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The purpose for choosing this study was to compare the perceptions of the role of presidents in teachers colleges in Northeastern Thailand. The study groups included the presidents, the administrative staff, and the teaching faculty within these colleges.

The *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire* (LBDQ) was employed to assess the leadership behavior of the teachers college presidents in terms of initiating structure and consideration. The population included 8 presidents, 240 administrative staff, and 400 teaching faculty.

Analysis of the data revealed that (a) the mean scores of the perceptions of the presidents were significantly higher than both the mean scores of the perceptions of the administrative staff and teaching faculty, (b) there was no significant differences in the perceptions and expectations between the administrative staff and teaching faculty members, (c) the expected scores of both the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff were significantly higher than the perceived scores for both the initiating Structure dimension and the consideration dimension.
In conclusion, role conflicts between the presidents and the teaching faculty can be reduced if the presidents concentrate on the expectations of the administrative staff and the teaching faculty members, and the presidents should accentuate both the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of time, people have been playing expected roles in the home, in the community, and in society (11). When a person plays a role as he or she perceives it, conflicts may arise when others have different role expectations about that person. Society tries to determine and to identify many roles with the hope that the roles may be achieved (11). Perceptions of leadership behavior reflect the different styles of leadership which higher education administrators engage in when interacting with and relating to their various reference roles. Expectations of leadership behavior reflect the different roles which administrators in higher education must seek to fulfill in the course of performing their duties (8). Previous studies suggest that higher education administrators adopt different styles of leadership behavior in dealing with different groups and that they experience role conflict stemming from conflicting perceptions and expectations of superiors and subordinates. In higher education conflicts are rampant and inevitable (2).
In higher education institutions, the relationships between faculty and administration are often a source of conflict. Administrators sometimes think that faculty members are impossible and impractical (11, p. 1). Salemn makes the observation that the faculty sometimes ignore administrators because administrators seem unaware of the purpose of the institutions (13, p. 17). Some people prefer the president to be the autonomous professional leader of the college, advising both board and faculty. Others see the president as chief spokesman for the board, and still others see the president consulting board members as they perform the negotiating process (5, pp. 25-29).

The success of higher education depends mainly upon an atmosphere of full cooperation which should pervade the institution (13, p. 177). Increased understanding of roles should facilitate the improvement of the administrative functions of the president. Differing perceptions of what constitutes effective leader behavior have often seemed to lead to conflict among staff at various levels. It would appear then that efforts should be directed toward reducing role conflicts by studying expectations and perceptions of one or both groups.

Such role conflicts exist in all countries and especially in Thailand due to the centralized governance of higher education. Teachers colleges in Thailand have particular problems in role conflicts due to the broader and
more role conscious professional preparation of faculty and administrative staff. Presidents may or may not have such preparation.

Teachers colleges are public institutions of higher education and are under the authority of the Ministry of Education. The position of the president in these teachers colleges is a key position. Full cooperation between faculty and president is necessary in order to reach goals most effectively. Therefore, a study of leadership as it pertains to the behavior of teachers college presidents in selected teachers colleges in Thailand seems to be needed. This study then will focus on the leadership behavior of teachers college presidents in selected teachers colleges in Thailand as perceived by the administrative staff and teaching faculty members of those colleges.

The northeastern part of Thailand was selected for this study because although other studies of leadership behavior have been done in Thailand, the northeastern part of Thailand has been largely ignored. Due to the isolated and undeveloped conditions of this area, few teachers colleges have existed.

During the last twenty years, however, the Thai government has created four additional teachers colleges in northeastern Thailand. Patterns of leadership of these colleges may be different from teachers colleges in other parts of Thailand due to the isolation of these colleges
from the other colleges and due to the tremendous amount of
growth of these educational institutions in northeastern
Thailand.

A study of leadership behavior in northeastern Thailand
seems then to be useful at this time. The results of such a
study can help to more efficiently further the development
of higher education in the northeastern part of Thailand.
By studying the perceptions of the role of the presidents in
northeastern Thailand, this study can help to identify
potential sources of conflicts over leader behavior. The
findings of this study can then be used to help create a
more harmonious relationship among all of the parties
involved in higher education in northeastern Thailand.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is the leadership behavior of
teachers college presidents in selected teachers colleges in
Thailand.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To determine if differences exist between the
perceptions of teaching faculty and administrative staff
regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;

2. To determine if differences exist between the
expectations of teaching faculty and administrative staff
regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;
3. To determine if differences exist between the perceptions of teaching faculty and presidents regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;

4. To determine if differences exist between the expectations of teaching faculty and presidents regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;

5. To determine if differences exist between the perceptions of administrative staff and presidents regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;

6. To determine if differences exist between the expectations of administrative staff and presidents regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;

7. To determine if differences exist between the perceptions and expectations of the teaching faculty regarding the leadership behavior of presidents;

8. To determine if differences exist between the perceptions and expectations of the administrative staff regarding the leadership behavior of presidents; and

9. To determine if differences exist between the perceptions and expectations of the presidents themselves regarding their own leadership behavior.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of the study the following hypotheses were tested using data collected by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ):
1. There will be no significant differences between the teaching faculty and administrative staff in their ratings of each real (perceived) dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

2. There will be no significant differences between the teaching faculty and administrative staff in their ratings of each ideal (expected) dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

3. There will be no significant differences between the teaching faculty and presidents in their ratings of each real (perceived) dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

4. There will be no significant differences between teaching faculty and presidents in their ratings of each ideal (expected) dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

5. There will be no significant differences between administrative staff and presidents in their ratings of each real (perceived) dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

6. There will be no significant differences between the administrative staff and presidents in their ratings of each ideal (expected) dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

7. There will be no significant differences between the real (perceived) and ideal (expected) of the teaching
faculty in their ratings of each dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

8. There will be no significant differences between the real (perceived) and ideal (expected) of the administrative staff in their ratings of each dimension of presidents' leadership behavior;

9. There will be no significant differences between the real (perceived) and ideal (expected) of the presidents themselves in their ratings of each dimension of their own leadership behavior.

Background and Significance of the Study

Thailand, which was formerly known as Siam, is a small Asian country that occupies the center of the South-East mainland, between Burma to the West, Laos and Cambodia to the East and Malaysia to the South. The population, according to the 1982 National Census, was approximately 48.8 million. The official national language is Thai. The traditional religion is Buddhism.

During the past decade, all institutions of higher education in Thailand, as in many countries, have developed and expanded rapidly to serve the needs of the people. Teachers colleges, which play a major role in producing nine-tenths of the nation's teachers, have also developed and expanded during that time. The first teachers college was established in 1892 (14, p. 43). At the present, there
are 36 teachers colleges located in different regions of Thailand. The Thai government has viewed teacher-education as its special responsibility. The private sector, at no time, has been permitted to organize programs for the education of teachers.

Since the Teachers Colleges Education Act was passed in 1976, teachers colleges have served purposes such as teacher training and research as well as providing a variety of community services and cultural preservation (3, p. 59). In short, the functions of teachers colleges as government degree-granting institutions, have been similar to that of the government universities: education, research, public service and cultural preservation (17, p. 59). These teachers colleges in Thailand are under the Department of Teacher Education. Six teachers colleges are in Bangkok, five are in Central Thailand, eight are in Northern Thailand, eight are in Northeastern Thailand, five are in Southern Thailand and four are in Western Thailand. The eight teachers colleges in the northeast which will be used in this study are Udornthani, Sakon Nakorn, Loej, Ubonrajchathani, Mahasarakarm, Nakorn Rajchasrima, Bureeram and Surin. These colleges are governed by two laws: the Teacher Education Department Charter and the Teacher College Act (10, p. 4). Generally, the Department of Teacher Education is responsible for administrative affairs while the various colleges are responsible for their own academic affairs.
The president of a teachers college is appointed to his position by the Department of Teacher Education. The president moves directly from a faculty position or from an administrative office within the Department of Teacher Education (12, p. 7).

The position of president of a higher education institution is regarded as a key position. How the presidents and others view the position can have a considerable influence upon the education policy. Dykes indicates that (4, p. 25):

University presidents, representing as they do the leadership of the nation's primary scientific, cultural, and intellectual institutions, must become involved in the larger society, not only because the health of their institutions is at stake but also they would bring valuable perspectives and capabilities to solve the nation's problems.

In order to play the role of the president, the president must receive all possible cooperation from his administrative staff and teaching faculty. Any neglect or indifference on the part of the president in performing his administrative role will seriously affect every aspect of administration at the college. Therefore, this type of study is frequently used by many administrators to minimize the role conflict in administration of the colleges. Upton viewed role conflict as the following (15, p. 28-31):

Differences in expectations for the performance of the president might be expected to have adverse effects on him and even, perhaps, on the institution. The effects should become more pronounced as differences grow greater.
If the effective functioning of the system is related to the behavior of its members, and if their behavior is in turn related to expectations for the system, increased understanding of specific roles should facilitate improvement of institutional practice. Efforts could be directed to reducing role conflict by changing expectations of one or both groups, by better defining and more carefully monitoring the decision-making process in areas of conflict, and by predicting and preparing for critical differences.

The college president, as the critical link between the administrative staff and teaching faculty, must become more aware of role conflict and the differing expectations of his position by these groups. Therefore, a study of college presidents should contribute to an understanding of leader behavior in Thai teachers colleges. However, this study has other immediate values as well. It can assist in identifying potential sources of conflict which may exist among various college groups concerning the leadership role of the presidents. It is also hoped that the outcome of this study will provide an instrument for developing guidelines for improving, appointing, or preparing persons to be presidents. In addition, the findings can minimize the role conflict and be useful to potential administrators for self studies, self-evaluation and improvement in teachers colleges.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they relate to this study.
1. **Teachers college**: A public institution to prepare people who seek the bachelor's degree and diploma in education.

2. **Department of Teacher Education**: One of the eight departments in the Ministry of Education in Thailand. It is responsible for training the vast majority of degree and sub-degree teachers, needed by the general education system, through teachers colleges (14, pp. 2-3).

3. **Role**: The expected behavior, the idealized rights and obligations of college presidents in the teachers colleges in northeastern Thailand.

4. **President**: This position refers to the chief executive officer of a teachers college. The president directs the institution in accordance with policies of the Department of Teacher Education and in accordance with law and custom.

5. **Administrative staff**: In this study, the administrative staff refers to the following administrators:
   a. Vice-president for academic affairs
   b. Vice-president for administrative staff
   c. Vice-president for student affairs
   d. Department Heads

6. **Teaching faculty**: Any instructor in teachers colleges in northeastern Thailand.

7. **Behavior**: The term is used in a broad sense to include an individual's perceptions, feelings, attitudes,
thoughts and verbalizations as well as overt action (7, p. 28).

8. **Leadership behavior:** The manifestation of initiating structure and consideration as displayed by the leader in his interactions with the work group: including his superiors and subordinates, and his behavior as described as a broad sense referred to in the above definition of behavior (2, p. 18).

9. **Initiating structure:** This term refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and ways of getting the job done (13, p. 1).

10. **Consideration:** This term refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group (13, p. 1).

11. **Perception:** This term refers to an immediate or intuitive cognition or judgment (9, p. 1).

12. **Expectation:** The desirable or appropriate behavior associated with a certain role. For the purpose of this study, staff consider the presidents' leadership behavior in terms of how they should act in certain leadership situation (16, p. 16).

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is limited to the following:
1. The bias, expectations and perceptions of the presidents, administrative staff and teaching faculty responding to the instrument used in the collection of data;

2. Presidents of eight teachers colleges in northeastern Thailand;

3. Administrative staff of eight teachers colleges in northeastern Thailand;

4. Teaching faculty of eight teachers colleges in northeastern Thailand;

5. Differences in age, sex, lengths of service, and academic degrees of the presidents and their staff members are not considered in this study.

The Survey Instrument

The research instrument which was used in this study is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which was developed by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University (7). The LBDQ was used to obtain information from the respondents for this study. It is composed of thirty short, descriptive statements which reflect the real and ideal ways in which leaders behave.

Procedures for Collection of Data

The collection of data for this study was carried out as follows.
1. A letter requesting permission to conduct this study was sent to the Director General of the Department of Teacher Education, Ministry of Education, Thailand. Permission was granted in that the Director General addressed each president by letter asking for cooperation with this study.

2. All materials, including letters to presidents and respondents explaining the purpose of the study as well as copies of the questionnaire (LBDQ) were sent to each of the presidents of selected teachers colleges.

3. The presidents then distributed letters explaining the purposes of the study and copies of the questionnaire to their staff members and faculty members as well as to themselves.

4. The presidents then collected the completed copies of the questionnaire and returned them to North Texas State University. To guard against possible presidential contamination, all respondents except the presidents were asked to seal their envelopes before returning the completed questionnaires.

5. An investigator assistant located in Thailand supervised the final collections of data by contacting each president.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The questionnaires were manually checked for accuracy of completion. The information obtained from the returned
questionnaires was transferred to Fortran coding forms and the data fed into the Statistical Analysis System at the North Texas State University Computer Center.

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS), uses an integrated approach to editing and statistical analysis of data. The SAS recognizes a simple language with which the users can specify to the computer what the users want the computer to do.

To test the first six hypotheses, the scores of the presidents were compared to the scores of both the administrative staff and the teaching faculty on the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. To test the remaining three hypotheses the real (perceived) scores and the ideal (expected) scores for each group (teaching faculty, administrative staff, and presidents) were compared on consideration and initiating structure.

Analysis of variance was used as the statistical technique to test the hypotheses. This technique 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

This study is organized into five chapters as follows:

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

Chapter II deals with the review of literature related to the study.

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

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

Chapter V is a summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations for the future research.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In recent years, a considerable amount of literature on the role of the education administrator has been developed. Most of these studies in this area have been done on the role of elementary and secondary school principals. Very few studies have been done concerning the role of college presidents.

This chapter reviews the related literature on the role of college presidents. The first part concerns studies of role, the second part covers the roles, responsibilities and functions of the college presidents, and the third part describes the characteristics and qualifications of college presidents. Part four discusses the concept of role, part five reviews the relevant research findings in higher education that pertain to leadership behavior of educational administrators who responded to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Part six discusses leadership studies in Thailand which used the LBDQ.
Role Studies

The concept of role is not new. The inventor of the concept of role was Linton (36). He states that role indicates the sum total of cultural patterns associated with a particular status (36). It consists of "... attitudes, values and behavior attributed by the society to any and all persons occupying this status" (36). This concept involves what Parsons (45) has called the "status role bundle," which involves a position and the social expectations of behavior that accompany that position.

Getzels (21) states that the most important analytic subunit of the institution is the role. Roles are the dynamic aspects of the positions, offices, and statuses within an institution; and they define the behavior of the role incumbents (54). A role is "... what the actor does in his relations with others as seen in the context of its functional significance for a social system" (55). In this respect, each actor is oriented to other actors, and is playing or acting a role. Lenski (35) states that role refers to a position which can be held by an individual, and to which distinguishing behavioral expectations and requirements are attached.

Role Expectation

According to Linton, role expectation consists of the legitimate expectations of persons holding a particular status with respect to the behavior toward them of persons
of other statuses within the same system (36). Parsons mentions that there are two aspects of role expectation (45). One is the expectations which concern and, in part, set standards for the behavior of the actor who takes himself as the point of reference. The other is a set of expectations relative to the probable reactions of others toward any person playing the same role. Gross (23) says that role expectations are a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent or a particular position. Owens (43) defines role expectation as the expectation that one person has of the role behavior of another person.

Role Conflict

In organizational settings, the interaction of two individuals in a superior-subordinate relationship is built on some sort of defense pattern that reflects the different positions of influence each person holds with respect to the other (8). A common role conflict in organizations arises with the conflicting demands on supervisors from both superiors and subordinates (54).

Parsons defines role conflict as the exposure of the actor to conflicting sets of legitimate role expectations, to such an extent that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible (45). Kahn says that role conflict is defined as the simultaneous occurrence of two sets of pressures, and that compliance with one would make for a more difficult compliance with the other (31). According to
Kahn, there are four types of role conflict: intrasender conflict--different prescriptions and prescriptions from a single member of the role sets; intersender conflict--opposite pressures from one or more other senders; interrole conflict--pressures stemming from membership in other groups; and person-role conflict--disharmony between demand of the role set and personal moral values, needs and aspirations (31, pp.19-20). Role conflict occurs when the behavioral expectations of a position differ between two or more parties.

Roles, Responsibilities and Functions

of the College President

Roles of the College President

One difficulty in trying to discuss the college or university presidency is the widely varying conceptions of the role portrayed in different times and places (33, p.4). There are so many images from the past, so many conflicting and contradictory ideas of what a president does, or ought to do. Each person brings an image, a memory or expectation on this subject.

The "old time" college president calls forth a variety of images. Usually the president was the only semipermanent member of the college staff, for the faculty was often made up of young future clerics supporting themselves through the tutoring of young boys. Thus, the early president taught courses in ethics and moral philosophy. The early college president was the college (33, p. 4).
The college's identity became a reflection of his character, leadership and personal success. One image that still remains in the American memory today, especially in the small liberal arts college, is that of the college as the "lengthened shadow" of its president (42). It is an image that still carries a burden of expectation.

In 1904, William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago, expressed concern about the role of the college president:

The college president deserves the support of the intelligent man of modern time. His position is a trying one; his burden is heavy, and the reward is, at best, meager. His effort is always intended to serve the interests that make for truth and the higher life. He is not usually a "liar" or a "boss". He may sometimes seem to be too self-satisfied; one could name a few such. But for the most part he does his work, conscious that he has the shortcomings which mark his kind, realizing keenly that his tenure of office, unlike that of his colleagues, is quite uncertain, yet fully resolved to perform his duty without fear of favor and to allow time to determine the question of his success or failure (26, p. 186).

Anderson (2) has summarized major writers on the roles of the college president.

Wriston (Academic Procession: Reflections of a College President) sees the central goal of the president as doing everything possible to enhance student development; Stoke (The American College President) sees the president more as an academic manager than as an innovator who smooths out personal and public relations; Kerr (The Uses of the University, with a postscript- 1972) describes the president
of the multiversity as a gladiator striving for quality and freedom; Kauffman (The Selection of College and University Presidents) advocates that the president be an effective manager, a clarifier of institutional values, and, for public institutions, an effective political leader; Bolman (How College Presidents Are Chosen) stresses finding a president whose characteristics are most closely related to the areas of the college's greatest needs.

Cohen and March (13) identified eight metaphors of presidential leadership which encompass possible types of governance by college presidents. The eight metaphors included were (1) the competitive market: where the president can establish any type of organization he or she wishes within the constraints imposed by the constituencies; (2) administration: where there are clear objectives set by the board toward the achievement of which the president coordinates the activities of the college; (3) collective bargaining: where the president mediates disputes and supervises the implementation of agreements reached; (4) democracy: where the president seeks support from internal and external interest groups to maintain a coalition that backs him or her; (5) consensus: where the president decides the issues to be discussed, induces discussion of them to solicit a consensus, and implements agreements reached; (6) anarchy: where the president is a catalyst who uses knowledge and adjustment of the system to create viable
solutions to problems rather than choosing from the conflicting alternatives; (7) independent judiciary: where the president reflects historic truths of the institution rather than the demands of current constituents; (8) plebiscitary autocracy: where the president seeks advice but is not obligated to follow it. The president acts on the institution's objectives as he or she sees them and tries to persuade the constituencies that the action is correct (13, pp. 38-39).

Pantax and Thomas used Cohen and March's book as part of the development of a questionnaire about the dimensions of the president's role that was given to a sample of faculty at ten institutions (44). Three relatively independent dimensions of presidential role were revealed through factor analysis: "personal-public image, faculty and student interaction with presidents, and absence of autocratic leadership style" (44, p. 431). The most important of these was public image, and of the eight metaphors set out by Cohen and March, only three-administration, independent judiciary, and plebiscitary autocracy had positive factor loadings on the personal-public image dimension (44, pp. 350-351).

At present, the college and university presidency is a crucial role which is more important than ever before. The president is the key position in the institution. It is the president who must articulate the potential of the institution for service to higher learning (33).
Responsibilities of the College President

Potter (47) indicates that some of the president's responsibilities include: having a competent administration and effective leadership; having sound policies; recommending assignments for each position and keeping employees at such positions; recommending an annual budget having sufficient reporting data; accepting board counsel in good grace; and accepting responsibility for decisions.

The Functions of the College President

According to Kauffman, leadership is the primary function of the president which should be separate from management and control. He states that the leadership function is necessary to keep all concerned, both inside and outside constituencies and forces, keenly aware of the central purposes, values and worth of the higher education enterprise (33, p. 14).

Harland Cleveland indicates that the president should be "a situation-as-a-whole" person, the one person who does not lose sight of the institution's goals. The president should be constantly influencing the shaping and reshaping of those goals (12).

Kauffman further states that the president has representative, communicative, and interpretative functions that focus on the value of a college or university being made known to others, crucial to its support and maintenance (18, p.14). The president is at the center of a vastly
complex and fragile human organization. Whatever one chooses as a leadership metaphor—prime minister, executive, manager—the president must be effective, or else the institution will suffer (33, p. 14).

Prator (48) lists five functions the president should perform. The five functions are: (1) to develop criteria to evaluate good teaching, (2) to discover the aims and ends of the college, (3) to interpret community interests and concerns to the faculty, (4) to assert the highest values of higher education, and (5) to meet monthly payrolls.

Bennis (4), past president of the University of Cincinnati, believes that universities are poorly run because they do not study their administrative procedures. He insists that

Universities are among the worst managed institutions in the country. Hospitals and some state and city administrations may be as bad; no business and industry except Penn Central can possibly be. One reason incredibly enough is that universities which have studied everything from government to Persian mirrors and the number seven have never deeply studied their own administration (4, p.3).

The need for a clearer understanding of presidential leadership is critical to the functioning of the institutions of higher education, not only at present but in the future (63).

Benezet, in his article "The Office of the President" pointed out that nearly a third of the president's time will be spent on correspondence, phrased widely to include campus communications and his own speeches and articles. Another
third will be spent in individual and group consultation. The final third goes for personal observation and reflection, reading and travel (5).

Dodds, former president of Princeton University, advises that the president should be an "educator" rather than a "caretaker" and he should spend at least fifty percent of his time on educational matters (17).

Characteristics and Qualifications of the College President

Various lists have been compiled describing the traits of a good president. Monroe (41) lists what he considers to be three essential traits: the president must be a man of above average intelligence and good scholarship, if for no other reason than that of being able to compete successfully with his faculty; he needs that precious gift of common sense to avoid being swept away by faddish educational movements; and his personality factor must inspire confidence and good will. Hillway (27) lists five crucial characteristics for college presidents as integrity in personal and professional relationships; intellectual ability and scholarship; ability to organize and to lead; democratic attitude and methods; and warmth of personality. He also lists five undesirable characteristics for college presidents as dictatorial attitude; dishonesty; weakness as a scholar; vacillation in organizing and leading; and poor personality.
Prator (48) recommends these characteristics for a college president: ability in public speaking; marriage; preferably with children; recognized scholarship; and patience. Gardner and Milton (20) list the four most important characteristics of the college president as integrity; ability to work with people; objectivity; and leadership with the board. On the other hand, he lists the four least important characteristics as charisma; professional training; humility; and a sense of humor.

Schultz and Robert studied 333 public junior college presidents and other administrative personnel in 1964. They found that eighty per cent of their presidents came to their assignments directly from other administrative positions. The mean age of the group was forty-seven years, with a range from thirty to seventy-four (55). Hughes (29) reported that most appointments to presidencies came between the age of thirty-four to fifty-two and came directly from faculty positions.

McGrath and Altman (38) reported in their study that leadership effectiveness was related to attributes such as intelligence, general ability, and level of formal education, and to personality factors of extroversion, social maturity, and assertiveness. President Perkins of Cornell stated that a characteristic of presidential leadership consists in seeking out faculty members with innovative ideas, and giving them encouragement and financial support (46, p. 57).
In his survey, Roueche (52) found that most presidents had master's degrees, forty-four per cent had doctorates and generally were fifty to fifty-three years of age. Breshears (10) studied the characteristics and qualifications of university administrators relating to leadership behavior. He found the average age of the administrators was forty-six years and the average number of years the administrators had held their positions was 6.12 years, with a range from one to twenty-eight years.

Richie, in describing the college presidency, suggested that the president must be able to gamble or take risks at times. In reference to the presidency, he stated that "one cannot move ahead, or make progress without sticking out one's neck" (50).

Characteristics of Thai Teachers College Presidents

Sakdaphitak (53) studied the characteristics of teachers college presidents in Thailand. She found that the majority of the presidents were between the ages of forty to fifty with a mean age of forty-five years. Ninety-two per cent of the presidents were males and were married.

Forty-two per cent of the college presidents held Ph.D. degrees while the remainder held master's degrees. One hundred per cent of the presidents had college teaching experience, and eighty-five per cent had more than ten years experience in college teaching.
She also found that forty-two per cent of the teachers college presidents came to their present positions from the presidency of other colleges, with the remainder being promoted from administrative and faculty positions. The majority of these presidents evaluated scholarship in educational administration as most desirable for future college presidents.

The Qualifications of the College President

Carman describes the selection process for choosing a president this way:

Once it has been constituted, the committee then agrees on the qualifications a person should possess to be considered for the post. These qualifications may cover a wide range of items: age, health, character, education, including degrees; scholarship and academic experience, administrative talent; personality; ability as a speaker; marital status; number of children, among others. In the last analysis, the principal requirement would seem to indicate a person, irrespective of age, who can best serve the needs of the institution, immediate and in the future so far as those needs can be foreseen (11, p. 89).

Kauffman (33) lists the qualifications sought for the president of Mankato State University in 1978, some of which include commitment to the role of a public, multi-purpose, regional university; commitment to and understanding of the centrality of teaching and scholarship in the educational process; knowledge of educational theories, trends, ideas and resources; college-level teaching experience; evidence of increasingly responsible administrative experience; and competence in management of fiscal affairs and in planning.
The Board of Trustees of Contra Costa Junior College District in California set out these qualifications for the president of their institution. The president should: possess a doctoral degree, have five years of highly successful administrative experience, have a firm commitment to the nature of the junior college, and be between thirty-five and fifty-five years old (49).

An analysis of the literature on presidential qualities listed as important by members of various groups that work with the president, or that participate in his selection, reveals several interesting facts (30). However, the most important is that there is very little agreement on the essential qualities (15, p. 57). Many trustees think the most important qualification for the presidency is what has loosely been termed "promotional ability"—including, generally, political acumen, shrewd and aggressive fundraising ability, vitality and youthful alertness, and sound business sense (15, p. 57).

Concept of Leadership

Leadership is a topic which has been subjected to extensive study during the past fifty years (59). This is due to the important role that the leader plays in an organization (7, p. 36). Leadership, as it will be used in this section, is defined as a process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal setting and goal achievement (7, p. 39).
Various leadership approaches have been identified, with the three most common approaches being the trait approach, the situational approach, and the behavioral approach. The trait approach states that there are numerous characteristics or traits which may be identifiable in leaders, and that these traits can distinguish leaders from followers (24, p. 49). Stogdill could not find any agreement among researchers in identifying specific leadership traits, and he suggested five personal characteristics which could be divided into five categories: capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation and status (62, pp. 35-71).

Dissatisfaction with the trait approach led to another approach called the situational approach (40). This approach is based upon studies which showed that certain leader behavior was most effective when associated with the kind of job the leader holds (24, p. 59). After considering many situational factors, Fiedler concluded that: "a discriminating leader is either highly favorable or unfavorable, a more lenient or permissive and considerate attitude is associated with high group performance" (19, pp. 45-46).

One of the more recent leadership approaches is the behavioral approach (37, p. 4). This approach attempts to explain leadership on the basis of his or her behavior and recognizes that both psychological and sociological factors can be strong behavioral determinants (3, p. 447).
Several studies have been made concerning leadership behavior. Stogdill and Coons tried to measure the human-relations oriented behavior of a leader through the use of a "consideration" questionnaire (24, p. 59).

"Consideration" refers to leadership behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his or her group (25). This dimension is one of the major dimensions of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

The second major dimension in the LBDQ is "initiating structure". Stogdill and Coons attempted to study, through the use of an "initiating structure" questionnaire, the extent to which a leader exercises instrumental leadership—through organizing the subordinates and other resources (24, p. 58). This dimension, according to Halpin (25) refers to a leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of his work group, and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and method of procedure.

Research has indicated that leaders were rated as more effective when they scored high both on consideration and initiating structure. These two patterns of behavior came to be important, not because they were displayed by the leader, but because they produced differential effects upon the behavior and expectations of followers (61, pp. 140-141). The LBDQ attempts to measure these two dimensions and is described in more detail in the following chapter.
Leadership Behavior of College Presidents

In compiling an annotated bibliography of literature on the college presidency between 1900 and 1960, Eells and Hollis (18) found that approximately one-half of the 700 publications were concerned with the duties and responsibilities of the presidents. A quarter of the publications dealt with the qualifications and selection of a president. The remainder dealt with personal factors—such as age, degrees, salary,—and general reference book work on college administration.

A computer search of recent publications in relevant areas indicates that studies of the roles of college presidents are rare. However, some doctoral candidates had devoted their time to studying this area of concern. This section focuses on the major findings of research studies of the college presidents.

In 1967, Blanchard (6) employed the LBDQ to study group situations in boards of trustees to determine whether these situations were favorable or unfavorable to their principal designated leaders—college presidents and board chairmen. He found that while the position power of college presidents and board chairmen was high in working with trustees, the group task of a board of trustees was unstructured to the extent that these leaders would not be able to initiate any structure without good relations with members of their boards. These findings confirmed that considerate,
diplomatic leadership behavior may induce trustees to cooperate more than controlling, managing and directive leadership behavior.

In 1968, Lederer (34) investigated how selected junior college presidents structured their perceptions of community leaders and he ascertained how the subjects' perceptions of community leaders relate to their leadership ideologies. He found that: New York State junior college presidents' perceptions of community leaders were influenced by their belief about how an ideal leader should behave; the presidents structured their perceptions in terms of behavior such as public policy making, independence and assertion of dominance, initiation reputation and political activity; and the presidents' perceptions about local leaders were qualified by their personal backgrounds.

In 1973, Ronning (51) examined the leadership behavior of college or university presidents as observed by the academic vice-president, the vice president of business affairs, the dean of students, the chairman and the vice-chairman of the board of trustees, the chairman of faculty council, the faculty chairman of the local chapter of the American Association of University professors, and the president and secretary of the student governing body. It was found that the four constituencies: the administration, the governing body, the faculty, and the students, of the respective institutions clearly perceived
the college president as leader of the institution. The governing body perceived the leadership role behaviors of the college president as being of somewhat higher quality than did three other constituencies: the administration, the faculty and the students. Ronning also concluded that the size of the institution did not influence the perceptions of the observer respondents.

In 1973, Katt, (32) made a study of the leadership behavior of the college and university presidents at fourteen of the four year units of the State University of New York as perceived by members of the local college council administrative staff, faculty and student body. Using the LBDQ, Katt found that more than one-third of the correlations between the twelve subscales of leader behavior were moderately high correlations, and that there was a significant difference, at least at the .05 level, among the four groups' perceptions for each of the twelve subscales of presidential leader behavior.

The results of Ronning's 1973 study were compared with the data of this study. When comparing the two distributions of the grand mean scores from each study, no significant difference appeared. When analyzing the scores of each respective group from both studies on all subscales, the only significant difference was between the student groups.
In 1975, Breshears (10) studied the relationship of age, academic training, and experience on the leadership behavior of university administrators as perceived by themselves and two of their subordinates. He indicated that there was a positive indication that training in educational administration increased the level of consideration exemplified by the administrators; and that there was a positive indication that younger administrators exhibited a higher level of consideration than older administrators. He also found that administrators thirty to thirty-nine years of age were more likely to have administrative training in higher education than was true of administrators fifty years or more.

In 1976, Stevens (60) conducted a study on leadership role behavior of community college presidents. His aim was to describe the leadership behavior of selected New York community college presidents as perceived by trustees, administrators and faculty leaders. Steven's study attempted to determine what leadership behavior the presidents were perceived to exhibit and how these perceptions related to selected institutional characteristics. The results of this study indicated that student leaders did not have enough contact with the president to enable them to complete the questionnaires adequately. It was discovered that trustees perceived the presidents as exhibiting specific leadership behavior most
frequently, administrators second most frequently, and faculty leaders perceived the presidents as exhibiting specific leadership behavior least frequently. Stevens also indicated that the trustees perceived the presidents as providing more integration of the needs of individuals and the needs of the institution than do administrators or faculty leaders.

In 1978, Grill (22) investigated the nature and extent of differences in expectations and perceptions reported by the presidents, members of boards of trustees, and administrative staff members related to college presidential leadership behavior. Out of fourteen charter member colleges of the Christian College Coalition, Grill found that: presidents and staff members reported similar expectations relative to ideal Christian college presidential initiating structure behavior; expectations of trustees relative to ideal Christian college presidential initiating structure behaviors were significantly higher than the expectations relative to ideal Christian college presidential initiating structure behavior; and presidents, trustees, and staff members reported virtually the same level of expectations relative to ideal Christian college presidential consideration behaviors.

In 1980, Gurubatham (24) attempted to identify and analyze the leadership behavior characteristics which distinguish an effective from an ineffective Seventh-Day
Adventist (SAD) college president as perceived by members of the faculty and administrative staff in eight small colleges. His findings showed that: there was no significant difference in the perceptions of the groups as to the overall leadership behavior characteristics of an SAD college president; significant perception differences existed on dimensions dealing with social exchange and the decision making processes; and the number of years served in the SAD higher educational system had no apparent effect on the respondent perceptions. Additionally, he found that significant differences existed on various dimensions based on geographical location, sex, age, academic area, and administrative office.

In 1983, Boapimp (7) attempted to examine the leadership behaviors of the rural two-year college presidents as expected and perceived by their board and faculty members. He found that board members' levels of expectation appeared to be significantly higher than that of their perceptions on both initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Faculty members' levels of expectation appeared to be significantly higher than that of their perceptions on both initiating structure and consideration dimensions. He also found that Board and Faculty members tended to agree regarding how their president should behave on the initiating structure dimensions of the LBDQ. His results indicated that the president was in position of role conflict.
Leadership Studies in Thailand

Several studies using LBDQ which have been done on the leadership behavior of Thai educational administrators are presented in chronological order. Between 1970 and 1984, there were only a small number of research reports on the president's leader behavior that were investigated using the LBDQ.

In 1978, Cooparat (14) studied the relationship between the leader behavior of elementary principals and the organizational climate of public elementary schools in the Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City. Using LBDQ, Cooparat found that the leader behavior of elementary principals in both initiating structure and consideration domains in this study did have a relationship with the organizational climate of their schools.

A year later, Deoisres (16) conducted a study on the school organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior as perceived by secondary school teachers. He found that there was a significant relationship between organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior; however, no matter how teachers perceived their school organizational climate, they still perceived their principal as an effective leader.

In the same year, Sitabkahul (58) presented her study of a comparison between the administrative effectiveness of male and female principals as perceived by teachers of
secondary schools. She found that female secondary school principals received significantly higher mean scores on leadership behavior (both initiating structure and consideration subtests) than did the male secondary school principals in most of the selected demographic variables.

In 1981, Hongham (28) investigated the relationship between the deans' leadership style and the faculty's professional zone of acceptance as perceived by the teaching faculty. He found that faculty members who perceived their dean as being strong on initiating structure and showing high consideration had the widest professional zone of acceptance. Faculty members who perceived their dean as being strong on initiating structure and low on consideration had a wider professional zone of acceptance than did those who perceived the dean as being weak on initiating structure and high on consideration.

Sinprasong (56) studied the relationships between principals' leadership behavior and teacher morale. She found that older teachers or teachers who had more years of teaching experience usually had high morale scores and related their principals' leadership behavior as being high in initiating structure.

In 1983, Siriparp (57) attempted to compare the perceptions and expectations of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of academic department chairpersons. The LBDQ was again used
as the method for this investigation. He found that the perceptions of the chairpersons were greater than those of the faculty members with regard to the real leadership behavior of the academic department chairpersons in the initiating structure dimension. The perceptions of the chairpersons were 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. Additionally, the expectations of the deans were 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. Siriparp concluded that the chairpersons needed to reevaluate their leadership behavior in relation to both deans and faculty members in order to fulfill the organizational goals and their personal needs.

In the same year, Amornkool (1) investigated the leadership behavior of the directors as perceived and expected by their department heads and faculty members. She found that the expected scores of the department heads and faculty members were higher than their perceived scores. Statistically significant differences were found between the perceptions and expectations regarding leadership behavior of the directors within each group of department heads and faculty members.
She also found that there was no statistically significant difference in the perceptions and expectations between both groups. Amornkool concluded that the directors can lead more effectively if they concentrate on the expectations of both groups and improve channels of communication and interpersonal relationships.

Summary

This review of literature generally indicates that the president is the most important person in a college. The college president is required to possess many abilities because he or she needs these skills in order to adequately perform numerous roles and responsibilities which the position entails. Literature that pertained specifically to the role of the college president is somewhat limited. However, the available literature seems to divide the president's role into two major areas. One is that of an educational leader, and the other is that of an administrator or manager.

This review of selected literature also seems to indicate that there is no universally accepted leadership theory. A more recent approach to the study of leadership is the behavioral approach. Studies concerning leadership behavior fall into two dimensions: consideration and initiating structure.
Various research approaches have been used, but the LBDQ, developed at Ohio State University, is probably one of the most efficient methods for the study of college presidents' leadership behavior. In using the LBDQ, superiors tend to be more concerned with the initiating structure dimension, while subordinates appear to be more concerned with the consideration dimension. The literature also indicates that leadership behavior is related to rated effectiveness and that the proper way to study leadership and leader effectiveness is through the observed and reported behavior of leaders.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the research procedures that were utilized in the study. The population of the study, description of the survey instrument, method of data collection, and an explanation of the statistical treatment of the data are included.

The Population

The sample for this study was drawn from the population of all administrators, teaching faculty, and presidents of eight teachers colleges in the northeastern part of Thailand. Each of these colleges has approximately thirty-five administrative staff members and sixty-five teaching faculty members. The sample drawn was as follows:

1. Presidents of the eight teachers colleges;
2. Thirty administrative staff members from each college;
3. Fifty teaching faculty members from each college.

To ensure an appropriate sample for this study, a standard table of random numbers was used. Each administrative staff member was assigned a unique number and
the numbers were systematically drawn from a random number table. The teaching faculty was selected in the same manner. After selecting the samples for the first teachers college, samples were selected from the remaining seven teachers colleges in the same manner.

The Survey Instrument

The research instrument used in this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as developed by Halpin and Winer at Ohio State University and published in Theory and Research in Administration (3). (See Appendix D). The LBDQ was employed to ascertain the differences in the perceptions and expectations of presidents, administrative staff and teaching faculty members regarding the leadership behavior of their presidents in teachers colleges in the northeastern part of Thailand.

The LBDQ consists of thirty items that are descriptive statements of the behavior of the leader as they operate in a given situation and 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 0-60 (2, p. 1). Halpin and Winer indicate that the reliabilities of staff perceptions of initiating structure and consideration for fifteen items scales are usually high. The estimated reliability, using the split-half, odd-even
method of obtaining a reliability estimate for the LBDQ-Real, staff was found to measure .83 for initiating structure scores and .92 for consideration scores, when corrected for attenuation with the Spearman-Brown formula (2).

For this study, the LBDQ was used in two forms:

1. The LBDQ-Real, describing actual leadership of the presidents as perceived by the administrative staff, teaching faculty and the presidents themselves;

2. The LBDQ-Ideal, describing how administrative staff and teaching faculty believe the presidents should behave as leaders. With modified instructions, this same instrument was used to measure the presidents' own leadership ideology.

Permission to use this Thai version of the LBDQ used in this study was requested from Doeisres (1). The accuracy of the Thai version by Doeisres was verified by a panel of judges consisting of three administrators and two language instructors at universities in Thailand (5).

Responses derived from the LBDQ reflect the perceptions and expectations of the administrative staff, teaching staff and the presidents themselves regarding the presidents' behavior dimension under study. The numbers of responses are shown in Table I. The colleges are presented in random order and do not correspond to the order of the colleges in Appendix G.
### TABLE I

**Questionnaire Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubonrajchathani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahasarakarm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakornrajchasrima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureeram</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loej</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakon Nakorn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udornthani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage Returned**

|                  | 100  | 73.3 | 97.7 | 88.7 |

**Data Collection**

The following procedures were used in data collection.

1. A letter requesting permission to conduct this study was sent to the Director General of the Department of Teacher Education, Ministry of Education, Thailand, explaining the purposes of the study. (See Appendix A).
2. Permission was granted by the Director General of the Department of Teacher Education in that he addressed a letter to each of the presidents of selected colleges asking for cooperation in the process of collecting data. (See Appendix B). The Thai version of the LBDQ accompanied the letter. (See Appendix E).

3. The presidents then distributed the investigator's letters explaining the purposes of the study and copies of the questionnaires to their staff members (administrative staff and teaching faculty) as well as to themselves. In correspondence with the presidents, administrative staff and teaching faculty the investigator emphasized that all data collected would be held and treated in strict confidence, that no institution or individuals participating would be known to anyone but the person who performed this study, that no one from an institution would view the responses of another person from that same or other institution, that the project was a study of leader behavior, and that the investigation was not an evaluation of the institutions, but was a descriptive study. The respondents were not asked to judge whether the behavior described was desirable or undesirable. They were only to describe how the president acts (Real) and how they think he should act (Ideal).

4. Within two weeks, the presidents of each selected teachers colleges collected the questionnaires from the
respondents. Those who had not responded received a follow-up letter, a second follow-up letter was sent to respondents whose questionnaires had not been returned. All completed questionnaires were mailed to the investigator at North Texas State University. All responses on the returned questionnaires were tabulated into numerical code for subsequent analysis.

The Statistical Treatment

The returned questionnaires were manually checked for accuracy. In this study, the information obtained from the returned questionnaires was transferred to Fortran coding forms and fed into the Statistical Analysis System at the North Texas State University Computer Center.

The prime focus of this study was the significance of differences between the population groups on reported leadership behavior of presidents. Thus, the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) embodies an integrated approach to editing and statistical analysis of data. The SAS recognizes a simple language with which the users can specify to the computer what the users want the computer to do.

The one-way analysis of variance was selected as the tool to test the research hypotheses. It can be used for testing the hypotheses when two or more independent samples are drawn from populations having the same meaning (4, p.
In this study, it was used to determine if there were significant differences between the perceptions and expectations of teaching faculty, administrative staff and presidents regarding the leadership behavior of the presidents at teachers colleges in the northeastern part of Thailand.

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. The hypothesis was rejected if the calculated statistic was equal to or greater than the tabled value, which meant that no significant difference existed. If the calculated statistic was smaller than the tabled value, the hypothesis was not rejected, which meant that no significant difference was found.

Summary

A detailed description of the following design aspects are included in this chapter: (1) the population, (2) the survey instrument, (3) data collection, and (4) the statistical treatment. An analysis and interpretation of the findings are presented in the next chapter with a more detailed explanation of some treatments of the data.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings, describing the leadership behavior--Real and Ideal of the teachers college presidents in the northeastern part of Thailand as perceived by their teaching faculty members, administrative staff members and the presidents themselves. Analysis was made of the data from a random sample of 400 teaching faculty members, 240 administrative staff and 8 presidents in the northeastern part of Thailand through the application of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

A total of 648 questionnaires were sent, and 575 questionnaires (approximately 88.73%) were returned. These percentages were required in order to carry out the purposes of the study as stated in Chapter I.

The data from each respondent are distributed into four scores reflecting the leadership behavior of the presidents: (1) the real (perceived) initiating structure (the relationship between the president and members of his group in establishing patterns of organization, channels of
communication, and getting the job done) scores; (2) the real (perceived) consideration (the behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the president and members of his group) scores; (3) the ideal (expected) initiating structure scores; and (4) the ideal (expected) consideration scores. The possible range of scores is from 0-60 points for each respondent.

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

Regarding Research Hypotheses

These data are presented in the order in which the hypotheses were developed from the research hypotheses as stated in Chapter I. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) at the North Texas State University Computer Center was used to analyze the data. One way analysis of variance was used to test the nine 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 of presidential leadership behavior between the presidents themselves, the administrative staff, and the teaching faculty members on the real and ideal dimensions of leadership behavior as stated in the purposes of this study. Statistical analysis of each hypothesis is presented in Appendix F, Tables XI to Table XIX. Mean scores from each group of respondents from each college are presented in Appendix G.
Research Hypothesis One

Research Hypothesis One states that there will be no significant differences between teaching faculty members and administrative staff in their ratings of each real (perceived) dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table II presents the mean scores of the teaching faculty and administrative staff as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

| TABLE II |

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Administrative Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>1.95**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .1485  **p < .1632

The data in Table II indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff for either real dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis One is retained. The perceptions of the teaching faculty members can be assumed to be no different from those of the administrative staff with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both real dimensions.
Research Hypothesis Two

Research Hypothesis Two states that there will be no significant differences between teaching faculty and administrative staff in their ratings of each ideal (expected) dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table III presents the mean scores of the teaching faculty and administrative staff as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

TABLE III

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHING FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Administrative Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .5926 ** p < .8437

The data in Table III indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the expectations of the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff for either ideal dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Two is retained. The expectations of the teaching faculty members therefore are no different from those of the administrative staff with regard to the
leadership behavior of the presidents in both ideal dimensions.

**Research Hypothesis Three**

Research Hypothesis Three states that there will be no significant difference between the perceptions of teaching faculty members and presidents in their ratings of each real (perceived) dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table IV presents the mean scores of the teaching faculty and presidents as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

**TABLE IV**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING FACULTY AND PRESIDENTS FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Presidents Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>8.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>10.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0042  **p < .0012

The data in Table IV indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the perceptions of the teaching faculty members and the presidents for each real dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Three is rejected. The
perceptions of the teaching faculty members are different from those of the presidents with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both real dimensions.

**Research Hypothesis Four**

Research Hypothesis Four states that there will be no significant difference between the expectations of the teaching faculty members and presidents in their ratings of each ideal (expected) dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table V presents the mean scores of the teaching faculty and presidents as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure and the consideration dimension.

**TABLE V**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHING FACULTY AND PRESIDENTS FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Presidents Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>1.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0642      **p < .2669

The data in Table V indicate that there is no statistically significant differences between the expectations of the teaching faculty members and the presidents for either ideal dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Four is retained. The
expectations of the teaching faculty members can be assumed to be no different from those of the presidents with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both ideal dimensions.

**Research Hypothesis Five**

Research Hypothesis Five states that there will be no significant difference between the perceptions of the administrative staff and presidents in their ratings of each real (perceived) dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table VI presents the mean scores of the administrative staff and presidents as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

**TABLE VI**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND PRESIDENTS FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Administrative Mean</th>
<th>Presidents Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>5.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>8.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0164  **p < .0041

The data in Table VI indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the perceptions of the
administrative staff and the presidents for each real dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Five is rejected. The perceptions of the administrative staff are different from those of the presidents with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both real dimensions.

**Research Hypothesis Six**

Research Hypothesis Six states that there will be no significant difference between the expectations of the administrative staff and presidents in their ratings of each ideal (expected) dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table VII presents the mean scores of the administrative staff and presidents as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure and the consideration dimension.

**TABLE VII**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND PRESIDENTS FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Administrative Mean</th>
<th>Presidents Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>5.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>1.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0230 **p < .2240

The data in Table VII indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of the
administrative staff and the presidents for the initiating structure dimension, but there is no significant difference between the expectations of the administrative staff and the presidents for the consideration dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Six is rejected. The expectations of the administrative staff are different from those of the presidents with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both ideal dimensions.

Research Hypothesis Seven

Research Hypothesis Seven states that there will be no significant difference between the real (perceptions) and ideal (expectations) of the teaching faculty members in their ratings of each dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table VIII presents the mean scores of the real and ideal of the teaching faculty members as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

TABLE VIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE TEACHING FACULTY FOR EACH DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Real Mean</th>
<th>Ideal Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>398.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>203.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001      **p < .0001
The data in Table VIII indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the perceptions and expectations of the teaching faculty for each dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Seven is rejected. The perceptions of the teaching faculty members are different from their expectations with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both dimensions.

**Research Hypothesis Eight**

Research Hypothesis Eight states that there will be no significant difference between the real (perceptions) and ideal (expectations) of the administrative staff in their ratings of each dimension of presidential leadership behavior. Table IX presents the mean scores of the real and ideal of the administrative staff as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

| TABLE IX |

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF FOR EACH DIMENSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Real Mean</th>
<th>Ideal Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>139.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>77.07**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001  **p < .0001

The data in Table IX indicate that there are statistically
significant differences between the perceptions and expectations of the administrative staff for each dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Eight is rejected. The perceptions of the administrative staff are different from their expectations with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in both dimensions.

**Research Hypothesis Nine**

Research Hypothesis Nine states that there will be no significant difference between the real (perceptions) and ideal (expectations) of the presidents in their ratings of each dimension of their own leadership behavior. Table X presents the mean scores of the real and ideal of the presidents as well as the F-ratio for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension.

**TABLE X**

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE PRESIDENTS FOR EACH DIMENSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Real Mean</th>
<th>Ideal Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>7.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>39.28</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0158  **p < .9524

The data in Table X indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions and expectations of the presidents for the initiating structure
dimension, but there is no significant difference between the perceptions and expectations of the presidents for the consideration dimension. Therefore, Hypothesis Nine is rejected. The perceptions of the presidents can be assumed to be no different from their expectations with regard to the leadership behavior of the presidents in the initiating structure dimension, but are not different with regard to the consideration dimension.

Summary

The major findings in this chapter may be summarized as follows: First, statistically significant differences were found between the perceptions of both the presidents and teaching faculty members and between the presidents and the administrative staff. Second, there was no statistically significant difference in the perceptions and expectations between the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff concerning the presidents' leadership behavior. Third, the expected scores were higher than the perceived scores of both teaching faculty members and administrative staff.

Discussion of Findings

As indicated by Hypotheses Three and Five, the mean scores of the perceptions of the presidents were significantly higher than both the mean scores of the
perceptions of the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff. This seems to indicate that role conflict exists between the presidents and both the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff regarding how these three groups perceive the presidents' actual leadership behavior. The presidents perceive themselves as being better leaders, than apparently, they are.

As observed by the Hypotheses One and Two, there were no significant differences in the perceptions and expectations between the administrative staff and the teaching faculty members. This indicates that the presidents encounter less role conflict than they would encounter if there were significant differences between the administrative staff and the teaching faculty members. The presidents should encounter little difficulty in determining their leadership behavior. This finding is similar to the findings of Siriparp (2) where he found that there was no significant difference between the perceptions and expectations of two groups of subordinates regarding real and ideal leadership behavior of those in the leadership roles in the initiating structure dimension and in the ideal consideration dimension. This finding differs from Siriparp in that he found significant differences between those in leadership roles and the subordinates in the ideal initiating structure dimension.
As indicated by Hypotheses Seven and Eight, the expected scores of both the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff were significantly higher than the perceived scores for both the initiating structure dimension and the consideration dimension. It appears that both groups impose their expectations upon the presidents regarding how they should behave as leaders. This indicates that role conflicts exist for the presidents in their relationship with the administrative staff and teaching faculty members. This finding agrees with the findings of Amornkool (1) where she found that there were significant differences between the expectations and perceptions of the subordinates regarding the leadership behavior of those in the leadership roles at the Institute of Technology in Thailand.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This chapter presents a summary of the research including the findings of the study. Conclusions and recommendations for future study are also presented.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe the leader behavior—real and ideal—of the teachers college presidents in the northeastern part of Thailand as perceived by their teaching faculty members, administrative staff and by the presidents themselves. Two dimensions of leadership were examined: initiating structure in which well-defined organizational goals and procedures are emphasized, and consideration, which refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationship between the leaders and members of the group. These two dimensions were analyzed under both the actually perceived or "real" behavior, and the expected or "ideal" behavior.
To serve this purpose, nine research hypotheses were established as guidelines for the study. The research instrument used was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The population of the study was eight teachers colleges in the northeastern part of Thailand. The data for the study were collected from 8 teachers college presidents, 176 administrative staff and 391 teaching faculty members. All respondents were asked, through the use of the LBDQ, to perceive how their own presidents behave (real behavior) and how they should behave (ideal behavior).

The data, both real and ideal, given by teaching faculty members, administrative staff and the presidents themselves were analyzed through the application of an F-test of one-way analysis of variance in order to test the significant differences of the perceptions and expectations of each group as well as the significant differences between real and ideal perceptions and expectations of each group. The differences found in the computations, through the use of the statistical methods, were reported at the .05 level of confidence.

Findings

The findings which resulted from the statistical analysis are as follows.

1. There is no difference between the perceptions of the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff
regarding the real leadership behavior of the presidents in each dimension.

2. There is no difference between the expectations of the teaching faculty members and the administrative staff regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the presidents in each dimension.

3. There is a difference between the perceptions of the teaching faculty members and the presidents regarding the real leadership behavior of the presidents in each dimension.

4. There is no difference between the expectations of the teaching faculty members and the presidents regarding the ideal leadership behavior of the presidents in each dimension.

5. There is a difference between the perceptions of the presidents and the administrative staff regarding the real leadership behavior of the presidents in each dimension.

6. There is a difference between the expectations of the presidents and administrative staff regarding the ideal presidential behavior in the initiating structure dimension, but no difference in the expectations of the presidents and administrative staff regarding ideal consideration dimension.

7. There is a difference between the real (perceptions) and ideal (expectations) of the teaching faculty regarding the leadership behavior in each dimension.
8. There is a difference between the real (perceptions) and ideal (expectations) of the administrative staff regarding the leadership behavior of the presidents in each dimension.

9. There is a difference between the real (perceptions) and ideal (expectations) of the presidents regarding their own leadership behavior in the initiating structure dimension, but no difference between the real and ideal of the presidents regarding their own leadership behavior in the consideration dimension.

Conclusions

1. The teaching faculty members and administrative staff tend to view the presidents' actual performance in the same way.

2. The presidents, in this study, may be somewhat unrealistic about their own performance.

3. Presidents appear to need more critical review of their current performance.

4. The expectations for presidents in teachers colleges in the northeastern part of Thailand appear to be commonly agreed upon.

Implications

The presidents could lead more effectively if they first, concentrate on the expectations of the administrative staff and the teaching faculty members; second, since the
perceptions and expectations between the administrative staff were not statistically significantly different, the presidents are placed in a position of less role conflict; third, since the expected scores were higher than the perceived scores of both the administrative staff and teaching faculty members, the presidents must accentuate both the dimension of initiating structure and the dimension of consideration; the presidents should display more personal trust, respect and warmth in their association with teaching faculty and administrative staff as well as contribute their interpersonal relations with both groups to create a climate conducive to accomplishment of organizational goals and satisfaction of personal needs.

The data in this study seem to confirm that the position taken by Kauffman that leadership is separate from management and control. It seems to reflect a typical Thai position regarding the administration in higher education.

Role conflicts between the presidents and the administrative staff and teaching faculty can be reduced by the presidents carrying out the above strategy. This will help to create a more harmonious relationship among all of the parties involved in higher education in northeastern Thailand.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of this study.

1. A similar study should be conducted as an in-depth
case study of each college.

2. A similar study should include additional information such as educational background, sex, age and comments of the respondents.

3. A similar study using different self-constructed or standardized instruments should be conducted to validate the findings.

4. Further study might investigate the leadership behavior of the college presidents as related to the organizational climate and system, and the teacher training program.

5. A similar study should be conducted at other types of higher educational institutions.
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Initial Letter to the Director
General of the Department of
Teacher Education
บั้งกี้ยื่นความ

ส่วนราชการ หน่วยงานพิเศษ กรมการศึกษา

ผู้ยื่น วันที่ 25 มีนาคม 2528

เรื่อง ขออนุมัติการศึกษาต่อ

เรียน รองปลัดกรมการศึกษา

ตัวแทนทางสายงาน ศูนย์รวมทั่วไป สำนักงานพิเศษ กรมการศึกษาฯ ได้รับหนังสือรายงานจากมหาวิทยาลัย North Texas State University กระทรวงศึกษาธิการ ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา ให้ความประสงค์จะทำการวิจัยเรื่อง "ความสัมพันธ์ของปัจจัยการศึกษา" หลักการจัดการศึกษาในระดับมัธยมศึกษาตอนต้นในประเทศไทย และให้ความยินดีในการเป็นวิทยาศาสตร์ศึกษาต่อในระดับปริญญาโท จึงขออนุมัติการศึกษาต่อจากกรมการศึกษาฯ ข้อมูลประกอบการศึกษา และให้ความยินดีในการศึกษาต่อในระดับปริญญาโท

ผู้ยื่น ประกาศให้เรียงลำดับข้อมูลที่ต้องการศึกษาต่อ ณ วันที่ 8 พ.ศ. 2528

เรียน

[ลายเซ็น]

[ชื่อ]

[, วันที่ 25 มิถุนายน 2528]
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Letters From the Director General of the Department of Teacher Education
Granting Permission and Requesting Participation in this Study
เรื่อง ขอความร่วมมือในการเงินข้อมูลการวิจัย

เรียน อาจารย์วิชาการศึกษาสังคมศาสตร์

สิ่งที่ต้องดำเนิน แบบสอบถาม จำนวน 81 ต่อ

ด้วยการศึกษาข้อมูลที่กับศูนย์เรื่อง มหาวิทยาลัยรัชมังคลาภิเษก เมื่อวันที่ 13 ต.ค. 2538 สำหรับวิชาการศึกษาสังคมศาสตร์ ขอท่านช่วยให้ข้อมูลการศึกษาข้อมูลทั้งหมดมาให้ไปทาง Higher Education Administration ที่พ.ศ. 2251 North Texas State University มหาวิทยาลัยเทนเนสซี ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา จะทำวิจัยเรื่อง "ความคิดเห็นของครูอาจารย์เกี่ยวกับการเรียนรู้ ความรู้เรื่องการศึกษาข้อมูลการศึกษาสังคมศาสตร์" ตามความเป็นพร้อมของวิชาการศึกษาสังคมศาสตร์ของนักเรียน การศึกษาข้อมูลนี้จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อการพัฒนางานของมหาวิทยาลัยด้วย ท่านจึงโปรดตรวจสอบข้อมูลการศึกษาสังคมศาสตร์ และยินดีเป็นการส่งสู่สำนักงานข้อมูลการศึกษาสังคมศาสตร์ ขอวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย เพื่อให้ทราบความร่วมมือในการศึกษา ขอแสดงความนับถือ

สิ่งเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดพิจารณาสำานักงานต่อไป

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

นายศรีกนิษฐา จันทร์สม
รองอธิบดี วัฒนวิชารักษ์

หน่วยศึกษาพิเศษ
โทร. 2816051, 2813905
เรื่อง  ขอความร่วมมือในการเก็บข้อมูลสำหรับวิจัย

เรียน  อดีตคณบดีา

ที่ส่งมาตามต่อ แนบเอกสาร จำนวน 81 ชุด

ด้วยกรรมการกิจกรรมกิจการกรุงเทพฯ ได้รับข้อแจ้งจาก หน่วยงานมีที่ว่า ปรับแผนการพยากรณ์ ภาคบัณฑิต รายวิชา 1
ระดับ 4 ลูกค้าที่มีกิจกรรมกิจการ กรรมการซึ่งส่งทีมที่จะเก็บข้อมูลกิจกรรมด้านความเป็นไปของอินเตอร์เวนเดอร์ การวิจัยครั้งนี้จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อการพยากรณ์ของกรรมการกิจกรรมกิจการ และยังเป็นการสนับสนุนการ
อินเตอร์เวนเดอร์ การวิจัยครั้งนี้จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อการพยากรณ์ของกรรมการกิจกรรมกิจการ และยังเป็นการสนับสนุนการ
และให้ความร่วมมือในการเก็บข้อมูลที่เกี่ยวกับการพยากรณ์ด้านภัย
ขอเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดพิจารณาค้นหาต่อไป

รองอธิบดี

นายวิชิต จิตรภทุม

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
เรื่อง ขอความร่วมมือในการบังคับใช้หลักการบริหาร

เรียน ดร.จัระศักดิ์ นครราชสีมา

สิ่งที่ส่งมาด้านล่าง แบ่งบัญชีตามชั้น 81 ข้อ

ตามข้อความที่ได้รับเรียนจากรัฐมนตรีว่าการกระทรวงศึกษาธิการ วันที่ 28 ธันวาคม 2528

เรื่อง การศึกษาด้านการบริหารและการจัดการศึกษา สำนักงานคณะกรรมการการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน สำนักงานศึกษาธิการจังหวัด

ในกรณีที่เป็นคู่สัญญาของสำนักงานคณะกรรมการการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน กับจังหวัด ให้บริหารจัดการ

การจัด أمرให้เป็นไปตามข้อบังคับที่กรมการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน สำนักงานคณะกรรมการการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน กำหนด

สามารถติดต่อได้ที่กรมการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน สำนักงานคณะกรรมการการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน ที่ 81 ข้อ

สำนักงานคณะกรรมการการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

[ลายมือ]

(นายพรชัย จันทร์สม) ณ วันที่ 28 ธันวาคม 2528

รองเลขาธิการกรมการศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน

[ลายมือ]

หน่วยศึกษาชั้นพื้นฐาน

โทร. 2816051, 2813905
เรื่อง  ขอความร่วมมือในการเก็บข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับ

เรียน  อดิการวิทยาสกุล บุรพนัน

ส่งที่ส่งมาด้วย แบบรายงาน จำนวน 81 ชุด

ตัวกรรมการคัดสรรครูให้ส่งคำขอร้องจาก นางลักษณ์วิเชษฐา ปิยพันธ์ วันจันทร์ที่ 1 ตุลาคม 2528 ลงที่คัดสรรคุณครูสังกัด ขณะนี้กำลังดำเนินการส่งไปยังกลุ่มต่อไป ด้วยวิทยา Higher Education Administration ที่มหาวิทยาลัย North's Texas State University ประกาศ เทศบาล ประกาศผลการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษาต่ำศึกษา และประกาศผลการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษา และประกาศผลการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษา ให้ผู้จัดการ ศึกษาการ เป็นประธานหลักสูตรการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษา และยังเป็นการรวบรวมข้อมูลของกรรมการคัดสรรครู และยังเป็นการรวบรวมข้อมูลของกรรมการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษา และยังเป็นการรวบรวมข้อมูลของกรรมการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษา ให้ความร่วมมือในการเก็บรวบรวมข้อมูล กรรมการคัดสรรครูหลักสูตรการบริหารบัณฑิตศึกษา

ลงชื่อ เขียนแนบสำเนา เลขานุการ

ชื่อ วรรณา จันทร์ทิพย์

นายกฯ วิทยาศึกษา

ชื่อ วิทยาศึกษา

นายกฯ วิทยาศึกษา

หน่วยศึกษาทั่วถึง

โทร. 2816051, 2813905
เรื่อง  ขอความร่วมมือในการเรียนยุลมหาหน้า
เรียน  ถึงอาจาร้วิทยาศาสตร์สุรินทร์

สิ่งที่ส่งมาด้วย แนบลงมติ ความรู้สึก ดังนี้

ตัวการณ์วิชาการสนับสนุนของอาจารย์  นางสาวนิว ธ.  ปีกันท์  อาจารย์ 1
ระดับ 4 ลงที่วิทยาศาสตร์สุรินทร์  ขออนุญาตให้ส่งกิจกรรมในวันศุกร์ที่ 29
Education Administration  มหาวิทยาลัย North Texas State University  มหาวิทยาลัย
ประเทศไทย  ประกาศให้รวมถึงเป็นเรื่อง  "ความต้องการของครูอาจารย์ เนื่องจากบริบทกิจกรรม
ที่มีความรู้สึกอย่างมั่นคงนั้นต้องการการปรับปรุงงานของกรรมการวิทยากร และการเป็นการกลับสู่นักศึกษา
ของกรมการมีสิทธิ์ การเรียนรู้ด้วย ดังนี้จะขอความร่วมมือจากวิทยาการให้  โปรดอ่านความต้องการ
และให้ความร่วมมือในการเรียนรู้จากข้อมูล  กรรมการมีสิทธิ์ช่วยจัดให้สำหรับการเรียนการต่อยอด
ของบุคคลที่  นโยบาย

ส่งเรียบร้อย

ของเล็กส่งความรู้สึก

(นายสุธรรม จันทร์สม)
รองอธิบดี  รักษาการนายก

อธิบดีกรมการมีสิทธิ์

หน่วยสื่อสารเทศกิจ

โทร. 2816051, 2813905
เรื่อง ขอความร่วมมือในการเก็บข้อมูลจากวิทยาศาสตร์

เรียน อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา ผู้ทรงคุณ

ส่งที่สำนักต้น แบบสอบถาม จำนวน 81 ฉบับ

กับกรมการศึกษาเอกชน ได้รับที่ออกจัดจาก สำนักงานการศึกษา ปีการศึกษา 1 ระดับ 4 สำนักงานสุขภาพสังคมฯ จะมีการสำรวจข้อมูลในปีการศึกษา 2528 สำหรับมีการศึกษา การวิจัยการศึกษา เพื่อทำการศึกษาและวิจัยในด้านการศึกษา วิทยาศาสตร์ ต่อไป

การศึกษาที่มีการสำรวจข้อมูลในปีการศึกษา 2528 สำหรับมีการศึกษา การวิจัยการศึกษา เพื่อทำการศึกษาและวิจัยในด้านการศึกษา วิทยาศาสตร์ ต่อไป

ขอเรียนคุณเพื่อโปรดจัดสรรคุณให้ทันท่วงที

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

อธิบดีกรมการศึกษา

หน่วยศึกษานิเทศก์

โทรศัพท์ 2816051, 2813905
เรื่อง  ขอความร่วมมือในการเรียนซักการ์ดวัน
เรียน  อธิการบดีมหาวิทยาลัยจุฬาลงกรณ์

ส่งที่ฝ่ายการเงิน แบบคำร้อง จำนวน ๒ ชิ้น

ตัวกรรมการมีashtraได้รับสมรรถนะของการจัดงานมหาวิทยาลัย ซึ่งมีการศึกษาทางกิจการเมือง สาขาวิชา Higher Education Administration ฝั่งมหาวิทยาลัย North Texas State University และอธิการบดีมหาวิทยาลัยจุฬาลงกรณ์ จะทำสั่งให้เรื่อง "ความมีประสิทธิภาพของครูอาจารย์เพื่อการทุนด้านการจัดการศึกษา" กรรมการมีashtraจัดหา เรื่องการวิจัยนี้เป็นประโยชน์ต่อการพัฒนางานของกรรมการมีashtra และยังเป็นการพิจารณานุลักษณะของกรรมการมีashtraดังนั้นด้วย ตรงมาขอความร่วมมือจากอาจารย์ท่าน ๆ โปรดส่งแนวทางดังกล่าวและให้ความร่วมมือในการเก็บรวบรวมข้อมูล กรรมการมีashtraจะวางแผนได้รับการพิจารณาดังกล่าวขอขอบคุณท่าน ขอต่อดังนี้

ตั้งเริ่มมาเพื่อประกาศการดำเนินการต่อไป

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(นายสวาท จันทร์สม)
อธิการบดี มหาวิทยาลัยจุฬาลงกรณ์
รองอธิการบดีมีashtra

หน่วยศึกษาทั่วถึง
โทร. 2816051, 2813905
เรื่อง ขอความร่วมมือในการศึกษาธิการในสังกัด

เรียน จักรวาลวิทยาลัยครู มหาสารคาม

สิ่งที่ต้องมีนั้น ตามที่ คุณ

ตัวแทนศึกษาธิการได้รับการจัดทำจาก มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏนครราชสีมา สำนักงานการศึกษาธิการ ระดับ 4 สำนักงานศึกษาธิการ กระทรวงศึกษาธิการ ศูนย์การศึกษาและวิจัย มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย กฎหมายการศึกษาธิการ มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ระดับ 4 สำนักงานศึกษาธิการ มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ศูนย์การศึกษาและวิจัย มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย กฎหมายการศึกษาธิการ มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ระดับ 4 สำนักงานศึกษาธิการ มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ศูนย์การศึกษาและวิจัย มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย กฎหมายการศึกษาธิการ มหาวิทยาลัยภาคเหนือ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ขอเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดพิจารณาดำเนินการต่อไป

อื่นๆ ตามความต้องการของ

(นายสุชาติ จันทร์) คณะ

เรียนหลักสูตรการศึกษาธิการ

หน่วยศึกษาทั่วไป

โทร. 2816051, 2813905
APPENDIX C

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

12. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

13. He lets group members know what is expected of them.

14. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.

15. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

16. He does personal favors for group members.

17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

18. He is easy to understand.

19. He finds time to listen to group members.

20. He keeps to himself.

21. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.

22. He refuses to explain his actions.

23. He acts without consulting the group.

24. He is slow to accept new ideas.

25. He treats all group members as his equals.

26. He is willing to make changes.

27. He is friendly and approachable.

28. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with him.

29. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

30. He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.
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 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

What the IDEAL leader SHOULD do:

1. Make his attitudes clear to the group.

2. Try out his new ideas with the group.

3. Rule with an iron hand.

4. Criticize poor work.

5. Speak in a manner not to be questioned.

6. Assign group members to particular tasks.

7. Work without a plan.


9. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines.

10. Encourage the use of uniform procedures.

11. Make sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members.
0——Never
1——Seldom
2——Occasionally
3——Often
4——Always

12. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

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 equals.

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 Thai Translation of the LBDQ
ประวัติภูมิแบบลงบุกเบิก

โปรดเลือกเครื่องหมาย √ ลงหน้าจอหลังจากที่ได้ทำการดูทุกที่และอธิบายรอบที่ถาม

1. สภาพแวดล้อมที่มัน
   ______ (1) บริการ
   ______ (2) รองธุรกิจ
   ______ (3) ศึกษา
   ______ (4) ฝึกอบรม
   ______ (5) อาจารย์

2. เผศิลธรรม
   ______ (1) ขนบ
   ______ (2) หม่อม

3. อาณานิคมที่มัน
   ______ (1) ลำน้ำ 25 ปี
   ______ (2) ระยะยาว 25 - 34 ปี
   ______ (3) ระยะยาว 35 - 44 ปี
   ______ (4) ระยะยาว 45 - 54 ปี
   ______ (5) ระยะยาว 55 - 64 ปี

4. วัฒนธรรมที่มัน
   ______ (1) ล้ำชาติประมวลผล
   ______ (2) ปรัชญา
   ______ (3) ปรัชญาซึ่งมีลักษณะ
5. ท่านมีประสบการณ์ในการสัมมนาแล้ว

(1) 5 ปี หรือน้อยกว่า
(2) 6 - 10 ปี
(3) 11 ปี หรือมากกว่า

6. ท่านรู้จักใครการเป็นเวที

(1) 3 ปี หรือน้อยกว่า
(2) 3 - 4 ปี
(3) 5 - 6 ปี
(4) 7 - 8 ปี
(5) 9 - 10 ปี
(6) มากกว่า 10 ปี

7. เพศของผู้อธิบายในสิ่งปัญหาของท่าน

(1) ชาย
(2) หญิง
แบบสอบถาม

ผสมผสาน 1 แบบสอบถามการจ้างทำและเดินทางเพื่อสุทธิศักยภาพของคุณ

(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL)

ข้อแนะนำในการตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. โปรดตอบข้อมูลตามแบบสอบถามแล้วเลือกตัวเลือกที่เหมาะสม
2. ท่านจะได้รับข้อความที่ตัวอย่างข้อมูลที่ไปยังอีเมล์ที่แจ้งให้ท่าน
3. โปรดทำตามที่

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ไม่เคย</th>
<th>เกีกันน้อย</th>
<th>เกือบจะ</th>
<th>เกือบจะ</th>
<th>เกือบจะ</th>
<th>เกือบจะ</th>
<th>เกือบจะ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยเกินไป</td>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยมาก</td>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยมาก</td>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยมาก</td>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยมาก</td>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยมาก</td>
<td>เกี่ยวข้องน้อยมาก</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. แสดงเจตนาของงานของให้เห็นการรวม
   ทราบถึงเรื่องเริ่มต้น

2. แสดงแนวความคิดเห็น ๆ ศิลปะการจ้าง

3. บริหารงานอย่างถูกต้องและเต็มที่

4. ใช้เทคนิคการจ้างงานที่ทำไม่ได้ผล

5. แสดงให้เห็นถึงการไม่ยอมรับผู้ที่
   ตั้งต้นใหม่ที่

6. ใช้เทคนิคการให้ความสำคัญกับ
   ผู้คน

7. บริหารงานรักษาให้เป็นการวางแผน
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ไม่เคย</th>
<th>เกิดอัน</th>
<th>เกิดอัน</th>
<th>เกิดอัน</th>
<th>เกิดอัน</th>
<th>เกิดอัน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>กำหนดมาตรฐานของการทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>เน้นเรื่องการทำงานให้สิ้นสุดก่อน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ล้างฝั่งไม่ให้ด้วยการทำงานอย่างมีระบบแบบแผนเดียวกัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>เชื้อเชิญให้ศาสตร์บรรจุจ้างให้นักศึกษาและ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ความรู้เชิงเฉพาะของที่หน้าภาษาไทย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ที่มีต่อภาษาไทย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ยอมรับให้ศาสตร์บรรจุปฏิบัติงานตามกฎหมาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>อย่างสิ้น</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ชี้แจงให้ศาสตร์บรรจุงานปัญหาบางส่วน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ที่ผ่านมา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>หนังสือราชการส่งให้ศาสตร์บรรจุทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>โดยใช้ความสำหรับบางส่วนเดิม</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>หนังสือราชการส่งการทำงานของ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ศาสตร์บรรจุเป็นไปอย่างสอดคล้องต้องการ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ทำงานให้เป็นศักย์ชั้นยอดของ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ศาสตร์บรรจุ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>กรรมาธิการลงมติพิจารณาขอให้ สภาจังหวัดรัฐบาลที่ต้องเจ้าหน้าที่เป็น สแรงสิทธิในภาษียqa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เสนอสมทบสภาจังหวัดเข้ารัฐสภา</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>มีเวลาที่จะต้องพิจารณาเรื่องที่ขอเสนอขอรับจากสภาจังหวัด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ยุทธวิธิงานตามอำนาจและหน้าที่ของรัฐ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ขอความเห็นสำนักงานให้แก่สภาจังหวัด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ปฏิบัติงานโดยไม่รับผิดชอบจากกฎหมาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ปฏิบัติงานโดยไม่รับผิดชอบจากกฎหมาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ไม่ค่อยยอมรับจากผู้ควบคุมสิทธิ์เรียกภาษี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ปฏิบัติตามต้องการรัฐบาลเสียภาษีให้</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เสนอให้ระเบียบเปลี่ยนแปลงและปรับปรุง วิธีการทงงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ในเคย เกิดชื่น เลย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อยมาก หรือ ผ่านสิ้นการ เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น เกิดบาง ครั้งบาง ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น น้อย ครั้ง</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น อยู่ เหลือๆ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เป็นกิจเองและพ้นจับ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้ผลการบูรณาการเป็นกิจเองเพื่อ เกิดจากประสบการณ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>นำข้อมูลแนะของภารกิจการดำเนินไปใน การบริหารงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ขอความเห็นยุทธศาสตร์การดำเนินเรื่อง สำคัญ ๆ ก่อนที่จะนำไปปฏิบัติ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
แบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 2 แบบสัมผัสพฤติกรรมในทางปฏิบัติ

(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - IDEAL)

ข้อมูลในตารางตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. โปรดจับอักษรในแบบสอบถามแต่ละข้ออย่างระมัดระวังและรอบคอบ
2. ท่านเห็นว่า วิธีการในคลาสของท่าน ควรจะมีกิจกรรม ต่อไปนี้มากน้อย
   เสมอใด โปรดตอบตามหมายถ้า มี ในcelonaที่ตรงกับคำถามเห็นของท่าน
3. โปรดตอบข้อมูล

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ไม่ครั้ง</th>
<th>ครั้ง</th>
<th>ครั้ง</th>
<th>ครั้ง</th>
<th>ครั้ง</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ละมั่น</td>
<td>ละมั่น</td>
<td>ละมั่น</td>
<td>ละมั่น</td>
<td>ละมั่น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
<td>ปานกลาง</td>
<td>มาก</td>
<td>มากที่สุด</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1  | แสดงศักยภาพดีด้านการให้การช่วยกัน  |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | ทดลองแนวความคิดใหม่ ๆ ไม่จำกัดเวลา |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเรียบร้อย |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | วิทยาลัยงานจัดงานที่ไม่ได้ยิน |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | ส่งการไม่ต้องการที่ไม่ยุ่งยากให้ผู้อื่น |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | รู้จักเลือกงานให้เหมาะสมกับภูมิข้อ情报งาน |  |  |  |  |
| 7  | บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้รับการวางแผน |  |  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ลำดับ</th>
<th>รายการ</th>
<th>รายละเอียด</th>
<th>ผลิตภัณฑ์</th>
<th>รายการ</th>
<th>ผลิตภัณฑ์</th>
<th>ผลิตภัณฑ์</th>
<th>ผลิตภัณฑ์</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>วิวัฒนาการฐานของทักษะงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>เน้นสร้างทักษะงานให้เต็มที่มากที่สุด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ส่งเสริมให้พัฒนาระบบงานอย่างมี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ระเบียบแบบแผนเต็มที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ฝึกและให้พัฒนาระบบการพัฒนาระบบ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ความรับผิดชอบต่อการสำคัญประการ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ที่มีผลต่อการวิ่ง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ขอร้องให้พัฒนาการปฏิบัติงานตามกฎหมาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ของปัจจัย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ฟื้นฟูให้พัฒนาระบบการประเมินความมุ่งหมาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ซึ่งจะมีผลต่อการที่จะให้พัฒนาระบบของการทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ผู้ดูแล</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>หมู่บ้านจะขับเคลื่อนให้พัฒนาระบบการทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>โดยใช้ความร่วมมือการอย่างชัดเจน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>หมู่บ้านจะจัดกระบวนการทำงานของ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ผู้ดูแล</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ให้เป็นไปอย่างต่อเนื่อง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ตลอดและ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ทำงานให้เป็นที่สร้างเสริมพัฒนาหมู่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ผู้ดูแล</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เลข</td>
<td>รายการ</td>
<td>ครุฑ</td>
<td>ครุฑ</td>
<td>ครุฑ</td>
<td>ครุฑ</td>
<td>ครุฑ</td>
<td>ครุฑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>สารที่ส่งผลกระทบและนัยที่ทำให้</td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ตกกระทบรู้สึกอันตรายได้ เจ้าหน้าที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>เป็นสิ่งที่มีภัยคุกคาม</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เป็นภัยที่อาจถูกอ้างเกี่ยวโยง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>มีการที่จะผิดกฎหมายเป็นข้อ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ล่ากลับ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ช่วยเหลือผู้ป่วยและไม่ส่งสื่อสาร</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>กับผู้ที่เจ็บป่วย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>คงสัตว์คุณค่าที่กรมท่าไม่ได้แก้</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ดาลอาจ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ปัจจัยที่จะส่งเสียงและเสียงเสื้อผ้า</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ประหารงานของตนเอง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ปัญหาเจ้าหน้าที่ไม่ได้รับคำ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ไม่ได้ยอมรับคุณค่าทางคุณค่าที่มี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ตกลง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ปัญหา talked หรือทางเดิน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>สิ่งที่อยู่ใน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>สิ่งที่ทำให้เกิด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เสียไว้ที่จะเปลี่ยนแปลงและปรับปรุง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>วิธีการงาน</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>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เบื้องต้นของแผนงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้ศูนย์ข้อมูลเป็นที่อยู่ เพื่อ เวลาที่จำเป็นมากขึ้น</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>นำข้อมูล那天ของแพทย์ผู้มีมาใช้ ในการบริหารงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>อดิเรกเพิ่มขึ้นจากพยาบาลในเรื่อง สำคัญ ๆ ก่อนที่จะนำไปปฏิบัติ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ชื่อแบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 1 แบบสอบถามกรัมกิจเติ้ลเพื่อวิเคราะห์พฤติกรรมของผู้คน

(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL)

ข้อแนะนำในการตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. โปรดอ่านข้อความในแบบสอบถามแล้วตัดสินใจโดยตรงและระมัดระวัง

2. ท่านเห็นว่า ท่านในฐานะผู้ภาวะผู้บริหาร ต่อไปนี้ เกิดขึ้นอย่างไรจัง
   โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย √ ในช่องที่ตรงกับความเห็นของท่าน

3. โปรดตอบทุกข้อ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ไม่เคย</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td>น้อยมาก</td>
<td>หรือ</td>
<td>มากครั้ง</td>
<td>บ่อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>แต่ละเจตคิดของตนเองให้มวล darm</td>
<td>ท่านอย่างยั่งยืน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ตลอดแนวความคิดใหม่ๆ ที่สามารถรับ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>บริหารงานอย่างเคร่งครัดและเข้มงวด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>วิทยำวิเคราะห์ฉันท์ท่านทำไม่ได้</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>สิ่งการในศิลปะที่ไม่ถูกต้องให้ผู้คน</td>
<td>ท่านได้แบ่ง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>รู้จักเลือกคนให้เหมาะสมกับลักษณะของงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>บริหารงานโดยไม่ได้มีการวางแผน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ไม่เคย</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
<th>เกิดขึ้น</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>รักษาภาระฐานของบรรษัทงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>เมื่อเสร็จทรงงานให้พักจากสถานที่</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ตั้งเสื้อให้พลทหารยังงานอย่างมี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ราคานั้นรายงานผลิตงานตามกฎ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ยื่นคำเสืนให้พลทหารยืนยันความมุ่งหวัง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>นับเวลาการตั้งให้พลทหารยังงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>หนังสือราชการแสดงการยังงานของ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td>เกิดขึ้น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เลข</td>
<td>รายการ</td>
<td>เลขที่</td>
<td>เลขที่หน่วยงาน</td>
<td>เลขที่หน่วยงาน</td>
<td>เลขที่หน่วยงาน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เทิร์นิ้วศิลป์เปลี่ยนแปลงและปรับปรุง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>บริการท่องเที่ยว</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เจ้าหน้าที่และพนักงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้เจ้าหน้าที่มีการพัฒนาการ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>เตรียมความพร้อมในการทำงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ผู้เข้าร่วมขึ้นอยู่ด้วยการสมัคร</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ในการบริการงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>สอบถามเพิ่มเติมจากพนักงานในเรื่อง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>สำนักงานที่จะมีการปฏิบัติ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
แบบลับกาม

ก่อนที่ 2 แบบลับกามที่เก็บกาวเกิดให้กับปกพฤติกรรมของผู้นำ

(THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - IDEAL)

ข้อแนะนำในการตอบแบบลับกาม

1. ประยุกต์ข้อความในแบบลับกามและย้อมย่างให้ตรงและรอบคอบ
2. ทำให้เห็นว่า ทำในส่วนต่างๆ การปฏิบัติงาน ต้องไปฝึกจนถูกต้องได้
   ปรากฏเหตุการณ์ที่จริง ไม้อยู่ที่ความเห็นของท่าน
3. โปรดตอบทุกข้อ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>โจทย์</th>
<th>ไม่สามารถ</th>
<th>สามารถ</th>
<th>ดำเนินการ</th>
<th>ไม่สามารถ</th>
<th>ดำเนินการ</th>
<th>ที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. เลื่อนลับกามของผู้นำให้เกิดการรับทราบอย่างชัดเจน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ทดลองแนวคิดความคิดใน ๆ ปฏิบัติจริง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. บรรจุงานย่าง เสร็จสิ้นและเรียบยาก</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. วิทยาการจัดงานที่ทำไม่ได้ผล</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ถ่ายการไม่สมเหตุที่ไม่เคยมีได้ให้ผู้ป่วย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. รู้สึกเสียกับงานให้เกิดความกังวลต่องาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ปรุงทุกงานโดยไม่เกิดการทำงานแผน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>序号</td>
<td>内容</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>该系统数据库的维护工作</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>检查并更新数据库信息</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>定期进行数据库的备份工作，并将备份文件进行归档</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>检查数据库的性能和运行情况，确保其正常运行</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>系统管理程序的维护工作</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>检查并更新系统管理程序的更新情况，确保其正常运行</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>确保系统管理程序的正常运行，对系统管理程序进行定期的更新和维护</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>检查服务器的运行情况，确保其正常运行</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ไม่เคยต้องการ</td>
<td>ควรต้องการ</td>
<td>ควรต้องการ</td>
<td>ควรต้องการ</td>
<td>ควรต้องการ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ทำงานให้เป็นที่รักโดยอย่างเพียงพอ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>กระทำสิ่งและผลดีอย่างที่ทำให้</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>เป็นคนที่มีจิตระบาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>มีเวลาที่จะทำตามคิดเห็น</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ยินดีทำงานตามสั่งการและไม่ส่งผลกระทบต่อกัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ค่อยๆตระหนักรับสิ่งที่ให้เก่งล่าช้า</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ปฏิบัติงานที่จะอธิบายเหตุผลในการบริหารงานของตนเอง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ปฏิบัติงานโดยไม่ปฏิบัติการล่าช้า</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ไม่เคยยอมรับเพื่อความคิดเห็นใหม่ๆ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ปฏิบัติตนอย่างดาบสำหรับความผู้ใน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ทางสะดวกที่สุด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>หมายเลข</td>
<td>วัตถุประสงค์</td>
<td>ระยะเวลา</td>
<td>ผลต่อเนื่อง</td>
<td>ผลลัพธ์</td>
<td>ผลลัพธ์ที่ผ่านมา</td>
<td>ผลลัพธ์ที่ต้องการ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>เบื้องต้น</td>
<td>มั่นคง</td>
<td>น้อย</td>
<td>น้อย</td>
<td>น้อย</td>
<td>น้อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>เป็นที่นิยม</td>
<td>สถานการณ์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ทำให้ความเข้าใจว่าเป็นที่นิยม</td>
<td>เริ่มจากผลผลิต</td>
<td>ผลผลิต</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ด้านผลผลิต</td>
<td>ผลผลิต</td>
<td>ผลผลิต</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ขอความยินยอมจากพนักงาน</td>
<td>ผลผลิต</td>
<td>ผลผลิต</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ส่วน ฯ ที่ผ่านมาไปปฏิบัติ
APPENDIX F

Analysis of Variance Summaries for Each Real and Ideal Dimension Scores of the Teaching Faculty, Administrative Staff and Presidents
### TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EACH REAL DIMENSION SCORES BETWEEN TEACHING FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>205.69</td>
<td>5526.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>121.15</td>
<td>35107.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The initials Dim, I ST, CON, DF, BG, WG, TOT denote Dimensions, Initiating Structure, Consideration, Degree of freedom, Between groups, Within groups and Total respectively.

### TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EACH IDEAL DIMENSION SCORES BETWEEN TEACHING FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>21102.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>16727.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The initials Dim, I ST, CON, DF, BG, WG, TOT denote Dimensions, Initiating Structure, Consideration, Degree of freedom, Between groups, Within groups and Total respectively.
TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EACH REAL DIMENSION SCORES BETWEEN TEACHING FACULTY AND PRESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0042  **p < .0012

TABLE XIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EACH IDEAL DIMENSION SCORES BETWEEN TEACHING FACULTY AND PRESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XV

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EACH REAL DIMENSION SCORES BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND PRESIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>582.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>505.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0164  **p < .0041

### TABLE XVI

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EACH IDEAL DIMENSION SCORES BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND PRESIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>154.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>35.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0203
TABLE XVII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REAL AND IDEAL DIMENSION
SCORES OF THE TEACHING FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>27341.91</td>
<td>53461.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>9621.54</td>
<td>36897.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001  **p < .0001

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REAL AND IDEAL DIMENSION
SCORES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>9204.55</td>
<td>23167.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3289.14</td>
<td>14937.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001  **p < .0001
TABLE XIX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REAL AND IDEAL DIMENSION SCORES OF THE PRESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0158
APPENDIX G

Means and Standard Deviations of the Eight Teachers Colleges in Northeastern Thailand
### TABLE XX

**COLLEGE 1**

THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS
FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE
THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=23)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>24.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXI

THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS
FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE
THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=23)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.22</td>
<td>30.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXII

**COLLEGE 2**

**THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS**

**FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34.69</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>40.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXIII

**THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS**

**FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>36.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXIV

COLLEGE 3

**THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=21)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXV

**THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=21)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>32.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXVI

**COLLEGE 4**

THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=18)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.67 41.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>8.86 7.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXVII

THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=18)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.61 38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>8.16 5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXVIII

**COLLEGE 5**

**THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=30)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>29.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXIX

**THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=30)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>30.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>35.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXX

COLLEGE 6

THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS
FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE
THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=17)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXXI

THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS
FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE
THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=17)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXII

COLLEGE 7

THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS
FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE
THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=14)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXXIII

THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS
FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE
THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=14)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXXIV

**COLLEGE 8**

THE REAL AND IDEAL INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=30)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXXV

THE REAL AND IDEAL CONSIDERATION DIMENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President (N=1)</th>
<th>Administrative (N=30)</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Halpin, Andrew W., Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Columbus, The Ohio State University Press, 1957.


Ideal Leader Behavior, Columbus, Ohio, Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, 1957.


Intarakumnerd, Tanom, A Study For Development of Training Programme for Administrators of Teachers Colleges, Bangkok, Center for Educational Innovation and Technology, 1983.


**Articles**


Wallberg, Herbert J. "The Academic President: Colleague,
Administrator or Spokesman?" *Educational Record*, L (Spring, 1969) 2.

Microfiche


Unpublished Materials


