relatively open climate; conversely, elementary schools whose principals scored low on both dimensions are perceived by teachers as having a relatively closed climate.

In 1979, Deoisres (9) investigated the organizational climate of selected schools and their principals' leadership behavior. A group of 286 secondary school teachers in Bangkok participated in the study. The data analyses indicate that all of the teachers perceive their principals as being high in both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Deoisres concludes that the teachers perceive their principals as effective leaders regardless of how they perceive their schools' organizational climate.

In 1981, Hongham (21) studied the relationship between the deans' leadership style and the faculty's professional zone of acceptance as perceived by 192 faculty members at selected Thai universities. The LBDQ was used to assess the deans' leadership style. Hongham found that faculty members who have high perceptions of their dean on both the initiating structure and consideration dimensions have the widest professional zone of acceptance, whereas faculty members who have a low perception of their dean on both
dimensions have the narrowest professional zone of acceptance. However, faculty members who have a high perception of their dean on initiating structure and a low perception on consideration have a wider professional zone of acceptance than those who perceived their dean as being low on the initiating structure dimension and high on the consideration dimension.

Summary

The study of the relevant research and literature on leadership behavior in higher education institutions was undertaken in order to understand and explain the background of the study of leadership in terms of behavior. The principal elements of such specific past studies indicate that (a) initiating structure and consideration are important fundamental dimensions of leadership behavior, and (b) the LBDQ is a practical and useful instrument with which to obtain data that has clarity and provides accurate descriptions of these two dimensions of leadership behavior.

The literature indicates that, normally, superiors and subordinates describe leadership patterns differently. Superiors tend to be more concerned with initiating structure dimension, whereas subordinates appear to be more concerned with the consideration dimension. Most studies indicate that there is no relationship between the way leaders perceive themselves, presently or ideally, and the
way in which their superiors and subordinates describe them. In other words, leaders have higher perceptions of their abilities and characteristics than are perceived by those with whom they work.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and procedures utilized in the study. Included are the population of the study, description of the survey instrument, method of data collection, and an explanation of the statistical treatment of the data.

The Population

An attempt was made to obtain a response from all of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members whose names were furnished by the rector of Silpakorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. There were 8 deans, 31 chairpersons, and 392 faculty members who were employed full-time at Silpakorn University in 1982. At the time the survey instrument was administered, 32 faculty members were on leave to further their education in Thailand and abroad; they were not included in the study.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire which was developed by the staff of the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University. (See Appendix D.) The LBDQ was employed to
ascertain the differences in the perceptions and expectations of deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons at Silpakorn University in Thailand. Two forms of the LBDQ were used, as follows:

1. The LBDQ-Real, on which the respondents describe how they perceive the actual (real) behavior of the academic department chairpersons;

2. The LBDQ-Ideal, on which the respondents describe how they expect or believe that the academic department chairpersons should behave (ideal behavior). With modified instruction, this same instrument was used to measure the chairpersons' own leadership ideology.

The LBDQ has undergone many revisions and "has been used for research purposes in industrial, military, and educational settings" (3, p. 2). The LBDQ incorporates the two significant dimensions of leadership behavior of initiating structure and consideration. It is composed of thirty items, fifteen each for the two dimensions. 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 (3, p. 1). Halpin (3, p. 1) indicates that the estimated reliability coefficient by the split-half method is .83 for
the initiating structure scores and .92 for the consideration scores, when correction is made for attenuation with the Spearman-Brown formula.

In order to administer the LBDQ to the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members in Thailand, permission was requested to use the Thai version of the LBDQ that was translated by Deoisres (1) in 1979. The accuracy of the Thai version was verified by the panel of judges that consisted of three administrators and four language instructors at universities in Thailand.

Responses derived from the LBDQ reflect the perceptions and expectations of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons on both initiating structure and consideration dimensions. These derivations are shown in Table I.

Data Collection

The following procedures were used in data collection.

1. An introductory letter was sent to the rector of Silpakorn University that briefly explained the purposes of the study and requested permission to conduct the study at Silpakorn University. (See Appendix A.) The permission was granted and the lists of deans, chairpersons, and faculty members were sent to the researcher at North Texas State University. (See Appendix B.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ-Real, Dean</td>
<td>LBDQ-Ideal, Dean</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ-Real, Dean</td>
<td>LBDQ-Ideal, Dean</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ-Real, Chairperson</td>
<td>LBDQ-Ideal, Chairperson</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ-Real, Chairperson</td>
<td>LBDQ-Ideal, Chairperson</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ-Real, Faculty Member</td>
<td>LBDQ-Ideal, Faculty Member</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ-Real, Faculty Member</td>
<td>LBDQ-Ideal, Faculty Member</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Thai version of the questionnaire was sent to two assistant researchers in Thailand during the 1982-1983 school year. (See Appendix E.) A letter explaining the purposes and procedures was sent along with the questionnaire. The assistant researchers were informed concerning the guarantee of the anonymity of respondents.

3. The assistant researchers distributed the questionnaire to 8 deans, 31 chairpersons, and 360 faculty members at Silpakorn University. Each respondent received a cover letter of explanation from the researcher and a copy of the LBDQ. The letter emphasized that all data collected would be held and treated in strict confidence, that no participating individuals would be known to anyone but the researcher. The respondents were not asked to judge whether the behavior described is desirable or undesirable; they were asked only to describe how they think department chairpersons act (real) and how they think department chairpersons should act (ideal). However, no direct reference was made to either dimension of behavior under study. The instructions stated that the researcher was looking for data on the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons, but no indication was given to indicate which aspects of behavior were to be investigated. Coded numbers were assigned to separate the responses from the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members.
4. Within two weeks, the assistant researchers collected the questionnaire from the respondents. Those who had not responded received a follow-up letter and a second copy of the questionnaire. One week later, a second follow-up letter was sent to respondents whose questionnaire had not been returned. All completed questionnaires were mailed to the researcher at North Texas State University. The total number of persons in each group, the number of returns, and the percentage of returns are shown in Table II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Number of Returns</th>
<th>Percentage of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>70.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>73.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Statistical Treatment

The returned questionnaires were manually checked for accuracy of completion. All data were punched on cards, and computation of all statistics involved in the study was done
by computer using a program at the North Texas State University Computing Center.

Analysis of variance was selected for use as the appropriate statistical technique to test the null hypotheses. According to Ferguson, "analysis of variance is used to test the significance of the differences between the means of a number of different populations" (2, p. 223). In this study, it was used to determine if there were significant differences between the perceptions and expectations of deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons at Silpakorn University.

An F-ratio was used to determine the differences between respondent groups on the real and ideal dimensions, and between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance for a two tailed test.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of data obtained by administering the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to 8 deans, 31 chairpersons, and 360 faculty members at Silpakorn University in Thailand. Actual returns were received from 6 deans (75.00%), 31 chairpersons (100.00%), and 255 faculty members (70.83%). These percentages were required in order to carry out the purposes of the 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 (expected) initiating structure, and (4) the ideal (expected) consideration. The range of scores is from zero to sixty for each dimension for each respondent.

Responses on the Initiating Structure Dimension of Leadership Behavior

The mean and standard deviation scores for perceptions and expectations of each respondent group regarding initiating structure dimension of the academic department chairpersons' leadership behavior are presented in Table III.
TABLE III
THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSION FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Deans (N=6)</th>
<th>Chairpersons (N=31)</th>
<th>Faculty Members (N=255)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>40.77</td>
<td>42.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiating structure refers to the behavior of the department chairpersons in attempting to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting his job done.

As indicated by the data in Table III, the mean scores of the three respondent groups for the ideal dimension of initiating structure for academic department chairpersons are greater than the mean scores for the real dimension. The mean score of the expectations (ideal) of the deans is 49.17 on this dimension. The mean score of chairpersons is 40.77 on the ideal initiating structure dimension, and the mean score of the faculty members is 42.02. The mean score of the perceptions (real) of the deans is 31.83. The mean score of the chairpersons is 35.90, and the mean score of the faculty members on the real initiating structure dimension is 30.61. Inferential statistical treatment
of these data is reported in Tables V, VI, IX, X, XIII, and XIV.

Responses on the Consideration Dimension of Leadership Behavior

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

**TABLE IV**

THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSION FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deans (N=6)</th>
<th>Chairpersons (N=31)</th>
<th>Faculty Members (N=255)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>50.48</td>
<td>49.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the data in Table IV, the mean scores of all three respondent groups for the ideal consideration dimension for academic department chairpersons are greater
than the mean scores for the real dimension. The mean score of the expectations (ideal) of the deans is 52.67 on this dimension. The mean score of chairpersons on the ideal consideration dimension is 50.48, and the mean score of the faculty members is 49.21. The mean score of the perceptions (real) of the deans is 35.17. The mean score of the chairpersons is 46.71, and the mean score of the faculty members on the real consideration dimension is 40.44. Inferential statistical treatment of these data is reported in Tables VII, VIII, XI, XII, XV, and XVI. In summary, as indicated by the data in Tables III and IV, the mean expectations (ideal) of all respondent groups are greater than their mean perceptions (real) of the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons for both the initiating structure and the consideration dimensions.

Analysis of Data in Relationship to the Research Hypotheses

These data are presented in the order in which the null hypotheses were developed from the research hypotheses as stated in Chapter I. One way analysis of variance was used to test all twelve null hypotheses at the .05 level of significance for a two-tailed test. An F-test was used to determine if there were any significant differences in the ratings between deans and chairpersons, between chairpersons and faculty members, and between deans and faculty
members for data on the real and ideal descriptions of leadership behavior as stated in the purposes of this study.

**Research Hypothesis One**

Research hypothesis one predicts that there will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table V indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans and faculty members on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The perceptions of the deans are the same as those of the faculty members with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the real initiating structure dimension.

**TABLE V**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REAL INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>24915.05</td>
<td>96.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>24923.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Two

Research hypothesis two predicts that there will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table VI indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans and faculty members on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The expectations of the deans are greater than those of the faculty members with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the ideal initiating structure dimension.

TABLE VI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299.22</td>
<td>299.22</td>
<td>8.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>9080.40</td>
<td>35.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>9379.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0038.
Research Hypothesis Three

Research hypothesis three predicts that there will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. The data in Table VII indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans and faculty members on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The perceptions of the deans are the same as those of the faculty members with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the real consideration dimension.

### TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REAL CONSIDERATION SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163.14</td>
<td>163.14</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>30111.42</td>
<td>116.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>30274.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Four

Research hypothesis four predicts that there will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. The data in Table VIII indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans and faculty members on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The expectations of the deans are the same as those of the faculty members with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the ideal consideration dimension.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IDEAL CONSIDERATION SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.12</td>
<td>70.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>10017.06</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10087.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Five

Research hypothesis five predicts that there will be a difference between deans and faculty members in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table IX indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The perceptions of the deans are the same as those of the chairpersons with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the real initiating structure dimension.

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REAL INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2713.54</td>
<td>77.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2796.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Six

Research hypothesis six predicts that there will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table X indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The expectations of the deans are greater than those of the chairpersons with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the ideal initiating structure dimension.

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>354.06</td>
<td>354.06</td>
<td>9.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1342.25</td>
<td>38.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1696.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0045.
Research Hypothesis Seven

Research hypothesis seven predicts that there will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. The data in Table XI indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of deans and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The perceptions of the deans are less than those of the chairpersons with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the real (perceived) consideration dimension.

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REAL CONSIDERATION SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>669.81</td>
<td>669.81</td>
<td>16.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1395.22</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2065.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0002.
Research Hypothesis Eight

Research hypothesis eight predicts that there will be a difference between deans and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. The data in Table XII indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of deans and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The expectations of the deans are the same as those of the chairpersons with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the ideal consideration dimension.

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IDEAL CONSIDERATION SCORES BETWEEN DEANS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1021.07</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1045.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Nine

Research hypothesis nine predicts that there will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table XIII indicate that there is statistically significant difference between the perceptions of faculty members and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The perceptions of the chairpersons are greater than those of the faculty members with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the real initiating structure dimension.

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REAL INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES BETWEEN FACULTY MEMBERS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>773.92</td>
<td>773.92</td>
<td>8.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>26227.92</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>27000.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0041.
**Research Hypothesis Ten**

Research hypothesis ten predicts that there will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of initiating structure. The data in Table XIV indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of faculty members and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The expectations of the faculty members are the same as those of the chairpersons with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the ideal initiating structure dimension.

### TABLE XIV

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES BETWEEN FACULTY MEMBERS AND CHAIRPERSONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>10272.98</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10316.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Hypothesis Eleven

Research hypothesis eleven predicts that there will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the real (perceived) dimension of consideration. The data in Table XV indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of faculty members and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The perceptions of the chairpersons are greater than those of the faculty members with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the real consideration dimension.

TABLE XV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REAL CONSIDERATION SCORES BETWEEN FACULTY MEMBERS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1085.35</td>
<td>1085.35</td>
<td>9.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>31076.97</td>
<td>109.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>32162.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0018.
Research Hypothesis Twelve

Research hypothesis twelve predicts that there will be a difference between faculty members and chairpersons in their ratings of chairpersons' leadership behavior in the ideal (expected) dimension of consideration. The data in Table XVI indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of faculty members and chairpersons on this dimension. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The expectations of the faculty members are the same as those of the chairpersons with regard to the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the ideal consideration dimension.

**TABLE XVI**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IDEAL CONSIDERATION SCORES BETWEEN FACULTY MEMBERS AND CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>10863.47</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10908.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The analysis of data obtained for this study reveals that the null hypotheses one, three, four, five, eight, ten, and twelve are retained. The F-ratio obtained in regard to these hypotheses are not statistically significant. The null hypotheses two, six, seven, nine, and eleven are rejected since there are statistically significant differences. A detailed summary of the findings, the conclusions, and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions and expectations of groups of deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons at Silpakorn University in Thailand. The leadership behavior of the academic department chairpersons was defined in terms of the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

Initiating structure refers to the behavior of the academic department chairpersons in their attempting 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 academic department chairpersons and other groups.

The data needed to test the hypotheses consists of responses from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire that was administered to 6 deans, 31 chairpersons, and 255 faculty members who were employed at Silpakorn University in
Thailand during the 1982-1983 school year. The four scores that were generated from the respondents' answers on the LBDQ are (a) the real (perceived) initiating structure, (b) the real (perceived) consideration, (c) the ideal (expected) initiating structure, and (d) the ideal (expected) consideration.

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study, twelve research hypotheses were formulated. The analysis of variance was used to test each of the null hypotheses at the .05 level of significance.

The findings that resulted from the statistical analyses are as follows:

1. The perceptions of the deans do not differ significantly from those of the faculty members regarding the real leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension.

2. The expectations of the deans are significantly greater than those of the faculty members regarding the ideal leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension.

3. The perceptions of the deans do not differ significantly from those of the faculty members regarding the real leadership behavior of the academic department chairpersons in the consideration dimension.

4. The expectations of the deans do not differ significantly from those of the faculty members regarding the
ideal leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the consideration dimension.

5. The perceptions of the deans do not differ significantly from those of the chairpersons regarding the real leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension.

6. The expectations of the deans are significantly greater than those of the chairpersons regarding the ideal leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in initiating structure dimension.

7. The perceptions of the deans are significantly less than those of the chairpersons regarding the real leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the consideration dimension.

8. The expectations of the deans do not differ significantly from those of the chairpersons regarding the ideal leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the consideration dimension.

9. The perceptions of the chairpersons are significantly greater than those of the faculty members regarding the real leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension.

10. The expectations of the chairpersons do not differ significantly from those of the faculty members regarding the ideal leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension.
11. The perceptions of the chairpersons are significantly greater than those of the faculty members regarding the real leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the consideration dimension.

12. The expectations of the chairpersons do not differ significantly from those of the faculty members regarding the ideal leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons in the consideration dimension.

Conclusions

Based on the findings from this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. In regard to the initiating structure dimension of academic department chairpersons' leadership behavior, which encompasses the chairpersons' abilities to organize, communicate, and complete projects.

   a. Since the faculty members have the lowest regard for these leadership abilities of chairpersons, and the chairpersons have the highest regard for their own abilities, it appears that the chairpersons need to reevaluate this dimension of their leadership in relation to faculty members;

   b. Since, ideally, the deans would like the chairpersons to have and display a greater dimension of their initiating structure abilities, there is reason to believe that
the chairpersons are not fulfilling this dimension of the leadership expectations of their deans;

c. In brief, therefore, the chairpersons perceive themselves as being better leaders for the initiating structure dimension than, apparently, they are. The chairpersons also believe that they would not have to improve these abilities as much as is believed necessary by their deans in order to attain ideal behavior for this dimension.

2. In regard to the consideration dimension of academic department chairpersons' leadership behavior, which encompasses their abilities to inspire friendship, trust, and respect, and to project a warmth into relationships, the following seems to be appropriate:

Since the deans have the lowest regard for these leadership characteristics of chairpersons, and the chairpersons have the highest regard for their own characteristics, it appears that the chairpersons need to improve the characteristics of this dimension of their leadership in relation to both deans and faculty members; therefore, it appears that the chairpersons perceive themselves as being more charismatic than, apparently, they are.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for future research are made:

1. Parallel studies need to be made of the other personnel on a similar level in the organizational structure.

2. A replication of the present study using different leadership instruments would serve to further validate the findings.

3. A replication of the present study should be made for other institutions of higher education in Thailand.

4. A replication of the present study incorporating personal variables of respondent groups should prove to be of value.
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เรื่อง  ขอบข่ายพื้นฐานของความรู้ทางการจัดการชี้แจงผล

เรียน  อธิการบดีมหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร

บัณฑิต  นายองซื่อ สิทธิคุณ  นักศึกษาปริญญาเอก สาขาวิชา Higher Education Administration ณ North Texas State University มีความสนใจและ
ประสงค์จะทำการวิจัยเรื่อง "Perceptions and Expectations of Deans, Chairpersons,  และ Faculty Members Regarding Leadership Behavior of Academic Department chairperson at Silpakorn University in Thailand" โดยมีจุดมุ่งหมายโดย
อดีตเป็นเรื่องเพียง perceptions และ expectations ของคณบดี หัวหน้าภาควิชา และ
ศาสตราจารย์ เพื่อปรับปรุงการบริหารงานปัจจุบัน ของหัวหน้าภาควิชาในมหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร ซึ่งคาดหวังผลของการวิจัยนี้จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อมหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากรเป็นอย่างมาก

ในการนี้บัณฑิตจะศึกษาและขอความร่วมมือในการจัดส่งข้อมูลต่อไปนี้

1. รายชื่อและตำแหน่ง คณบดี หัวหน้าภาควิชาทุกท่าน ในมหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร
2. รายชื่อและตำแหน่ง ศาสตราจารย์ประจำห้องปฏิบัติงานที่เกี่ยวข้องในขณะนี้ โดย
   แยกเป็นแต่ละภาควิชา ยุคพระ
3. ระเบียบการเลือกคัดและ/หรือแต่งตั้งหัวหน้าภาควิชา ในมหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร

ยัง อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาของบัณฑิตได้ส่งจดหมายมาที่พนอธิการบดี เป็น
การส่วนตัวด้วยอีกส่วนหนึ่ง

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดพิจารณา หวังว่าจะได้รับความร่วมมือจากท่าน
เป็นอย่างดี และขอขอบคุณที่เป็นอย่างสูงมาก ณ โอกาสนี้.

ขอแสดงความนับถืออย่างสูง

( นายองซื่อ สิทธิคุณ )

P.O. BOX 8459 NT. STATION
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U.S.A.
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เรียน ผู้ทรงอิสรภาพ

ขอความมุ่งมั่น ให้การศึกษา

สำหรับแผนการศึกษาด้านการจัดการ

เรื่อง "Perceptions and Expectations of Deans, Chairpersons, and Faculty Members Regarding Leadership Behavior of Academic Department Chairperson at Silpakorn University in Thailand"
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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 situations when such steps are considered desirable.

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

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

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

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

   College of Admin Science
   Support Services
   The Ohio State University
   1775 College Road
   Columbus, OH 43210 U.S.A.

1979
APPENDIX D

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
12. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations. 0 1 2 3 4
0-----Never
1-----Seldom
2-----Occasionally
3-----Often
4-----Always

13. He lets group members know what is expected of them. 0 1 2 3 4
14. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity. 0 1 2 3 4
15. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. 0 1 2 3 4
16. He does personal favors for group members. 0 1 2 3 4
17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. 0 1 2 3 4
18. He is easy to understand. 0 1 2 3 4
19. He finds time to listen to group members. 0 1 2 3 4
20. He keeps to himself. 0 1 2 3 4
21. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. 0 1 2 3 4
22. He refuses to explain his actions. 0 1 2 3 4
23. He acts without consulting the group. 0 1 2 3 4
24. He is slow to accept new ideas. 0 1 2 3 4
25. He treats all group members as his equals. 0 1 2 3 4
26. He is willing to make changes. 0 1 2 3 4
27. He is friendly and approachable. 0 1 2 3 4
28. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with him. 0 1 2 3 4
29. He puts suggestion made by the group into operation. 0 1 2 3 4
30. He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead. 0 1 2 3 4
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-IDEAL

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently the leader SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five numbers to show the answer you have selected.

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

What the IDEAL leader SHOULD do:

1. Make his attitude clear to the group. 0 1 2 3 4
2. Try out his new ideas with the group. 0 1 2 3 4
3. Rule with an iron hand. 0 1 2 3 4
4. Criticize poor work. 0 1 2 3 4
5. Speak in a manner not to be questioned. 0 1 2 3 4
6. Assign group members to particular tasks. 0 1 2 3 4
7. Work without a plan. 0 1 2 3 4
8. Maintain definite standards of performance. 0 1 2 3 4
9. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines. 0 1 2 3 4
10. Encourage the use of uniform procedures. 0 1 2 3 4
11. Make sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. 0 1 2 3 4
12. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations. 0 1 2 3 4
0-----Never  
1-----Seldom  
2-----Occasionally  
3-----Often  
4-----Always  

13. Let group members know what is expected of them.  
14. See to it that group members are working up to capacity.  
15. See to it that the work of group members is coordinated.  
16. Do personal favors for group members.  
17. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.  
18. Be easy to understand.  
19. Find time to listen to group members.  
20. Keep to himself.  
21. Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members.  
22. Refuse to explain his actions.  
23. Act without consulting the group.  
24. Be slow to accept new ideas.  
25. Treat all group members as his equal.  
26. Be willing to make changes.  
27. Be friendly and approachable.  
28. Make group members feel at ease when talking with him.  
29. Put suggestions made by the group into operation.  
30. Get group approval on important matters before going ahead.
APPENDIX E

The Translated LBDQ
แบบสอบถาม
ตอนที่ 1 แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับพฤติกรรมของผู้นำ
(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL)
ข้อแนะนำในการตอบแบบสอบถาม
1. โปรดด้านข้อความในแบบสอบถามแต่ละข้ออย่างเคร่งครัดและจริงจัง
2. ข้อความของท่านใช้เป็นเกณฑ์ ต่อไปนี้เกิดขึ้น
ข้อเห็นได้ โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ในข้อที่คิดถึงความเห็นของท่าน
3. โปรดตอบทุกข้อ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>แสดงเจตคิดของตนเองให้คู่ราชการ ทราบอย่างชัดเจน</th>
<th>ไม่เคย</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น เลย</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหม่กับคู่ราชการ</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเป็นมงคล</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>วิชาการวิจารณ์งานที่ทำไม่ได้ผล</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>สั่งการในลักษณะที่ไปมุ่งความให้ผู้ใด ชักลากหย่อนยินดี</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>สร้างความสัมพันธ์ให้เหมาะสมกับธุรกรรมงาน</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้มีการวางแผน</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>รักษาความสมานฉันท์ทางงาน</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>เสนอเรื่องทางงานให้ทันเวลาถูกต้อง</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ นานๆครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เป็นบางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เสมอๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ลำดับที่</td>
<td>รายการ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ส่งเสริมให้ศาสตราจารย์ทำงานอย่างมีระเบียบแบบแผนเต็มที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ชื่นชมให้ศาสตราจารย์เข้าใจหน้าที่และความรับผิดชอบของหัวหน้าภาควิชาที่มีต่อภาควิชา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ชื่นชมให้ศาสตราจารย์ปฏิบัติงานควบคู่ช่วยเหลือ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ชื่นชมให้ศาสตราจารย์ทำงานที่ง่ายๆหน้าที่ช่วยเหลือจากหัวหน้าบางของภาควิชา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>หนึ่งตรวจราชการและให้ศาสตราจารย์ทำงานโดยใช้ความสามารถอย่างเต็มที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>หนึ่งตรวจราชการทำงานของศาสตราจารย์ให้เป็นไปอย่างสมดุลและเต็มที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ทำงานให้เป็นที่รักใคร่ขอบพอดของศาสตราจารย์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>กระทำสิ่งใดเดิมสมนัยอย่างทำให้ศาสตราจารย์รู้สึกยินดีได้เข้าร่วมเป็นสมาชิกในภาคฯ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เป็นคนที่ศาสตราจารย์เข้าใจได้ง่าย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เลข</td>
<td>รายการ</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ บางครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น บ่อยครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่เสมอๆ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ปีเวลาที่จะพิจารณาคัดเลือกของคุณำการ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ขอหน่วยงานตามลักษณะและไม่ส่งเสริมกับผู้อื่น</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ค่อยจัดหาสวัสดิการให้แก่คุณำการ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธที่จะยอมรับเหตุผลในการบริหารงานของคน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธงานโดยไม่ปฏิเสธคุณำการ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ไม่ค่อยยอมรับพิจารณาคัดเลือกใหม่ๆ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธแผนแจ้งคุณำการ์สะสมอยู่ในสถานะเก่าที่มีกัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เดินใจที่จะเปลี่ยนแปลงและปรับปรุงวิธีการทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เป็นกันเองและหมาญ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้คุณำการ์รู้สึกเป็นกันเองเมื่อเวลาพบกันผ่านทาง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>นำข้อมูลแนะแนวของคุณำการ์ย้ายไปในกรณีบริหารงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ข้อความที่ถูกต้องจากคุณำการ์ไม่เรียงลำดับหรือที่จะนำไปปฏิเสธ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
แบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 2 แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับพฤติกรรมของผู้บริหาร

(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - IDEAL)

ข้อแนะนำในการตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. โปรดอ่านข้อความในแบบสอบถามแต่ละข้ออย่างเคร่งครัดและระบุตรง
2. ต้านทานว่า หัวหน้าภาควิชา ในสถาบันของท่าน ควรมีพฤติกรรม คือไปนี่
   หมายถึงเพียงใด โปรดตอบเครื่องหมาย ✓ ในช่องที่ตรงกับความเห็นของท่าน
3. โปรดตอบทุกข้อ

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด
| 1 | จะมี | จะมี | จะมี | จะมี | มีมาก
| 2 | ไม่เลย | น้อยมาก | ปานกลาง | มาก | ที่สุด

1. แสดงเจตคติอย่างแน่นอนให้คณานารย์ ทราบอย่างชัดเจน
2. ทดลองแนวความคิดใหม่ๆกับคณานารย์
3. บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเนียบมาก
4. วิจัยวิจารณ์งานที่ทำไปไม่ดีสมถ
5. ส่งเสริมในลักษณะที่ไม่บุคคลให้ผู้ใด รักษาได้แก่
6. รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่งาน
7. บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้มีการวางแผน
8. รักษามาตรฐานทางทำางาน
9. เน้นเรื่องการทำางานให้ทันตามกำหนด

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>แสดงเจตคติอย่างแน่นอนให้คณานารย์ ทราบอย่างชัดเจน</th>
<th>ไม่ควร</th>
<th>ควร</th>
<th>ควร</th>
<th>ควร</th>
<th>ควรจด มีมาก ที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 | ทดลองแนวความคิดใหม่ๆกับคณานารย์ | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด
<p>| 3 | บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเนียบมาก | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |
| 4 | วิจัยวิจารณ์งานที่ทำไปไม่ดีสมถ | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |
| 5 | ส่งเสริมในลักษณะที่ไม่บุคคลให้ผู้ใด รักษาได้แก่ | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |
| 6 | รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่งาน | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |
| 7 | บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้มีการวางแผน | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |
| 8 | รักษามาตรฐานทางทำางาน | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |
| 9 | เน้นเรื่องการทำางานให้ทันตามกำหนด | ไม่ควร | ควร | ควร | ควร | ควรจด |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ไม่ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>มีมาก</th>
<th>ฟีดแบ็ก</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ต้องเริ่มให้คณาจารย์ทำงานอย่างมีระเบียบแบบแผนเสียก่อน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ชี้แจงให้คณาจารย์เข้าใจหน้าที่และความรับผิดชอบของทั้งนักคณาจารย์ ที่มีต่อภาควิชา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ขอร้องให้คณาจารย์ปฏิบัติงานตามกฎหมาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ชี้แจงให้คณาจารย์ทราบถึงความมุ่งหวัง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ที่มีควรจัดตารางให้คณาจารย์ทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ที่มีควรจัดตารางทำงานของคณาจารย์ให้เป็นไปอย่างสอดคล้องต้องกัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ทำงานให้เป็นที่ชัดเจนโดยชอบหลักของคณาจารย์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>กระทำการสื่อสารและดำเนินการให้คณาจารย์รู้สึกเสมือนได้เข้าร่วมเป็นสมาชิกในภาควิชา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เป็นคนที่คณาจารย์เข้าใจได้ง่าย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ไนตร์</td>
<td>ไนตร์</td>
<td>ไนตร์</td>
<td>ไนตร์</td>
<td>ไนตร์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
แบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 1 แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับพฤติกรรมของผู้นำ

(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – REAL)

บันทึกในแบบสอบถามแน่นอน
1. โปรดแสดงความคิดเห็นในแบบสอบถามแต่ละข้ออย่างใจจริงและรอบคอบ
2. ต้านทานว่า ต้านในความสิ่งขั้นผ่านวิเคราะห์พฤติกรรม ต่อไปนี้ เกิดขึ้น
   บ่อยเหี่ยวใด โปรดคาดเสิร์ชอนพาด  ในข้อที่ตรงกับความเห็นของท่าน
3. โปรดตอบขั้นตอนที่

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>เลย</td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| เลข | แพร่กระจายคิดต้องคนอื่นๆที่มีความจากราย
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>แสดงเจตน์ของตนเองให้คนอื่นๆทราบอย่างชัดเจน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหญ่ๆที่มีการเจรจา</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ว่ากล่าวหรือวางงานที่ทำไปได้ผล</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ส่งเสริมในลักษณะที่ไม่ยินยอมให้ผู้อื่น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>รู้จักเลิกคบคบให้เหมาะสมกับสถานะของงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้มีการวางแผน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>รักษาคุณภาพของงานที่ทำ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำวิจารณ์ให้ทันตามที่เห็น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>เชิญเรียนให้บุคคลที่เกี่ยวข้องนำผลการประเมินแผนงานอย่างมีรายละเอียดแผนงานศึกษา</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ชื่อเจ้าหน้าที่และอัตราพนักงานที่มีหน้าที่ปรับปรุงข้อกำหนดการดำเนินงานของหน่วยงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ชื่อเจ้าหน้าที่และอัตราพนักงานตามกฎหมายข้อมูลพนักงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>หน่วยตรวจสอบมีการดำเนินการทางวิชาการ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>หน่วยตรวจสอบมีการดำเนินการทางวิชาการตามกฎหมาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>หน่วยตรวจสอบมีการดำเนินการทางวิชาการตามกฎหมาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>หน่วยตรวจสอบมีการดำเนินการทางวิชาการตามกฎหมาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>หน่วยตรวจสอบมีการดำเนินการทางวิชาการตามกฎหมาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เป็นพนักงานที่มีการดำเนินการทางวิชาการ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เลข</td>
<td>คำถาม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ปั๊มน้ำที่จะพังความคิดเห็นของคุณจริง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ช่วงที่งานตามลำพังและไม่สังสรรค์กับผู้อื่น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ค่ายจิตภาพสวัสดิการได้แก่คุณจริง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธที่จะอธิบายเหตุผลในการบริหารงานของคุณ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธงานโดยไม่เปรียบคุณจริง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ไม่คอยยอมรับพัฒนาความคิดเห็นใหม่ๆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธคัดค้านคุณจริงเสียผู้อยู่ในสถานะเท่าเทียมกัน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เลิกใจที่จะทำงานแปลงและปรับปรุงวิธีการทำงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เบื้องก้นเองและหน้างาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้คุณงานรู้สึกเป็นกันเองเมื่อเวลาพบปะมากกัน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ให้ข้อเสนอแนะของคุณจริงไม่ใช่ในงานบริหารงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>อนาคตจะมีสอนจากคุณจริงในเรื่องสำคัญๆที่จะนำมาปฏิบัติ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
แบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 2 แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็น เรียกว่าพฤติกรรมของผู้นำ

( THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - IDEAL )

ข้อแนะนำในการตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. โปรดอ่านข้อความในแบบสอบถามแต่ละข้ออย่างใคร่ครวญและรอบคอบ
2. ด้านเนื้อหา ด้าน ในฐานะพื้นฐานการวิชา ความยุทธศาสตร์ ต้องเป็นมาคั่นอย่างเพียงใด โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย √ ในช่องที่ตรงกับความเห็นของคุณ
3. โปรดตอบทุกข้อ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ไม่ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
<th>ควรจะมี</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ไม่ควรจะมี</td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
<td>ปานกลาง</td>
<td>มาก</td>
<td>มีมาก</td>
<td>มากที่สุด</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>คำตอบ</th>
<th>แต่ละพฤติกรรมควรจะมีอย่างไร</th>
<th>แต่ละพฤติกรรมควรจะมีอย่างไร</th>
<th>แต่ละพฤติกรรมควรจะมีอย่างไร</th>
<th>แต่ละพฤติกรรมควรจะมีอย่างไร</th>
<th>แต่ละพฤติกรรมควรจะมีอย่างไร</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>แสดงเจตคัดของตนเองให้คนอาจารย์</td>
<td>ความอย่างชัดเจง</td>
<td>แสดงเจตคัดของตนเองให้คนอาจารย์</td>
<td>ความอย่างชัดเจง</td>
<td>แสดงเจตคัดของตนเองให้คนอาจารย์</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหม่ๆท้ายคณาจารย์</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหม่ๆท้ายคณาจารย์</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหม่ๆท้ายคณาจารย์</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหม่ๆท้ายคณาจารย์</td>
<td>แสดงแนวความคิดใหม่ๆท้ายคณาจารย์</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ริเริ่มวิชาการอย่างที่ทำไม่ได้เลย</td>
<td>ริเริ่มวิชาการอย่างที่ทำไม่ได้เลย</td>
<td>ริเริ่มวิชาการอย่างที่ทำไม่ได้เลย</td>
<td>ริเริ่มวิชาการอย่างที่ทำไม่ได้เลย</td>
<td>ริเริ่มวิชาการอย่างที่ทำไม่ได้เลย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>สิ่งกำกับลักษณะที่เป็นมนูษย์ให้ผู้ต้อง</td>
<td>สิ่งกำกับลักษณะที่เป็นมนูษย์ให้ผู้ต้อง</td>
<td>สิ่งกำกับลักษณะที่เป็นมนูษย์ให้ผู้ต้อง</td>
<td>สิ่งกำกับลักษณะที่เป็นมนูษย์ให้ผู้ต้อง</td>
<td>สิ่งกำกับลักษณะที่เป็นมนูษย์ให้ผู้ต้อง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่ของงาน</td>
<td>รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่ของงาน</td>
<td>รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่ของงาน</td>
<td>รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่ของงาน</td>
<td>รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับหน้าที่ของงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้วางแผน</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้วางแผน</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้วางแผน</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้วางแผน</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้วางแผน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>รักษามาตรฐานของการทำงาน</td>
<td>รักษามาตรฐานของการทำงาน</td>
<td>รักษามาตรฐานของการทำงาน</td>
<td>รักษามาตรฐานของการทำงาน</td>
<td>รักษามาตรฐานของการทำงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำงานให้พันตามกำหนด</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำงานให้พันตามกำหนด</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำงานให้พันตามกำหนด</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำงานให้พันตามกำหนด</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำงานให้พันตามกำหนด</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ลำดับ</td>
<td>คำถาม</td>
<td>ไม่ควรจะมี</td>
<td>ควรจะมี</td>
<td>ควรจะมี</td>
<td>ไม่ควรจะมี</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ส่งเสริมให้สาขาวิชาที่งานอย่างมี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ชี้แจงให้พระอาจารย์เข้าใจหน้าที่และความรับผิดชอบของที่ว่ามีการวิทยาการที่มีคุณภาพ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ขอร้องให้อาจารย์ปฏิบัติงานตามกฎ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ชี้แจงให้พระอาจารย์ทราบถึงความมุ่งหวัง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>หนึ่งควรตรวจควบคุมให้พระอาจารย์ทำงานโดยให้ความสามารถอย่างเต็มที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>หนึ่งควรตรวจสอบการทำงานของ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ทำงานให้เป็นที่รักใคร่ของพี่คุณอาจารย์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>การทำสิ่งละมุนแต่น้อยที่ทำให้พระอาจารย์ผู้สังกัดที่ให้เข้ามาร่วมเป็นสมัครใน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เป็นคนที่พระอาจารย์เข้าใจได้ง่าย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เลข</td>
<td>แนวข้อสอบ</td>
<td>ไม่ควรจะผ่าน</td>
<td>ควรจะผ่านเมื่อ</td>
<td>ควรจะผ่านเมื่อ</td>
<td>ควรจะผ่านเมื่อ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>วิเคราะห์สาระสังคมของศาสตร์พยากรณ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>สอบถามความคิดเห็นของพยากรณ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ค่อยๆทำความเข้าใจให้แม่พยากรณ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธที่จะยอมรับเหตุผลในการบริหารงานของคุณ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธงานโดยไม่ปรึกษาพยากรณ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ไม่ค่อยยอมรับเหตุผลที่ถูกใจ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ปฏิเสธผลคดีพยากรณ์เสมือนอยู่ในสถานที่แบบเทียบเท่ากัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เดินใจที่จะเปลี่ยนแปลงและปรับปรุงวิธีการทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เปรียบเทียบเจรจา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้พยากรณ์รู้สึกเป็นที่เป็นที่ยอมรับผลิตภัณฑ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ทำให้ส่งผลแบบของพยากรณ์มาใช้ในงานบริหารงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>สอบถามเห็นชอบจากพยากรณ์ในเรื่องสำคัญก่อนที่จะนำไปปฏิบัติ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Classification of Higher Education Institutions in Thailand
# Classification of Higher Education Institutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>The Office of University Affairs</th>
<th>The Education Ministry and Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Government Colleges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Education Ministry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 college of technology and vocational education with 28 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 universities</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 vocational and technical colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 institutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 commercial colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 agricultural colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 teacher training colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 physical education colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dramatic arts college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 fine arts college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public Health Ministry</strong></td>
<td>7 nursing colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Ministries</strong></td>
<td>4 military/police academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 military/police nursing schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 other ministries schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 nursing college under Bangkok Metropolitan Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Private Specialized Institutions</strong></td>
<td>1 nursing college of the Bangkok Seventh Day Adventist Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 private colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Buddhist colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Asian Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX G

Academic Departments at Silpakorn University
SILPAKORN UNIVERSITY

BANGKOK CAMPUS

1. FACULTY OF PAINTING, SCULPTURE, AND GRAPHIC ARTS
   Department of Painting
   Department of Sculpture
   Department of Graphic Arts
   Department of Thai Arts

2. FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE
   Department of Architectural Technology
   Department of Related Arts and Architecture
   Department of Architecture
   Department of Urban Design and Planning

3. FACULTY OF ARCHAEOLOGY
   Department of Archaeology
   Department of Arts History
   Department of Oriental Languages
   Department of Western Languages
   Department of Anthropology

4. FACULTY OF DECORATIVE ARTS
   Department of Applied Art Studies
   Department of Interior Designs
   Department of Visual Communication Designs
   Department of Product Designs

5. GRADUATE SCHOOL

NAKHON PATHOM CAMPUS

1. FACULTY OF ARTS
   Department of History
   Department of Geography
   Department of Thai Language
   Department of English Language
   Department of French Language
   Department of German Language
2. FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
Department of Psychology and Guidance
Department of Educational Foundations
Department of Curriculum and Methodology

3. FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Department of Mathematics
Department of Chemistry
Department of Biology
Department of Physics
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