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The problem with which this investigation was concerned was the level of knowledge about the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities. The four purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To determine the prevalent leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities in terms of the Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid concept;

2. To determine if self-reported leadership style is congruent with the leadership style determination obtained through an instrument developed to analyze leadership style;

3. To determine if the following are factors in the leadership choice of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities:

   - Size and complexity of the institution
   - Age
   - Years of experience as a chief student affairs administrator
   - Educational preparation, i.e. academic, administrative, or religious
- Type of professional experience
- Level of educational preparation
- Affiliation of the institution where the highest level of education was obtained
- Administrative level within the institution
- Number of subordinates reporting directly to the administrator;

4. To determine if the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrator is predominantly people-oriented or purpose-oriented.

Thirteen hypotheses were generated from these four purposes.

The chief student affairs administrators in the forty-six senior level colleges and universities affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention made up the population of the study. Thirty-nine (84.7 percent) of these administrators participated in the study by completing a demographic questionnaire and the Styles of Leadership Survey. The Styles of Leadership Survey, based on Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid concept, is a weighted-choice instrument which measures the strength of concern for people or for purpose.

Various factors were isolated and analyzed to determine their effect on the choice of leadership style used by these institutional officers. Chi-square, the t-test, one-way analysis of variance, the Scheffé test, and the Spearman Rho correlation coefficient were used in the statistical analyses. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. For the
purpose of analysis, the administrators were divided into three groups according to the size and complexity of the institution.

The following were the major findings from the analyses:

1. The 9/9 (Team) leadership style was the highest weighted choice of leadership style of these administrators with the 1/9 (Country Club) style ranked second.

2. The officers reported a stronger direction toward the more effective leadership styles (9/9 and 5/5) and less direction toward the least effective styles (1/1 and 1/9) in their self-ranked statements from the questionnaire than as measured on the Styles of Leadership Survey.

3. No significant difference in leadership style choice was found in the following factors: size and complexity of the institution, age, educational preparation, level of education, affiliation of the institution granting the degree, administrative level in the institution, number of subordinates, and the sex of the administrator.

Significant differences were found in the choice of leadership style in the following factors: years of experience, previous professional experience, and comparison of people-orientation and purpose-orientation.

4. These administrators report a preference for the 1/9 (people-oriented) style over the 9/1 (purpose-oriented) style of leadership.

The findings from this study reflect only the self-reported perception of leadership style.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The study of the management of organizations has been a subject of much research in the present day because of the emphasis on increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of these organizations. The process of management has been divided into four distinct functions: planning, organizing, directing, and controlling (25, p. 5). The third of these functions of management—directing—has included the terms "leading," "motivating," "guiding," and "actuating." All of these words, although having different connotations, clearly indicate that this function of management is concerned with the human factors of an organization. This concern for the human factor in the management process attests to the major role of leadership in helping an organization in reaching its goals. Although beneficial studies could be conducted within any part of the management process, this study focused on the aspect of leadership within the directing function of management.

For as long as people have studied management, the question of leadership has permeated the central issues of organizational effectiveness. In recent years especially, numerous analyses have been made concerning leadership and
its importance in effective management. Most of these studies have been in the field of business. Educators have said, "You cannot run a college like a factory." Grassell agrees, but states, "That does not mean that we should not objectively investigate the tremendous growing field of management knowledge to see what is applicable to college and university governance" (13, p. 79). Cangemi concludes that in spite of the different purposes, business has much to offer education, especially in the area of leadership (5, p. 229). The need for understanding leadership effectiveness has become more acute during the last few years and will be even more acute in the future because of the increasing complexity of higher educational institutions and the demands of our society on higher education. Scholarship and personality are not enough to produce efficient and effective administrators. If colleges and universities are to respond successfully to the challenges which currently confront them, management must be improved.

If improvement of management in higher education administration is essential, improvement is even more vital in the field of student affairs. Shaffer emphasizes this when he discusses the challenges of the next decade in student affairs, then states, "To meet these challenges, the administrator will need to be increasingly efficient and effective in the performance of his administrative functions (24, p. 5).

Responsibilities for student affairs functions and concerns
have come close to reaching the pinnacle of the administrative ladder in many of our institutions with the title of vice-president for student life, student affairs, and student services becoming common. Brown indicates that the administrative function is a difficult role for many student affairs administrators because as a professional group they are people-oriented, not generally aggressive or assertive (4, p. 40).

In a study made with the chief student affairs officers in 139 four-year institutions with enrollments between 1,000 and 2,000, Lilley (17) found that the five most important functions of chief student affairs administrators dealt with administrative matters needing strong leadership skills. These functions were (1) being chief administrative officer of the student affairs subdivision, (2) forming policy, (3) preparing the budget, (4) recruiting and hiring staff, and (5) interpreting policy to students (17, p. 9).

As campuses and staffs continue to get more complex, the student affairs administrator will be forced to devote more time and attention to staff management functions. Lilley concludes that "the present role of the chief student affairs administrator appears to be one of coordinating and administering a heterogeneous group of functions" (17, p. 9).

Shaffer included an even higher degree of responsibility requiring leadership skills. He believes that student affairs administrators, as staff officers, have prime responsibility
for establishing and performing certain services designed to improve the educational effectiveness of the academic community. Therefore, to be successful, they must maintain close relationships with all other elements of the institution so that their work is not perceived as something separate and apart from the total institution's task. According to Shaffer, the student affairs administrator will need to devote more effort and attention to the task of integrating student affairs efforts and concerns into all aspects of the institution as it becomes more complex and pressures toward fragmentation multiply (24, p. 5). In the past many student affairs administrators have risen to their positions from the faculty ranks by showing ability to work with students; it appears that in the future these administrators will need to know as much about effective and efficient management skills as about the students themselves.

Those responsible for the administration of student affairs programs must evaluate carefully the efficiency and effectiveness of present administrative practices, role changes, and developing trends. For student affairs administrators, insight into personal leadership styles can be advantageous in achieving the goal of the effective administrators, needed for the years ahead. The comprehensive challenge according to Shaffer is that the chief student affairs administrator "be as effective an administrator as his specialists are in their respective fields" (24, p. 9). From experience, the chief administrator should possess an
even greater degree of expertise than his subordinate in order to achieve the degree of effectiveness needed.

In the past the terms "leadership," "administration," and "management" were often used interchangeably. As the behavioral sciences developed, the concept of leadership became increasingly limited to designating a particular aspect of interpersonal relationships; whereas, management took on a much broader definition. Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevish state that management consists of activities undertaken by one or more persons to coordinate the activities of other persons to achieve results not achieveable by any one person acting alone (9, p. 17). Today, leadership is differentiated from management with the concept that to be effective, management must include leadership. Leadership is an essential factor of successful administration according to Davis (8). He states that leadership is a part of management, but not all of it. A manager is required to plan and organize, but all that we ask of a leader is that he get others to follow. Davis defines leadership as the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically. He sees leadership as the human factor which binds groups together and motivates them toward goals because management activities such as planning, organizing, and decision-making are dormant cocoons until a leader triggers the power of motivation in people and guides them toward toals (8, p. 96).
When two or more persons constitute a group, the relation of leadership and followship becomes evident. In answering the question about what leadership is, there are about as many definitions as there are people trying to define the term. For some, the term means the activity of the one who holds an office in an organization or group. Gibb indicates that this was the definition initially adopted by Shartle and Stogdill in 1952 to guide the Ohio State University studies in naval leadership (11, p. 210). Sisk defines leadership as it functions in organizations as "the accomplishment of organizational objectives as the result of interpersonal relationships of the group" (25, p. 391). Hersey and Blanchard, from the situationist viewpoint, define leadership as "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (16, p. 84). In a fuller definition, Cribbin describes leadership as a process of influence on a group in a particular situation, at a given point in time, and in a specific set of circumstances that stimulates the willingness toward attaining organizational objectives (6, p. 9). Within this study, Hall and Williams' definition of leadership is used. They define leadership as "the use of power—one's capacity of influencing others—to achieve purpose through people" (14, p. 1).

Defining leadership in a clear, concise, and comprehensive manner is difficult as definitions take on the focus of the person or group defining the term, such as from a
psychological, sociological, or business viewpoint. At times reference is made to "positions of leadership;" sometimes as "kind of leadership;" and at others, the "quality or characteristics" a person has. The common thread running through the definitions is that leadership is the process whereby one individual exerts influence over others (9, p. 252).

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this investigation was concerned was the level of knowledge about the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators of Southern Baptist colleges and universities.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To determine the prevalent leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities in terms of the Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid concept;

2. To determine if self-reported leadership style is congruent with the leadership style determination obtained through an instrument developed to analyze leadership style;

3. To determine if the following are factors in the leadership style choice of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities:
- Size and complexity of the institution
- Age
- Years of experience as a chief student affairs administrator
- Educational preparation, i.e. academic, administrative, or religious
- Type of professional experience
- Level of educational preparation
- Affiliation of the institution where the highest level of education was obtained
- Administrative level within the institution
- Number of subordinates reporting directly to the administrator;

4. To determine if the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrator is predominantly people-oriented or purpose-oriented.

Statement of the Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference from the statistically uniform distribution in the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities.

2. There is no significant difference between a self-reported leadership style and the dominant leadership style as indicated by the Styles of Leadership Survey.

3. There is no significant relationship between the "ideal ranking" of leadership styles from Blake and Mouton's
research (9/9, 5/5, 9/1, 1/9, and 1/1) and the ranking of
the leadership style of the chief student affairs administra-
tors in Southern Baptist institutions.

4. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the size or complexity of the institutions.

5. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the age of the chief student affairs
administrators in their institutions.

6. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the years of experience as a chief
student affairs administrator.

7. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the educational preparation of the
administrator: academic, administrative, or religious.

8. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the professional experience of the chief
student affairs administrator.

9. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the level of education of the chief
student affairs administrator.

10. There is no significant difference in leadership
style with regard to the affiliation of the institution where
the highest level of education was obtained, i.e. public,
private, church-related, Southern Baptist, or Southern
Baptist seminary.
11. There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the administrative level of the chief student affairs administrator within the institution.

12. There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the number of subordinates reporting directly to the chief student affairs administrator.

13. There is no significant difference in the leadership style preference toward a people-orientation or a purpose-orientation.

Need for the Study

In recent years numerous studies have been conducted in the student affairs domain. In 1974, Crookston (7) conducted an extensive study of the changes that were taking place among chief student affairs administrators in American colleges and universities from 1967 to 1972, an update of a previous study. His study, involving administrators who were members of the American College Personnel Association, consisted of a series of demographic descriptions of various job changes because of the movement towards the developmental concept. Gladstein (12) reports finding 492 dissertations from 1950 to 1964 in student affairs. These studies dealt extensively in the characteristics of the chief student affairs administrators. The most prevalent areas of study were surveys of services and various demographic descriptions. As these studies have added to the description of the student affairs domain, a study of the leadership style dimension within the
area would add further insight into this field of administration.

Harway (15) reports a study made of the management styles of the chief student affairs administrator in comparison to the styles of other major officers in twenty-three colleges receiving funds from the Exxon Education Foundation. He found that student affairs officers in this study described their management behavior as being open and accessible whereas the academic and fiscal administrators described their style as most typically democratic (15, p. 260). Would this finding hold true among other groupings of institutions in higher education, such as the Southern Baptist colleges and universities?

A vast diversity exists among institutions of higher education in the United States. In studying the leadership styles of the student affairs administrators, studies could be made of various distinctive groups of institutions, such as large state universities, regional or state institutions, community colleges, or other groupings. Another distinctive group is church-related, private institutions. The present study investigated a group of institutions in this private, church-related segment of the diverse system of higher education in America.

Throughout history, the private, church-related institution of higher learning has played an important part in the growth and development of the United States. Eight of the
first nine colleges in America were founded by various religious groups. These colleges and universities, until recent years with the influx of vast numbers of "non-traditional" students into the new community college movement and the enlarging of the state university systems, enrolled more than fifty percent of the American college students (18, p. 3). The Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1977-78, published by the National Center for Educational Statistics, listed 1,395 private institutions as compared to 561 public senior level institutions (20, p. XXVI).

Although not serving as large a percentage of the college population today, according to a number of studies these institutions will continue their significant role in higher education in America. One such report is that of McGrath in a thorough study in 1975, in which he states that the present condition and future prospects of these institutions are not as precarious as some less well-informed observers have contended. His opinion is that the educational and fiscal health of the church-related institutions will depend upon their tenacity in holding to the basic religious, spiritual, and moral principles for which they were established (18, p. 3).

What is the role of the church-related institution of higher learning in American education? Benezet, compiling the findings of twenty-two studies, listed the following as the most important contributions of private education: (1) preserves diversity of choice (included in all twenty-two
of the studies); (2) provides standards of academic quality (included by sixteen); (3) emphasizes human values and individual attention (included by fourteen); and (4) saves taxpayer money (included by eight of the studies) (1, p. 205).

The rate of growth of these institutions compared to the public sector has slowed, but the number of enrollees has risen considerably since 1950. Only twenty-five percent of the degree-credit enrollment are now attending church-related institutions but their total enrollment has doubled, rising from 1,064,024 in 1950 to 2,185,122 in 1976 (18, p. 3). McGrath, in a study of all 372 colleges and universities with enrollments between 250 and 2,900 which categorized themselves in the 1975-76 edition of the Education Directory as being affiliated with a church body, found a 2.2 percent decrease in total college and university enrollment in 1976; whereas, the institutions in his study increased their enrollment by two percent (18, p. 5).

Pace also notes the continued strength of church-related institutions which are sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education when he states that the future of the evangelical-fundamental church-related institution looks secure because of the strong assistance they receive from those who financially and spiritually support their educational philosophy (21, p. xii). Bowen and Mintor (3) also do not confirm the frequently asserted opinion that most private colleges and
universities are not still a viable and sturdy part of the American system of higher education (3, p. 78).

The forty-six colleges and universities affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention fit into a unified, identifiable group within the church-related institutions in America. These institutions had a fall, 1977, enrollment of 79,239 students, with an increase of thirty percent in enrollment in the past ten years (10, p. 6). These colleges and universities are unified through a formal organization, the Association of Southern Baptist Colleges and Schools, and by an affirmation of purpose through this organization as well as through their affiliation with the Southern Baptist Convention. All are fully accredited members of their regional accrediting associations.

The student affairs domain of these institutions was the focal point of this study. The students affairs movement has been the historical advocate of the "Student Personnel Point of View," a statement by the Committee on College Personnel of the American Council on Education. This statement stresses each individual student's development as a "whole" person (26, p. 1). Therefore, student affairs administrators should rate high in "concern for people" in leadership style. Paschall, in studying college presidents and lower level administrators in Texas, concludes that there is not a significant difference between the leadership styles of administrators, in general, in public and private
institutions in Texas (22, p. 100). However, Riggs, speaking specifically of student affairs administrators, believes that a focus on persons would be high on the list in all the processes of a Christian college as our religious heritage would make that an obvious mandate (23, p. 42). Although Riggs is speaking of a general orientation in his statement, is there a distinct people-oriented leadership style among the chief student affairs administrators in church-related colleges and universities?

Specifically, this study would be a significant addition to the literature in that the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in a distinct group of church-related institutions in American higher education was identified and analyzed. A study was not found concerning the leadership styles or characteristics of this or any other group of church-related institutions. With the current emphasis on studying leadership style and its implications to administrative effectiveness, the application of the leadership style studies in this group of institutions could be significant as they prepare for an ever more austere future which will require the most effective and efficient management skills available.

The findings, both in the strength of the style choice as identified by the survey instrument and by any incongruence with the self-identified style from the questionnaire in Appendix G, could stimulate self-analysis by both the institutions and the individual student affairs administrator.
The conclusions drawn from studies utilizing the *Styles of Leadership Survey* have indicated that age, level of the leader, and the number of people supervised are factors in determining leadership style (27). Could other variables, such as type of professional preparation, previous fields of experience, level of educational preparation, or affiliation of the institution granting the degree, be influencing factors affecting the ability to meet the particular administrative needs in the student affairs domain of these church-related institutions? The information gathered in this study could provide a data base to assist these institutions in assessing administrative effectiveness in Southern Baptist colleges and universities.

There are a number of approaches to studying leadership style. Blake and Mouton's concept was chosen as the basis for this study as it is ideally suited for use in studying leadership style. It is based on the assumption that there is a "best" leadership style and that leadership can be changed through training programs to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of administrative skills. Blake and Mouton believe that education provides new insight and skills, introduces new possibilities, and excites new motivation for something better than that which presently exists (2, p. 216). Speaking specifically of their managerial grid, Blake and Mouton state that their concept is useful in helping people identify the assumptions they make as they work with
others; thus helping a person to see himself and others more objectively, to communicate more clearly, to understand differences, to make personal changes, and to help others toward more productive and rewarding experiences (2, p. 6).

The knowledge of one's present style of leadership would not in itself lend assistance to more effective administration. However, by using the Managerial Grid concept as a pattern to analyze leadership style, training programs could be initiated to improve leadership effectiveness and to direct the style more toward the "9/9" leadership style, Blake and Mouton's concept of the "ideal" or most effective style of leadership. This style is characterized by maximum concern for both output and people within the organization. In their studies, Blake and Mouton explain that their research has demonstrated that a 9/9 orientation to leadership is more positively associated with success, productivity, and profitability in comparison to the other four pure styles they have identified (2, p. 28).

Definition of Terms

The following terms had restricted meaning and were defined for this study.

1. Student Affairs: A major administrative subdivision of a college or university, such as academic affairs or business affairs, including such functions as counseling, career planning and placement, housing, and coordinating student activities (19, p. 3).
2. **Chief Student Affairs Administrator**: The staff member responsible for the management and direction of the student affairs subdivision of a college or university.

3. **Southern Baptist colleges and universities**: The forty-six senior level institutions of higher learning which are listed in the 1978 *Annual* of the Southern Baptist Convention as being affiliated with that convention.

4. **Leadership**: The use of power - one's capacity for influencing others - to achieve purpose through people (14, p. 1).

5. **Leadership style**: A person's preferred way of leading which reflects the interplay between purpose, people, power, and philosophy (14, p. 1).

6. **Styles of Leadership Survey**: An instrument, developed by Jay Hall and Martha S. Williams for Teleometrics, International, Woodlands, Texas, which is based on a two dimensional analysis of leadership practices, essentially like that developed by Blake and Mouton.

7. **Concern for Purpose**: The reason for being which characterizes the organization, the objectives to be served by organized action (14, p. 1).

8. **Concern for People**: Those human resources which comprise the organization (14, p. 1).
Delimitations

1. Although there are a number of methods of studying leadership style, the data collected and analyzed in this study were based on the concepts drawn from the descriptive styles of Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid.

2. The findings of this study are based on the analysis of data reflecting a self-analysis by the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions instead of analysis by administrative superordinates or subordinates.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

The study of leadership in student affairs is an extension of the current study of leadership in all aspects of group management. To be able to understand the effect of leadership among student affairs administrators, a knowledge of what has been learned about leadership is essential. The purpose of this chapter is to present the research and literature related to the present study.

Leadership may well be the most written about and discussed aspect of organization and management. Interest in the subject of leading others has existed throughout the history of human groups and organizations; but it has been in the past thirty years that most scientifically analyzed studies in leadership have occurred. Man has always been intrigued with the nature of leadership and the impact of leaders such as Moses, Alexander, Napoleon, Washington, Eisenhower, and others. The impact of such leaders has been dramatically demonstrated over and over again throughout history. Writing on the subject has been found at least as far back as the early Greeks. Hardin observes that Plato in his Republic defines three types of leaders: "philosopher-statesman," "military commander," and "businessman" (25, p. 299).
Most of the research on leadership has been conducted in the United States with a few significant studies in other English-speaking countries. This is due primarily to the political and social heritage of this country and to the rapid industrialization and growth of bureaucratic organizations. The behaviorist school of management theory has added the main thrust to this area of research in recent years.

As an outgrowth of the number of studies on leadership, a number of summations of these studies have been completed. One of the earliest of these, and a classic in the field, was undertaken by Stogdill through a grant by the Office of Naval Research in 1948 (48). In this study, surveying the literature from 1904 to 1948, Stogdill divided the methods of identification and study of the characteristics of leaders as the following: (1) observations of behavior in group situations, (2) choice of associates (voting), (3) nomination of rating by qualified observers, (4) selection (or rating or testing) of persons occupying positions of leadership, and (5) analysis of biographical and case history data (48, p. 35). Others who have made compilation studies of research in leadership are Gibb (19) and Stogdill again in 1974 (49).

The major themes of the study of leadership have been traced using various combination of categories. This historical summary will use the four categories suggested by Cunningham and Gephart: (1) "Great Man" approach,
(2) Trait approach, (3) Situational approach, and (4) the Behavioral approach (9, p. 2).

Great Man Approach

Much of the early literature on leadership was characterized by analyses of the lives of great men. An old adage stated "Leaders are born, not made." This view suggested certain inherent abilities or personality characteristics, or both, which were passed from one generation to the next by biological genes. Such a belief initiated from the ancient feudal systems of kings and royalty. Cunningham and Gephart summarize the viewpoint of this area as feeling that nature is more important than nurture and that instinct is more important than training (9, p. 2). Although assuming this, the writers believed that leadership could be learned from the lives of these great men; therefore, they documented and analyzed their lives. Gustavson (22) emphasizes the importance of this theory in his writings about leadership. The concept was that there was something about the personality and makeup of these men that enabled them to have a significant effect on the course of human events. The debate over the "Great Man" theory led to the so-called "trait" approach to the study of leadership.

Trait Approach

The trait approach assumed that leadership effectiveness could be explained by isolating psychological and physical
characteristics which were presumed to differentiate the leader from the other members of his group. If the leader is endowed with superior qualities that make him tower over his followers, it should be possible to identify these qualities. The earliest trait theories believed that such characteristics were inherited. This belief was eventually modified and expanded to include the idea that traits could also be acquired through the learning process and experience. Leaders were assumed to possess similar personalities, physical traits, and psychological characteristics. The lists of traits included such things as size, energy, intelligence, morality, friendliness, wisdom, imagination, and courage. It was felt that once the traits that constituted the one best leadership style were established, leader selection could be reduced to finding people with the proper physical, intellectual, and personality traits. Also, leadership training would consist of an attempt to develop those traits in potential leaders. This observation appeared logical, but has not worked out well in practice.

The first problem had to do with the number of qualities that are proposed as essential for leadership. In relation to this, Cribbin states that the lists varied from about five to twenty or more with the impression that the lists told more about the enumerators than about the characteristics of leadership (8, p. 29). Factor analysis has also shown that many traits listed are merely variation of a common dimension.
Cribbin cites one investigation as indicating more than 17,000 one-word descriptions of leadership qualities are found in the literature (8, p. 29). He also reports that in 106 studies of leadership characteristics, only five percent of the traits appeared in four or more of the studies (8, p. 29).

Summaries of research into the trait theory were written by Goode (21) and Stogdill (48). These reviews of the literature indicated that no consistent pattern of traits could be found. Certain traits that seemed to be primary ingredients of success in some situations were of limited importance to others. Cunningham and Gephart report that some of these lists even included contradictory traits—kind but firm, pensive but active, steady but flexible, forceful but cooperative (9, p. 2). In his summation of leadership studies, Stogdill reports finding contradictory conclusions such as in physical characteristics. He found nine studies concluding that leaders were taller than followers, two in which they were shorter, and two which found no significant difference with correlations between height and leadership ranging from -.13 to .71 (49, p. 40). However, in his 1948 summary he states that leaders in fifteen or more studies exceeded the average member of his group in intelligence, scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibilities, activity and social participation, and socio-economic status (48, p. 62). His conclusion was that a person does not
become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers (48, p. 64).

Other problems were also noted in addition to the fact that no two lists of essential traits were identical. Sikula reports concerns with the number of such traits needed, the relative degree of possession or importance, the current ability versus future potential factor (46, p. 119). Sisk found a number of shortcomings in the trait approach as a means of analyzing and understanding leadership. Among these shortcomings were that trait studies did not assign weightings to the traits so that the relative importance of such traits to leadership could be determined, considerable overlap or conflicts occur among the various traits, traits make no differentiation between those traits of value in acquiring leadership positions and those traits necessary to hold or maintain leadership, and the trait approach to leadership ignores situational factors in the environment that influence the effectiveness of leadership (47, p. 397).

These and other considerations lead behavioral researchers to conclude that the trait approach to leadership could at best be only a partial explanation of the total leadership phenomenon. Apparently, other situational factors in addition to character traits have some bearing on the
explanation of leadership behavior. The best conclusion from the studies would be that those who possess certain basic traits have a higher probability of becoming successful leaders than those without them. In his research study Ghiselli (18) reports on several personality factors that are related to most, though not all, cases of effective leadership. He states the following as being very important leadership traits: (1) supervisory ability, (2) intelligence, (3) self-actualization, (4) self-assurance, and (5) decisiveness (18, p. 632).

Davis adds that measurement of a trait usually occurs after a person becomes a leader, and does not necessarily prove a cause and effect relationship. Davis mentions four traits which he considers to be related to successful organization leadership. First, he states that leaders have higher intelligence than the average of their followers. The second trait, social maturity and breadth, indicates that leaders have broad interests and activities, emotional maturity and a high frustration tolerance. Inner motivation and achievement drives is the third trait given, indicating a strong personal motivation to continue accomplishing something. The last trait, human relations attitudes, is the realization that they get their job done through people and therefore try to develop social understanding and appropriate skills. This dissatisfaction with finding the answer to understanding leadership behavior through the trait approach led to the situational approach to leadership.
Situational Approach

As the trait approach declined in popularity, the emphasis swung away from the leader as an entity complete into himself and the situationist approach came to the fore. The situationist did not completely abandon the search for significant leader characteristics, but he attempted to look for them in situations containing common elements. The evidence suggested that leadership is a relationship that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not be in other situations.

In the late 1940's, various theories were introduced that attempted to identify these situational factors. Although such theories often varied in terminology, a central core of variables became prevalent.

Sikula identifies these variables as (1) traits of the leader, (2) characteristics of the followers, (3) characteristics of the task, (4) characteristics of the organization, and (5) characteristics of the external environment (46, p. 122). Leadership is considered as an output of all five of these input variables. Sikula sees leadership behavior as a system comprised of many interrelated, dynamic, overlapping, and constantly changing variables that individually can not explain leadership ability, but when pictured collectively can account for many factors comprising the leadership phenomenon. Because factors and circumstances change frequently, leadership must be approached by a systems
methodology incorporating the many variables existing in an environment.

One behavioral scientist who has contributed much to this area of leadership research is Fiedler. He developed a contingency theory of leadership. Three important situational factors, or dimensions, are specified and are assumed to influence the leader's effectiveness, namely: leader-member relations, task-structure, and position power (14, p. 85). Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevish report that Fiedler measured leadership style by evaluating leader responses to the Least-Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) questionnaire. The leaders who rated their least-preferred co-worker in favorable terms (high LPC) were assumed to be people-oriented and supportive. Those leaders who gave low LPC ratings were considered more task-oriented (11, p. 267).

By utilizing the three dimension model, Fiedler specified the type of leadership style that is more appropriate in different situations. The LPC measure of leadership style is assumed to discriminate between leaders who tend to be permissive, considerate, and foster good interpersonal relations among group members and leaders who tend to be directive, controlling, and more oriented to task than toward people. The model suggested that leaders who direct and leaders who are permissive can function best in certain types of situations. However, instead of stating that a leader must adopt a certain style, Fiedler identified the
type of leader who functions best in a situation and then suggested that leaders be placed in favorable situations. For this he defined eight conditions and by matching the three leadership dimensions, he structured the best style of leadership for each of the conditions (11, p. 267).

Another situational theory is the Path-Goal theory of House (32). This theory proposed that the leader is a key individual in bringing about improved subordinant motivation, satisfaction and performance. The important key in this theory is the way the leader affect the "paths" between subordinate behavior and goals by (1) recognizing the stimulating subordinantes' needs for rewards, (2) rewarding goal achievement, (3) supporting subordinates' effort to achieve goals, (4) helping reduce frustrating barriers in the way of achieving goals, and (5) increasing the opportunity for personal satisfaction for subordinates (32, p. 322). A third situational leadership model is the Vroom-Yetton model. This model attempted to identify the appropriate leadership style for a given circumstance or situation. The leadership styles, from I to IV, are defined in terms of the extent to which the subordinates participate in decisionmaking (11, p. 271).

Another situational model is that of Hersey and Blanchard (28). Hersey and Blanchard believe that a leader must be able to diagnosis his own leader behavior in light of his environment. In their Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership, they
take into account the level of maturity of one's followers in determining the appropriate leadership style. According to the theory, as the level of maturity of one's followers continue to increase, appropriate leader behavior not only required decreasing structure (task) while increasing consideration, but eventually it should entail decreases in socio-emotional support (relationships) (30, p. 333). An instrument, LEAD-Self, was developed by the authors to measure leader style, range, adaptability, and effectiveness. Their effectiveness dimension is similar to that of Reddin in his 3-D model of Leadership (44).

Sergiovanni (45) agrees with Hersey and Blanchard and Reddin in their concept of style matching, but states that maturity is not the only, and frequently not the most important, consideration. He listed other areas of consideration such as role expectations of followers, peers, and superordinates; personality characteristics (other than maturity) of leaders and followers; time constraints of achieving objectives, political considerations; and interpersonal tension within the group (45, p. 393).

In another concept, Sisk, in his "Theory Z" leadership model, stresses the belief that organizational effectiveness is dependent upon recognizing and adapting to many variable and interdependent situational factors. He gives six interacting, situational variables as factors that determine the appropriateness of any given organizational structure or process. These factors are size of organization, degree of
interaction, personality of members, congruence of goals, level of decision making and the state of the system (36, p. 257).

These propositions from the framework of Theory Z, a systems approach to the study of organizations. Sisk states that as size increases, organizational structure becomes more formal and complex, leading to an authoritarian structure. In an organization, as the need for interaction increases in order to accomplish prescribed work, the organizational structure should become more participative and informal. He believes that participative processes and a less formal structure are appropriate when member and organizational goals are congruent. He states further that when decision-making functions are retained within a workgroup, participative processes and informal structure are effective. However, when the performance of an organization is poor in achieving goals, authoritative processes of motivation and structure may be necessary. The parameters of Sisk's theory function as a system and a change in value in one factor modifies the significance of the remaining five variables (46, p. 257).

Behavior Approach

The most recent approach to the study of leadership is that of the analysis of leadership behavior that recognizes that both psychological and sociological factors, both individual and situational factors, are powerful behavioral determinants.
The behavioral approach focused upon the observed behavior of the leader-in-situation. The assumption was not necessarily made that leadership behavior exhibited in a given situation would transfer to other situations; instead, this became a variable for investigation. Research procedures utilized have been rating scales, interviews, and observations to assess individual, group, and organizational variables believed to be related to leadership behavior. Utilizing the behavioral approach to the study of leadership, the Ohio State University Personnel Research Board initially isolated two dimensions, "initiating structure" and "consideration," as significant dimensions for describing leader behavior (46). These dimensions were delineated from a factor analysis of data obtained by use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which assesses the behavior of leaders in social systems. A significant majority of the studies of leadership behavior in the field of education have used the LBDQ (9, p. 4). Several studies and experiments attest to the viability of the LBDQ subscales for assessing leadership behavior (48).

The behavior approach to the study of leadership also served as the basis for much of the work at the Midwest Administrative Center of the University of Chicago where three distinctive behavior styles were identified. The three styles were normative (nomothetic), personal (ideographic),
and transactional (9, p. 5). The normative style places emphasis on the normative dimension of behavior and on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectations. The personal style places emphasis on the personal dimension of behavior and on the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need disposition. The transactional style calls attention to the need for moving toward the normative style under one set of circumstances and toward the personal style under another set of circumstances (9, p. 5).

Studies which have utilized the behavioral approach have contributed greatly to an understanding of the nature of leadership. From research based on the behavioral approach, Cunningham and Gephart (9) believe that the leader-follower relationship represents a delicate mix of personal and situational variables. These personal and situational variables do not operate singly but in discernable patterns and combinations which may be misperceived by either the leader of the followers. They feel that the degree or extent of misperception is meaningfully and systematically related to a variety of organizational, group, or individual variables (9, p. 5). The rationale for behavioral studies of leadership differs from the situational approach in a number of important ways. Henley (27) presents three major differences between the behavioral and situational approaches. He says that the behavioral approach focuses upon observed behavior rather than upon a capacity for leadership that
may be inferred from this behavior, does not assume that the leader behavior exhibited by a leader in one group situation will carry over into other group situations, and does not think that leader behavior is determined either innately or situationally (27, p. 143).

Thus, the behavioral approach suggests that both role variables and psychological variables may be important in the generation of observed leader behavior in organizational settings. In essence, the behavioral approach to leadership has tended to focus upon the search for significant behavioral dimensions to be used in describing and delineating leader behavior. Situational approaches, on the other hand, have focused on those relationships and variables in social and environmental situations that appear to generate leader behavior.

Leadership Styles

As has been noted, there are a number of methods of analyzing leadership. Attempts to better understand the nature of leadership over the last two decades have frequently stressed the importance of leadership style. This approach to understanding leadership concentrates on how the leader directs others—his style. Leadership style is defined as a pattern of behavior designed to integrate organizational and personal interests and efforts in pursuit of some objective (16, p. 311). Writers have attempted to construct descriptive terminology for various
types of leaders. In fact, Cribbin (8) entitled a chapter in his book "Fifty-seven Varieties of Leaders." Terms like "democratic," "impoverished," "task-oriented," "free-rein," "exploitative," "autocratic," "missionary," and "country-club" fill the literature. Each of these is an attempt by writers to describe the leader's behavior in relationship to the organization, the group, or the individual.

The earliest use of the "style" to describe a characteristic manner of behavior was reported by Boles and Davenport to be Weber, who categorized styles as "traditional," "bureaucratic," and "charismatic" (6, p. 234). They state that Weber's assumption apparently is that style is a personality characteristic rooted in the leader's perception as to the source of his authority. The traditional style was described as autocratic and the charismatic was considered to have a mystic quality that did not seem to accord with Weber's personal views of what "should be." He seems to have preferred the bureaucratic style (6, p. 234).

The most traditional patterns for dealing with leadership style have been to describe a demonstrative behavior as being authoritarian, democratic, or laissez-faire. These terms were first used by Lippett and White (35). The authoritarian, or autocratic, leader is one who makes decisions, giving orders without consulting others. The authoritarian leader centralizes power and decision-making in himself, and he structures the complete work situation for his employees.
The employees do what they are told. The leader takes full authority and assumes full responsibility (10, p. 105). This type of leadership provides strong motivation, and it also permits quick decision making because one person decides for the group. Cunningham and Gephart state that the main disadvantage of the authoritarian style is that people do not like it, but it does have its place in the design of management (10, p. 105).

The democratic leader decentralizes power and encourages his subordinates to be cooperative in using their own initiative in handling the details of their jobs. The leader assumes subordinates want to do their best, and he makes it easy for them by supporting them rather than commanding them. This style is also referred to as participative because such a leader participates with his subordinates concerning decisions that will affect them (10, p. 105).

The laissez-faire leader adopts a "hands-off" attitude and helps only when asked. This style of leadership is recommended when the group is composed of individuals competent to perform independently or when experience has shown that the group functions more effectively when authority is applied sparingly (12, p. 61).

A number of studies indicate that the democratic style of leadership is best in most situations. Lippett and White (35) reach the conclusion in their study that nineteen out
of twenty prefer the democratic leader, and more dissatisfaction is expressed in autocratic than in democratic. They found that in democratic groups there was a greater "we" feeling, more frequent mutual praise and more readiness to share group property than in the other patterns of leadership (35, p. 535). Several conclusions of their experiment indicate that the poorest situation is laissez-faire in terms of productivity and member satisfaction. They believe that although less work is accomplished in the democratic situation than in the autocratic, the greater originality, interest, and cooperation give the democratic leadership style the best overall performance (35, p. 537).

In deciding which of the three leadership styles to use, it should be remembered that no supervisor uses any of them all of the time (12, p. 63). The environment in which an organization operates will usually define the kind of leadership style which is appropriate (39, p. 25).

Building from the autocratic-democratic dichotomy, Tannenbaum and Schmidt (5) postulates a leadership continuum which implies that leaders should not choose a strict "autocratic" or "democratic" style but should be flexible enough to cope with different situations. Leadership actions are related to the degree of authority used by the managers and to the amount of freedom available to the subordinates in reaching decisions (50, p. 259).
Others have also expanded on the concept of naming particular leader behavior styles. Miller (3) gives seven personal leadership models: paternalistic authoritarian, intuitive rationalistic, charismatic, managerial, pragmatic functional, political legalistic, and personalistic (intuitive) humanistic. In an additional concept, which involved non-extremist approaches, Miller (37) adds "middle of the road" styles designated as organismic (the whole individual or organization), the gestaltist (the field theory approach), creative (innovative, new ideas, not status quo) and scientific (ones who use a set process of decision making) (37, p. 120). The rationale for this is that no one in the field of education is completely at one of the extremes of the democratic, autocratic, or laissez-faire styles.

Reddin adds another typology of leadership styles in his eight "3-D" styles (44). Stating that a style may be effective or ineffective depending on the situation, he suggests eight styles as follows: (ineffective) deserter, missionary, autocrat, and compromiser; (effective) bureaucrat, developer, benevolent autocrat, and executive (44, p. 13).

Beginning with the Ohio State University leadership studies in 1945, most of the research on leadership has identified two dimensions of leader behavior (49). These two dimensions were identified as "initiating structure" and "consideration." Initiating structure refers to "the leader behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to
establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedures" (24, p. 4).

Consideration refers to "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff" (24, p. 4). These were seen by the Ohip State staff as separate and distinct dimensions. A strong inclination on one dimension did not necessitate a low score on the other. The behavior of a leader could be described as any mix of both dimensions (29, p. 95). The suggestion was made that the individual differences in leadership performance could be explained by positing these two variables (114, p. 10). Thus, it was during these studies that leader behavior was first plotted on two separate axes rather than on a single continuum. Four quadrants were developed to show various combinations of initiating structure and consideration. Others have used different terminology to designate the same basic dimensions: relationship behavior-task behavior (29), concern for people-concern for production (4).

Both the situational and behavioral theorists center upon the identification of leadership styles. In situational frameworks, the theorists emphasize that the characteristics of each situation will dictate the style that is most fitting. Concentration is upon ways situations can be classified, and there is no single best style advocated for all situations.
Examples of this category are the frameworks of Lewin, Ohio State University, Redding, and Fiedler. The behaviorists, on the other hand, depict an array of available styles, but ultimately recommend one particular style as best for all situations. In this category, the schemes are similar in design to those of the first classification, but a particular style is selected as most appropriate. Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid and Likert's continuum are examples of this second classification.

Within the behaviorist framework, the Managerial Grid of Blake and Mouton is one of the most widely known style schemes. According to Blake and Mouton, a person's style of leadership is a product of his personality, the organization, the specific day-to-day situation, the person's values, and change (4, p. 13-14).

The two dimensions of the grid are labeled "concern for people" and "concern for production". The grid is a 9 x 9 checkerboard on which a score of one indicates low concern and a score of nine shows high concern on a continuum. On this basis, five basic styles of managerial behavior have been identified as country club manager 1/9 (concern for people instead of production in organization), production pusher 9/1 (more concern for production in their relationships), organization man 5/5 (balancing people and production), do-nothing manager 1/1 (minimum effort by
leaders for people and production), and team builder 9/9 (high people concern and high production from committed people) (3, p. 24).

In the philosophy of Blake and Mouton, only the 9/9 position of maximum concern for both output and people is a desired style of leadership. This philosophy is consistent with the models of man developed by McGregor, Argyris, and Hersberg, as they hypothesized that there should be little fundamental conflict between a well-managed organization and a well-adjusted mature human being (16, p. 319). The 9/9-oriented leader views his responsibility as seeing that planning, directing, and controlling are accomplished soundly.

Blake and Mouton explained that the 9/9 oriented leadership style is characterized by informal free choice, shared participation in problem-solving and decision-making, mutual trust and respect, open communication, activities carried out within a framework of goals and objectives, and responsibility for one's own actions (5, p. 96). The developers of this concept of leadership style stated that to hold the premise that the most effective leadership style "depends upon the situation at any given time," one would have to reject these basic propositions (3, p. 28). They equate their concept with the basic principles that have been discovered by behavioral science.

Using various assessment instruments developed around the Managerial Grid concept, a person is able to locate his
own leadership style and at least one backup style. Blake and Mouton state that "once this is known, one's leadership style can be changed by learning what assumptions are held about people and behavior and acted upon when working with and through others, and what alternative assumptions provide more effective results" (3, p. 24). The authors emphasize that they are measuring the "degree" of "concern for," not "how much" or the amount of actual production or actual behavior toward people (5, p. 9). The degree of concern one has for each area decides the way one will act and flows out of his basic attitudes.

Blake and Mouton do not think of their five "pure" positions or any of the eighty-one possible mixtures as being a set of personality characteristics. Rather, they see them as positions constituting "anchorages for managerial attitudes and practices" (4, p. 12). In comparison to the mechanical explanation of managerial behavior, the grid pictures a number of different sets of assumptions about how a leader "can" lead. Any set of assumptions is subject to change. The style for any given person in any given situation is influenced by the organization, the situation, one's values, one's personality, and change (5, p. 13). When a person changes his underlying leadership assumptions, his actual leadership practices shift accordingly. A given individual's style is viewed as a dominant set of assumptions (4, p. 13). Blake and Mouton believe the purpose of leadership training is to
aid an individual to become more knowledgeable regarding his own assumptions about how to lead and learn how to modify his leadership more toward the 9/9 (Team) style.

An important dilemma faces leaders today. This dilemma is whether to adopt a flexible approach to leadership as advocated by the situationists or to implement a "one-best-way" approach such as that of Blake and Mouton.

As indicated earlier, most of these leadership studies were based on business settings. However, there are significant exceptions to this. Halpin (24) made a study of school superintendents in 1956 using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire developed by Ohio State University. Bartkey (1) also made a study in 1956 focusing on administration as educational leadership. Evenson (13) replicated Halpin's study with a group of high school principals in 1959. Luckie (36) did essentially the same study to establish the existence of leader behavior studies at the college level. All of these studies reinforced Halpin's conclusions that leaders scoring above the mean in both dimensions of the quadrants were perceived to be the ones with the most desired leadership behavior (22, p. 148).

Firth (15) reports of his examination of the literature on leadership in educational administration from January, 1968 through September, 1975. Over six hundred citations were found concerning leadership using ERIC, Psychological Abstracts.
Sociological Abstracts, and Dissertation Abstracts, International. Most of the research centered on administration, curriculum, instruction, and supervision, with forty percent on administration (15, p. 329). The doctoral dissertations in education during this period showed a trend away from the traits of the leader toward a broader view of leadership (15, p. 329). Brown (7), in studying twenty-eight public colleges and universities in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, found a strong preference for and satisfaction with a subordinate-centered leadership style by professors for their department heads and division chairpersons. Paschall (42), in studying the lower-level officers in institutions holding membership in the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities, found that the most popular leadership style was democratic among the chief officers in the institutions in the study and that the lower-level officers tended to adopt similar leadership styles. Hyatt (33) made a study of management and leadership in Ohio higher education in 1968. He reports a significant difference between the self-perceived and the other-perceived management style but no significant difference between management style and administrative success.

Gladstein made a study of doctoral research in student personnel services in 1966. In his study, covering 589 dissertations, Gladstein found that the most frequently researched areas were a survey of services, counseling, proposed organization, and evaluation. No listing was given in this
study of leadership styles or behavior as such, but student personnel worker characteristics were included. He concludes that research in student personnel services is far from adequate in all areas (20, p. 25).

Harway (26) compared the perception of student personnel officers with other administrative officers in twenty-three colleges which were funded by the Exxon Education Foundation in 1975. Using an interview format, Harway found that fifty-nine percent of the student personnel officers described their leadership style as open and assessible as compared to forty-nine percent of the fiscal and academic administrators. Eighteen percent of the student personnel officers described themselves as democratic, as against thirty-nine percent of the fiscal and academic officers. In contrast, eleven percent of the fiscal and academic officers referred to themselves as more authoritarian than democratic (26, p. 261).

Franz (17) found student personnel administrators sensitive to personal, humanistic, and social influences and least sensitive to materialistic, abstract, and analytical influences. Moore and Fredrickson (40) advocate using the situational approach to leadership for counselors. Parker (41) made a study of the leadership behavior of deans and directors of student development/student personnel services in Texas community colleges. He found that high priority was placed on collaborative-interactive type behaviors and low priority on administrative-related behaviors.
The examination of the research on leadership has not located any studies of the leadership style of student affairs administrators in church-related institutions in general. LaBelle's (34) study of the leadership patterns of the administrators in six Christian Brothers colleges in 1969 focused on leadership characteristics that affected learning climate rather than leadership styles. LaBelle found that leadership characteristics did have an influence on the learning climate of an institution. He also found that the academic deans were the most effective leaders among the administrators on the six campuses that were included in his study. As one factor in his study, Paschall (42) found that there was no differences between the leadership style of administrators in public or church-related colleges.

The same lack of research on leadership is true of Southern Baptist colleges and universities. A number of studies were found concerning student affairs areas but these dealt with describing functions and services either in existence on these campuses (2) (38) (43) or in describing an optimal program for student affairs (31).

A list of research studies completed using the Styles of Leadership Survey was obtained from Teleometrics, International. Of the six studies reported, none dealt with higher education or student services. The company reports that their normative data indicates that leadership style is affected by the number
of people supervised, the age of the leader, the level of the leader within the company, and the occupational type (51).

Summary

Historically, leadership has been one of the most researched areas of management. Especially has this been true in the past three or four decades in the behavioral school of management and the increase in organizational complexity. The study of leadership has gone through four different periods of study: the "Great Man" approach, the Trait approach, the Situational approach, and the Behavioral approach.

One of the major methods of studying leadership has been to study how the leader directs others — his style. Style has been studied in three different ways: polarized positions, a continuum, and as mutually exclusive dimensions on a grid concept. Using various terminology, "task" and "relationship" have been isolated as the two dimensions of leadership behavior. The leadership style designates have been thought of as either flexible or unitary. The flexible, or situational leadership style, revolves around the concept that different situations require different leadership behaviors. The unitary concept states that administrators usually adopt one basic style to meet all of the various needs of the organization.

In searching the literature, research has been found concerning leadership in the student affairs domain of institutions of higher education. However, few of these studies
have dealt with the leadership style of the administrator in the student affairs area. The study of the leadership styles of the chief student affairs administrator in church-related institutions had not been isolated in any of the studies which were found in the literature.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


24. Halpin, Andrew W., The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, Columbus, Ohio, College of Education, Ohio State University, 1956.


CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter is concerned with procedures centered around the collection of data pertaining to this study. It is divided into six areas related to the subjects of the population of the study, the procedures for the collection of data, the survey instrument, the questionnaire, the research design, and the procedures for the analysis of the data.

Population of the Study

The chief student affairs administrators of the forty-six colleges and universities affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention comprised the population for the study. These institutions are located throughout the southern states, Arizona, and California. The institutions range in size from Baylor University (9,500 students) in Waco, Texas to Blue Mountain College (300 students) in Blue Mountain, Mississippi. They are located in a cross section of southern cities (Houston, Texas; Birmingham, Alabama), towns (Rome, Georgia; Jackson, Mississippi) and rural communities (Blue Mountain, Mississippi; Suisa Creek, North Carolina). Baylor is the only large university among the institutions. The others vary from medium-sized universities offering diverse programs to small, liberal arts colleges. The majority of
the students in these institutions are from regional, southern, Baptist families with only small percentages of out-of-state, foreign, or minority-group representation. Most faculty and staff are Baptist-oriented and most of the institutions are supported financially by the Southern Baptist Convention and by the state Baptist conventions with which they are affiliated.

Procedures for the Collection of Data

A survey instrument, Styles of Leadership Survey, and a demographic questionnaire were sent to the chief student affairs administrator of each of the forty-six Southern Baptist colleges and universities on June 10, 1979. A letter (Appendix A), asking for their participation in the study and explaining the procedures to be followed, accompanies the instrument and questionnaire. A cover letter (Appendix B) from Dr. Arthur Walker, Jr., Executive Director of the Education Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, was sent along with the other materials as an introduction and as an encouragement to their participation in the study.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope was provided for each administrator. These envelopes were mailed along with the instruments for convenience and time-saving purposes. A request was made through the introductory letter to return both the survey instrument and the questionnaire in the envelope. Confidentiality was assured.

In order to facilitate follow-up procedures, a cover sheet (Appendix C) was stapled to the questionnaire with the
administrator's name, institution, address, and a question asking if the respondent would like to receive a copy of the abstract of the study. The survey instrument and the questionnaire had matching numbers coded on them. After recording the names of the ones desiring a copy of the abstract and recording the receipt of a response from the institution, the cover sheet was removed. The coded numbers of the survey instrument and the questionnaire kept an institution's responses matching and they were then identified only as being in one of the three subgroups of the study.

A minimum of seventy-five percent return of the survey instruments and questionnaires was required for the study. As only twenty-one (45.0 percent) of the administrators responded to the first request, a follow-up letter (Appendix D) was sent on July 12, 1979, to each administrator who had not responded to the first letter. Four additional responses were obtained from this second request. As the required level of response still had not been reached, the remaining administrators were contacted by telephone on July 24, 1979. In some cases, because of vacations and other reasons for being out of the office, the secretary of the administrator was the person contacted instead of the chief student affairs administrator. From the results of these telephone calls, the required percentage of returns was reached on August 16, 1979. The number of institutions included in the study was thirty-nine (84.7 percent) of the original forty-six institutions.
Of these thirty-nine returns received, only thirty-six (78.3 percent) were usable for the statistical analyses. The officers from two of the institutions indicated only the most and least characteristic responses instead of all five responses. Another administrator did not return the *Styles of Leadership Survey* with his questionnaire. The data on the questionnaire for these three returns were used only in the descriptive analyses. The participating institutions are listed in Appendix E.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in the study was the *Styles of Leadership Survey* (Appendix P) developed by Jay Hall and Martha S. Williams and published by Teleometrics, International of Woodlands, Texas. In a review of this instrument for *The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook*, Korman gave a negative evaluation of the instrument (3, p. 1163). Because of the developmental state of leadership analysis and instruments to assess leadership, all current instruments attempting to identify leadership style and leadership characteristics were given negative reviews in both *The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook* and *Tests in Print II*.

The *Styles of Leadership Survey*, or its companion form, *Management Style Inventory*, has been used in one book, two professional journal articles, and five doctoral dissertations according to the list in *The Eighth Mental Measurement Yearbook* (3, p. 1163). Telemetrics, International indicated that
the instrument had been used in six other research studies, including one doctoral dissertation, four master's theses, and one professional article (8). The company stated that the current sample for their normative profile for the Styles of Leadership Survey included 2,844 leaders from educational, civic, business, industrial, governmental, and service organizations. The average number of followers supervised by these individuals was thirty-four with a range from four to 403. The average age of those comprising the sample was 37.7 years and ranged from seventeen to sixty-nine. Their study has shown that leadership style is affected by the number of people supervised, age of the leader, rank of the leader, occupational type, and organizational type (8). The company stated that the instrument met their need for diagnostic feedback for growth and development purposes in their leadership training.

Accepting Korman's appraisal of the instrument, the Styles of Leadership Survey was selected as it met the purpose of this study better than any instrument available at the present time. The authors of the instrument stated that the data are "but a general index of how you perceive yourself within the limits imposed by the leadership grid test format" (4, p. 4). Assuming this limitation, for use as a general indicator of leadership style within this framework, the instrument was chosen as the basis for the analysis of the leadership styles of the population of this study.
In the Styles of Leadership Survey, based on the two dimensional grid concept of Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, the administrator is asked to respond to a series of twelve questions concerning the behavior of individuals as they function as leaders of groups or organizations. A variety of situations and dimensions common to groups are included in the questions. They are four major categories of questions: Philosophy of Leadership, Planning and Goal Setting, Implementation, and Performance Evaluation. Each major category is represented by three situations. Five alternative patterns of individual behavior or attitudes are supplied as possible responses to each situation. From each of the five alternatives, the respondent rank orders the possible answers and then weighs them on a scale from completely characteristic (10) to completely uncharacteristic (1).

As a result of this procedure, a position on the grid is located corresponding to the extreme points on the grid quadrants plus the mid-point on the grid. These styles (9/9; 9/1; 1/9; 1/1; 5/5) correspond to the description of styles from Blake and Mouton (1, p. 10).

Questionnaire

A questionnaire (Appendix G) was sent along with the survey instrument to collect demographic information from each chief student affairs administrator. The questionnaire
asked for both general information questions and specific data to be categorized for analysis. In addition to the demographic information, the respondent was asked to make a self-determined style ranking from a list of statements describing Blake and Mouton's five basic leadership style positions. This request for information followed the usual format of questionnaires developed for demographic information.

Research Design

The entire population of the chief student affairs administrators of Southern Baptist colleges and universities were the subjects of the study. These administrators were divided into three groups for analysis purposes. The groups were divided basically according to the major divisions of Dr. Earl J. McGrath's Study of Southern Baptist Colleges and Universities, 1976-77 (6). The institutions for McGrath's study were clustered in accordance with the Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education.

Group I of the present study included twelve responding institutions. Eleven of these were designated as Comprehensive Universities I and II in the McGrath study. The University of Richmond, which did not participate in the McGrath study, was the twelfth institution in this group.

Group II, fifteen responding institutions, was composed of the Liberal Arts II institutions from the McGrath study with enrollments of over 1,000 and Campbell University
which was not in the McGrath research. The third group was comprised of the remainder of the Liberal Arts II institutions which had enrollments of fewer than 1,000 regularly enrolled students for the fall semester of 1977-78. Twelve institutions made up Group III, including Missouri Baptist College, which was not in the McGrath study. The division of the Liberal Arts II group into two segments according to size was made for the purpose of analysis.

Each chief student affairs administrator was asked to complete the questionnaire and to respond to the twelve questions on the Styles of Leadership Survey. The items concerning demographic data were tabulated, grouped and placed in tables, or reported in narrative form. Statistics of central tendency were made when appropriate.

The raw score data (Appendix H) from the survey instrument were used in most of the analyses. A raw score was the score obtained by totaling the one to ten weighted responses to the twelve questions in each leadership style. T-Scores (Appendix I) were used in the analysis of research question thirteen. T-Scores were derived scores from the raw scores having a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten (4, p. 5). As outlined in the procedures, five different scores were obtained from the instrument, indicating the strength of concern for the five different styles of leadership being measured by the instrument. The data for analysis
were transferred to key punch worksheets, on to cards, and processed by means of computer at the North Texas State University Computer Center.

Procedures for the Analysis of Data

Each of the hypotheses to be analyzed was stated in a null hypothesis form for testing. The 0.05 level of significance was taken as the critical value. Results significant at the 0.05 level of significance and beyond were interpreted as being statistically significant. The data were treated as continuous and interval level in all hypotheses except one, two, and three (7, pp. 13-18). Hypothesis one yielded nominal level data and hypotheses two and three yielded ordinal level data (7, pp. 15-16).

The first hypothesis was analyzed by use of the chi-square test of goodness of fit (\(X^2\)). Although recognizing the lack of power of this technique in comparison to other statistical methods, this statistic was used because the Styles of Leadership Survey yielded a score for each of the five "pure" styles of the Blake and Mouton "Management Grid" for each respondent. Using frequency counts, nominal level data, the first choice of leadership style was determined which gave a picture of the prevalent style needed for initial analysis of the data from the survey. Chi-square is the most common device for testing the significance of educational data when data are classified into categories (5, p. 55). The chi-square
technique was described by Borg and Gall as a nonparametric statistical test often used in casual-comparative studies, particularly when the data are in the form of frequency counts (2, p. 313). The technique can be used with either discrete or continuous data.

\[
X^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \frac{(O_j - E_j)^2}{E_j}
\]

(7, p. 249)

Following the chi-square test for goodness of fit analysis, which determined whether there was a significantly prevalent leadership style, other analyses were made of a more exacting nature.

The t-test was used to analyze hypotheses two, eleven, thirteen, and the extra hypothesis on the sex of the administrators because these involved only two groups in the analysis. Hillway states that the t-test is the appropriate statistic to use when the difference between two groups is tested for significance (5, p. 55).

\[
t = \frac{\bar{D}}{S_D} \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{D} = M_2 - M_1 \quad \text{and} \quad D = X_2 - X_1
\]

(7, p. 227)

In hypothesis two, the five categories of styles were rank-ordered from one to five according to frequency count for both the self-reported style and the style designation from the Styles of Leadership Survey. Then the rank of each style category was analyzed using the t-test. In hypothesis eleven, the t-test was used to determine whether there was
a significant difference in leadership style with regard to
whether the chief student affairs administrator was directly
responsible to the president or to a lower level officer.
The t-test was also used to analyze whether there was a
stronger people-orientation or purpose-orientation among these
administrators. The t-test analysis used the average rank
on the self-ranking statements from the questionnaire and the
average rank on the Styles of Leadership Survey for these two
styles.

On hypothesis three a comparison was made between the
"ideal ranking" of the leadership styles according to Blake
and Mouton and the actual ranking on the Styles of Leadership
Survey and on the self-ranking statements contained in the
questionnaire by the chief student affairs administrators in
these institutions. Blake and Mouton suggested that the
ideal ordering of the leadership styles according to effective-
ness is 9/9, 5/5, 9/1, 1/9, and 1/1 (1, p. 249). Using the
frequency counts of the data in hypothesis one, the five
categories were ranked from one to five according to the
frequency of choice. The Spearman Rho correlation coefficient
was used to analyze this hypothesis. Although most often
used to compare the relationship between pairs of rankings
for one individual or group, it can be used to obtain a measure
of the relationship of an individual or group to a standard
as long as it is not used for projection purposes in this
use.
Hypothesis four through ten and hypothesis twelve were analyzed with data treated as interval level through two statistical methods: one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test for all possible comparisons. An analysis of variance used the raw score data from each leadership style to determine whether any of the various groupings of administrators differed significantly from the others for each question. When the F-ratio was statistically significant, .05 level or stronger, a Scheffé test was completed to determine which group means differed significantly from one another.

One-way ANOVA  \[ F = \frac{MS_b}{MS_W} \]  \[ df = k-1, N-k \]  (7, p. 295)

Scheffé Test  \[ F = \frac{(M_1 - M_2)^2}{MS_W (1/n_1+1) (k-1)} \]  \[ df = k-1, N-k \]  (7, p. 313)

Descriptive statistics also were utilized to summarize the data called for on the demographic questionnaire. The questions were analyzed, described, and illustrated in both descriptive and analytical forms in order to give a comprehensive examination of the information on the subjects included in the study. The data were compiled and reported in the form of tables in order to facilitate their presentation and discussion.

Additional tests were made to examine the various relationships that evolved as the initial data were analyzed.
Another test was made after the initial data were analyzed. The t-test was used to analyze whether the sex of the administrators was a factor in determining the choice of leadership style. Within the hypotheses, additional calculations were made with various groupings from the original hypothesis by collapsing or expanding the groupings to make further study of the data.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the data for this study obtained from responses to a questionnaire and the Styles of Leadership Survey returned from thirty-nine (84.7 percent) of the chief student affairs administrators in the forty-six senior level Southern Baptist colleges and universities. The purpose of the current study was to describe and analyze the leadership style of these administrators both from a self-reported designation chosen from five descriptive statements of various leadership styles and from an instrument designed to identify leadership style based on Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid leadership designations. The analysis was designed to determine whether significant differences existed in the leadership style of these student affairs administrators with regard to various demographic and institutional variables. The data received are presented and analyzed from both the questionnaire and the hypotheses of the study as outlined in Chapter I. Results derived from the treatment of the data are presented in appropriate tables and discussed in the related narrative.

The returns from three of the thirty-nine institutions were not complete. The officers from two of the institutions
indicated only the most and least characteristic responses instead of all five responses. These returns were used only when first choice answers were used in the analysis. Another administrator returned only the questionnaire; therefore, this input was used only in describing the data from the questionnaire.

Data for Analysis

The raw data from the Styles of Leadership Survey is presented in Appendix H. The scores represent the total of the scale value numbers for the twelve questions of the survey instrument for each of the five leadership styles. The data from this table form the basis for the analysis of hypotheses four through nine and number twelve.

The T-Scores of the respondents which are derived from the raw score data are presented in Appendix I. The T-Scores have a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten (2, p. 6). The originators of the Styles of Leadership Survey explain that the T-Score transformation allows for the adjusting of the raw scores so that the relative standing of the raw scores can be compared. They state that the T-Scores reveal more about style preferences since the T-Score transformation controls for response bias which can not be detected in raw scores (2, p. 4). The T-Scores are used in the analysis for hypothesis thirteen.
Descriptive Analysis of Questionnaire

In the first inquiry on the questionnaire, the chief student affairs administrators were asked to give the official title of their positions on their campuses. Although not used in the statistical analysis, the data from this question gave a picture of the status of the student affairs domain within these institutions. The responses from this question were tabulated and are presented in Table I.

### TABLE I

OFFICIAL TITLES OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Title of the Chief Student Affairs Administrators</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Vice-President</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Pres. of Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Pres. for Student Develop.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Pres. for University Life</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Life</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of College Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Develop.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39

* I - Large, complex institutions
  II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
  III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000
The most prevalent title was Dean of Students, being listed by sixteen (41.0 percent) of the administrators. The second most common title was Vice-President of Student Affairs, indicated by nine of the institutional officers (23.2 percent). By dividing the three institutional groupings according to size and complexity, the title of Vice-President of Student Affairs was most common among the institutions in Group I (the larger, more complex institutions), with the Dean of Students being the most prevalent title with the two groups of smaller institutions.

Grouping the titles by vice-president and dean designations gave a further picture of these institutional officers. The title of vice-president was used by thirteen (33.3 percent) of the institutions. Six of the institutions in Group I used the designation of vice-president for the chief student affairs officer. Seven of the fifteen colleges in the second group used the title of vice-president. None of the colleges in Group III (institutions with enrollment under 1,000) used this designation for this official.

Twenty-three of the schools (59.0 percent) used the title of dean to designate this chief student affairs officer. Nine of the fifteen (60.0 percent) of the institutions in Group II and nine of twelve (75.0 percent) of the colleges in Group III used various titles of dean to designate this official.

The second inquiry of the questionnaire dealt with two personal characteristics, age and sex. The age division
characteristics of the administrator group is depicted in Table II.

TABLE II

THE AGE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of the Chief Student Affairs Administrator</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>( 5.1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(30.8 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(41.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(15.4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 &amp; Above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( 7.7 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39 12 15 12 39

* I - Large, complex institutions
II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000

The most common age bracket of these administrators was the 40-49 age group with sixteen (41.0 percent). The age bracket of 30-39 was indicated by twelve (30.8 percent) of these officers. A majority of the institutions in Group I had chief administrators in the 40-49 age range. The largest number of administrators in Group II were also in this same range. The smaller institutions, Group III, indicated fifty percent of their administrators as being in the 30-39 age bracket. No institution in Group I had an administrator below
age thirty and no school in Group II had an administrator over age sixty.

The chief student affairs administrators were asked on the questionnaire to designate whether they were male or female although not included in the thirteen hypotheses in this study. The responses to this inquiry are summarized in Table III.

**TABLE III**

THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES CATEGORIZED BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of the Chief Student Affairs Administrator</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31 (79.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 39

* I- Large, complex institutions  
  II- Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above  
  III- Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000

In all three groups there was a majority of males serving in this administrative capacity with a total of 79.4 percent males. The difference was less pronounced with seven males compared to five females in the institutions in Group III, the smaller of the institutions. There were eleven males and one female serving in the capacity of chief student affairs officer in the larger, more complex institutions. The ratio was thirteen males to two females in the institutions in Group II.
These officers were asked in the next question to state the institutional official to whom they were directly responsible. The responses to this inquiry are summarized in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER TO WHOM THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR IS DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly Responsible to:</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33 (84.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice-President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Pres. for Univ. Adm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39

* I - Large, complex institutions
   II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
   III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000

In all three groups of institutions, the chief student affairs officers reported almost exclusively to the president of the institution. The executive vice-president was the only other institutional officer indicated by more than one of the reporting institutions. The others indicated by these administrators were Dean of the College, Vice-President for University Administration, and Academic Dean.
The fourth question on the questionnaire related to the educational background of these administrators. The respondents were asked to give the degrees earned, the major for these degrees, and the institutions granting the degrees. These data are summarized in Table V.

**TABLE V**

THE EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Background Categories</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  II  III  Total (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Highest Degree Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. (includes D.A., J.D.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (20.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (35.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.Ed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.R.E./M.Div.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Major for Highest Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 (30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 (20.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling, Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion, Rel. Education, Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9 (23.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Affiliation of Institution for Highest Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (28.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25 (64.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Background Categories:</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Affiliation of Institution for any Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Baptist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private, church-related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39
* I - Large, complex institutions
  II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
  III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000
** Totals exceed thirty-nine because respondents attended other institutions before attending a seminary.

The most common degree held by the total group was the Doctor of Education degree. By dividing the institutions into the three groupings, the most prevalent degree was the Doctor of Education degree for administrators in Group I and II and the Master of Education degree for these officers in Group III. Seventy-five percent of the chief student affairs administrators in Group I held the doctor's degree in some field. In Group III, 33.3 percent of the officers held the doctor's degree. Twenty-five percent of the officers in Group III held a master's degree in religious-oriented areas.

In the major for the highest degree, educational administration was the most common major for the total group. This held true as the most common major for the officers in
Groups I and II with various academic areas being the most common major for the leaders in Group III. No administrator among the larger schools held a major in religion in contrast to twenty-five percent holding a major in religion in the smallest group. Fifty-eight percent of the administrators in Group III majored in religion or in an academic field. Eighty-three percent of the administrators in Group I majored in either administration, student services, or guidance areas. Seven, 46.7 percent, of the officers in Group II majored in Educational Administration.

In tabulating the data as to the affiliation of the institution granting the highest degree, it was found that 64.1 percent received this degree from a public institution. This majority held true in all three of the subgroups. Twenty-five percent of the leaders in Group III received their highest degree from a seminary. In contrast, none of these officers in Groups I and II received the highest degree from a seminary.

Another area of comparison was to observe the affiliation of the institutions these officials attended during their total educational process. Twenty-six (66.7 percent) of the thirty-nine administrators attended a Southern Baptist college or university at some point during their educational process. An additional six of these officers attended other church-related or private institutions, making a total of 82.3 percent attending a church-related institution. Thirteen
(33.3 percent) received a degree from a Baptist seminary in addition to the other institutions attended. Seven of the administrators did not attend a religious-oriented institution. The majority of each subgroup attended a Southern Baptist institution at some point in their education, including seventy-five percent of the administrators in Group I.

Question five dealt with the previous professional experience of these officers. The data are summarized in Table VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Experience</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>Total ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in Post-secondary Institutions</td>
<td>I  II  III</td>
<td>6 8 6 20** (51.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>I  II  III</td>
<td>10 7 6 23 (59.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Occupations</td>
<td>I  II  III</td>
<td>1 7 6 14 (35.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I  II  III</td>
<td>0 5 3 8 (20.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39
* I - Large, complex institutions
II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000
** Totals exceed thirty-nine because of experience in more than one of the categories.

The total years of experience exceed thirty-nine in the the categories because some of the administrators had
experience in more than one of the four areas. The majority of the administrators in the total group had previous experience in some capacity within the student affairs domain. Within the subgroups, student affairs was the most prevalent area of previous experience among the respondents in Group I. College teaching was the most common previous experience for those in Group II, with the experience in Group III being evenly split among the three defined areas. Eighty-three percent of the leaders in Group I had previous experience in the student affairs domain with one having had experience in a religious occupation.

Question six was concerned with the amount of experience that the administrator had as the chief student affairs administrator. The responses from these officers were tabulated and are summarized in Table VII.

**TABLE VII**

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience as Chief Student Affairs Administrator</th>
<th>Institutional Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(56.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39

* I - Large, complex institutions
  II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
  III - Liberal arts institution, enrollment under 1,000
The majority of the administrators had five or fewer years of experience as the chief administrator of the student affairs division. This was also true for each group of administrators when divided into the three institutional subgroups according to size and complexity. No administrator in Group III had more than eleven years of experience; whereas, 66.7 percent had five or fewer years of experience in this position.

The last inquiry on the questionnaire was concerned with the number of professional staff members who report directly to these administrators. The responses to this question were tabulated and are summarized in Table VIII.

**TABLE VIII**

**THE NUMBER OF SUBORDINATES DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE TO THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Subordinates of the Chief Student Affairs Administrator</th>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18 (46.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 (38.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 39

* I - Large, complex institutions
II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000
The most common number of subordinates was in the zero to five range for the total group of administrators. Seventy-five percent of the officers in the smaller institutions (Group III) had five or fewer subordinates. In Group I, half of the administrators had from six to ten subordinates. One institution in Group II and one in Group III had eleven or more lower ranking officers responsible to the chief officer in the student affairs area.

Statistical Analysis

In this study thirteen hypotheses generated from four basic purposes were investigated. These were formulated to answer questions pertaining to the effect that various factors might have on the leadership style in use by these administrators in their capacities of leadership in the student affairs domain in their institutions. The data for analysis were obtained through a questionnaire, a self-ranking set of statements on leadership style, and an instrument designed to locate strength of direction toward the five basic leadership style designations of the Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid.

The hypotheses were stated in the null form and were analyzed using five statistical techniques: chi-square, t-test, Spearman Rho correlation coefficient, one-way analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test. For chi-square, the t-test, analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test, the mean of the various groups' raw scores were used in the analyses.
The raw score was the score obtained by totaling the one to ten weighted responses to the twelve questions in each leadership style.

The first hypothesis was analyzed using chi-square. Using frequency counts to determine the first choice of leadership style, the choices were analyzed to test for the significant difference from a uniform distribution of leadership style choice. The t-test was used to analyze hypotheses two, eleven, and thirteen as these involved only two groups in the analyses.

The one-way analysis of variance was used in analyzing hypotheses four through ten and hypothesis twelve as they involved three or more groups in the analysis. The Scheffé test was used to make individual group comparisons after using the one-way analysis of variance. Hypothesis three was analyzed using Spearman Rho as ranked scores were used as nominal level data to find the relationship between a standard and the data from this study. The .05 confidence level was used as the minimum level of significant value in these analyses.

In the analysis of most of the hypotheses, the data from thirty-six of the thirty-nine responding institutions were analyzed. One of the respondents returned only the demographic questionnaire. Two other administrators chose only the most and least characteristic styles statements; therefore,
they did not have valid raw score or T-Score totals for the statistical analysis.

The Styles of Leadership Survey was based on the Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid. This grid concept identified five major leadership style designations from among the eighty-one possible leadership positions on the grid. These five designations refer to the relationship between concern for people and concern for purpose by the leaders. In the "9/9" style, purpose is from the integration of task and human requirements by the leader. In the "5/5" style, purpose comes first for the leader, but morale is not ignored. Adequate task efficiency and satisfactory morale are the goals. For the leader using the "9/1" style, the workers are a commodity just as machines. The leader concentrates on task efficiency and shows little regard for the development or morale of subordinates. The leader focuses on being supportive and considerate of subordinates in the "1/9" style. Task efficiency is secondary. In the "1/1" style, minimum effort to accomplish the purpose but enough to maintain organization is exerted by the leader (1, p. 262). Titles have been given to these five major leadership style designations. These are used to refer to these styles within the tables of this study. The titles are 9/9, "Team;" 5/5, "Middle-of-the-Road;" 9/1, "Task;" 1/9, "Country Club;" and 1/1, "Impoverished."
HYPOTHESIS 1: There is no significant difference from the statistically uniform distribution in the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities.

To determine whether the chief student affairs administrators' choice of leadership style differs from the uniform distribution of these five leadership styles, the highest mean score of the five styles for each administrator was analyzed using the chi-square test for goodness of fit. The uniform distribution was an expected 7.2 of the respondents choosing each of the leadership styles. The data from this analysis are given in Table IX.

### TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style*</th>
<th>9/9</th>
<th>5/5</th>
<th>9/1</th>
<th>1/9</th>
<th>1/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square = 11.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Confidence = 0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Leadership styles:
- 9/9: Team
- 5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
- 9/1: Task
- 1/9: Country Club
- 1/1: Impoverished
The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference from a uniform distribution of leadership styles among these administrators. Thirteen of the respondents chose the 9/9 leadership style and one chose the 9/1 style according to the highest mean raw score on the survey instrument.

Although the frequencies were too small in number to use the chi-square technique for analysis, these choices were tabulated and presented in Table X according to the size and complexity of the institutions. The institutions in Group I included the larger, more complex Southern Baptist colleges and universities. The institutions in Group II were liberal arts institutions with enrollment of 1,000 and above. The institutions in Group III were liberal arts colleges with fewer than 1,000 in enrollment. There were twelve institutions in each of the three groups for this analysis.

The scores of fifty percent of the administrators in Group II indicated a stronger preference for the 9/9 leadership style than the other four styles of leadership. In Group III, 41.6 percent indicated a stronger preference for the 9/9 style and fifty percent, the 1/9 style. According to the chi-square test in Group III, a 0.008 level of confidence with four degrees of freedom was indicated; however, the expected frequency was only 2.4 per cell. Therefore, the
null hypothesis was accepted because the expected frequency needed to be five or more to accept the difference as being statistically significant.

**TABLE X**

THE LEADERSHIP STYLE PREFERENCE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO SIZE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Group*</th>
<th>Leadership Style**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 36
* I - Large, complex institutions
II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment of 1,000 and above
III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000

** Leadership Styles:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished

HYPOTHESIS 2: There is no significant difference between a self-reported leadership style and the dominant leadership style as indicated by the Styles of Leadership Survey.
Each chief student affairs administrator was asked on the questionnaire to rank statements of leadership style from one to five according to its relationship to his own leadership style. The average ranking of each style description was found along with the average of the leadership style ranking from the answers to the twelve questions on the Styles of Leadership Survey. Using the t-test, an analysis was made to determine whether there was a significant difference between the administrator's thoughts about his leadership style characteristics and that as measured by a standardized survey instrument. The data from this series of t-tests are summarized in Table XI.

### TABLE XI

**A COMPARISON BETWEEN A SELF-REPORTED RANKING AND THE RANKING ON THE STYLES OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY (SLS) OF THE FIVE LEADERSHIP STYLES BY THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style*</th>
<th>Institutional Group**</th>
<th>(1) Self-Ranked (2) SLS Ranked</th>
<th>Mean Rank (1-5)</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Two-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style*</td>
<td>Institutional Group**</td>
<td>(1) Self Ranked</td>
<td>(2) SLS Ranked</td>
<td>Mean Rank (1-5)</td>
<td>T Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(1) 3.17</td>
<td>(2) 2.50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>(1) 3.00</td>
<td>(2) 3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>(1) 2.50</td>
<td>(2) 3.42</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(1) 2.89</td>
<td>(2) 2.97</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(1) 3.08</td>
<td>(2) 3.83</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>(1) 3.17</td>
<td>(2) 3.92</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>(1) 3.83</td>
<td>(2) 3.92</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(1) 3.36</td>
<td>(2) 3.89</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(1) 2.75</td>
<td>(2) 2.67</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>(1) 1.83</td>
<td>(2) 2.83</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>(1) 2.08</td>
<td>(2) 2.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(1) 2.22</td>
<td>(2) 2.53</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(1) 4.25</td>
<td>(2) 3.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>(1) 4.17</td>
<td>(2) 2.92</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>(1) 4.50</td>
<td>(2) 3.08</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(1) 4.31</td>
<td>(2) 3.00</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=36
Df= 11  P>.05 is significant
* Leadership style:
  9/9: Team
  5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
  9/1: Task
  1/9: Country Club
  1/1: Impoverished
** I - Large, complex institutions
II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000
The null hypothesis was rejected on seven of the twenty comparisons. There was a significant difference between the self-rankings and the Styles of Leadership Survey ranking of leadership styles in these seven comparisons. On the 9/9 leadership style, there was a significant difference in ranking by the administrators in Group I. The choice of statements of leadership style by these officers indicated a stronger preference for this style than was indicated by their responses on the Styles of Leadership Survey. The .055 probability approached significance in the comparison of rankings for the total group of thirty-six administrators in this 9/9 style. The total group reported a stronger inclination toward this style than that measured on the survey instrument.

No significant difference in rankings was noted in the 5/5 leadership style comparisons although the 0.059 probability approached the .05 level of significance in Group III. A stronger tendency for the Middle-of-the-Road leadership style was shown by these administrators in self-ranking than was indicated by their responses on the survey instrument.

In the 9/1 style, the difference between the rankings in the self-ranked statements and the Styles of Leadership Survey was significant for the total group of thirty-six administrators and approached significance in Group I. This significant difference indicates a stronger concern for task or purpose than those officials reported according to their personal ranking.
In the 1/9 style, the rankings were significantly different for the administrators in Group II. The survey instrument responses indicated that these administrators in the liberal arts institutions with enrollment of 1,000 and above were not as people-oriented as indicated by their self-reported ranking. There was no difference in ranking for the administrators in the smallest institutions in their tendency toward a people-orientation of leadership style according to the two methods.

In the 1/1 style, there was a significant difference at better than the .05 level in all four of the ranking comparisons. Just the opposite of the other leadership styles, the administrators in all four groups reported less preference for the 1/1, "Impoverished," style than was indicated by their responses on the Styles of Leadership Survey.

HYPOTHESIS 3: There is no significant relationship between the "ideal ranking" of leadership styles from Blake and Mouton's research and the ranking of leadership styles of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist institutions.

Research by Blake and Mouton had shown that the most effective leadership style was the "9/9" style. In order of descending effectiveness, the leadership styles were 9/9, 5/5, 9/1, 1/9, and 1/1. By tabulating the responses from the Styles of Leadership Survey and the self-ranking of these styles from the questionnaire, a comparison was made between
the ordering of these leadership styles of the chief student affairs administrators by preference and the "ideal" ordering by Blake and Mouton.

The Spearman Rho correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between the various groups on this hypothesis. Although most often used to compare pairs of rankings by the same group or individual, it can be used in comparing a group to a standard as long as the correlation is not used for prediction purposes.

There were thirty-eight officers included in the responses on the self-ranked choices from the questionnaire as compared to thirty-six responses for the T-Score rankings from the Styles of Leadership Survey. The reason for this difference in number is that two administrators in Group II completed the survey incorrectly; therefore, their T-Scores were invalid. The data from the summaries and rankings are given with the Spearman Rho correlation coefficients in Table XII.

According to the T-Score averages, the ordering for the total group of thirty-six administrators was 9/9, 1/9, 1/1, 5/5, and 9/1. The 9/9 style was the highest average T-Score for the administrators in Group II. For the officers in Group III, the 1/9 style was first with the 9/9 style second. The 5/5 and 1/1 styles ranked first in the ranking by the officers in Group I. The highest correlation using Spearman
TABLE XII

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE RANKING OF LEADERSHIP STYLE CHOICE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND BLAKE AND MOUTON'S IDEAL RANKING OF LEADER EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blake and Mouton Leadership Style*</th>
<th>Styles of Leadership Survey / T-Score**</th>
<th>First Choice Institutional Group***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Ranking</td>
<td>No./Rank</td>
<td>No./Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>6 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>2 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>2 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spearman Rho</strong></td>
<td>- .150</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Self-ranked on Questionnaire First Choice |
| No./Rank | No./Rank | No./Rank | No./Rank |
| 9/9       | 5 - 1     | 5 - 2     | 4 - 1     | 14 - 1   |
| 5/5       | 3 - 2     | 2 - 3     | 2 - 3     | 7 - 3    |
| 9/1       | 1 - 4     | 0 - 4     | 2 - 3     | 3 - 4    |
| 1/9       | 3 - 2     | 7 - 1     | 4 - 1     | 14 - 1   |
| 1/1       | 0 - 5     | 0 - 4     | 0 - 5     | 0 - 5    |
| **Spearman Rho**                  | .750      | .325      | .520      | .575     |
|                                   | 12        | 14        | 12        | 39       |

*Leadership style:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished

**A statistical technique which allows for the adjusting of raw scores so that the relative standing of these raw scores can be compared.

***I - Large, complex institutions
II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000
Rho was .200 for the total group of thirty-six administrators. As the other correlations were even lower, the null hypothesis was retained.

Using the self-ranking statements about the five leadership styles from the questionnaire, a second series of comparisons was made. For the total group, the 9/9 style was the highest average rank with the 1/1 style being the lowest, as in Blake and Mouton's research. The highest correlation according to Spearman Rho was .750 for Group I. In this group, only the 9/1 and 1/9 leadership styles were interchanged from the ideal ranking of Blake and Mouton. The null hypothesis was retained as the correlation coefficient needed to be .90 for five pairs of scores at the .05 level of confidence (4, p. 439).

HYPOTHESIS 4: There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the size or complexity of the institution.

The institutions were divided into three groups according to the size and complexity of the institution to test whether this factor affected the leadership style used by the chief student affairs administrators of these institutions. These divisions follow the divisions of McGrath in his study of Southern Baptist colleges and universities (3). The data were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance and are presented in Table XIII.
TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT
AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO SIZE AND COMPLEXITY
OF THE INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>F PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Group**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  II  III</td>
<td>MSb</td>
<td>MSw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>84.75 93.08 89.50</td>
<td>209.711</td>
<td>163.399</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>73.83 73.58 72.67</td>
<td>4.535</td>
<td>74.401</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>57.42 57.83 59.08</td>
<td>9.033</td>
<td>119.864</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>66.42 70.83 74.83</td>
<td>212.688</td>
<td>128.250</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>39.50 34.83 32.75</td>
<td>143.360</td>
<td>199.543</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36 (12 in each group)
Df= 2, 33  F>.05 is significant
* Leadership Style:
  9/9: Team
  5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
  9/1: Task
  1/9: Country Club
  1/1: Impoverished
** I - Large, complex institutions
  II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
  III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in leadership style with regard to the size and complexity of the institution according to the one-way analysis of variance in any of the five leadership styles. The null hypothesis was retained. As none of the F probabilities of the various leadership styles even approached significance when the institutions were divided by size and complexity, this factor was shown to have little effect on the choice of the leadership style used by the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist institutions.
HYPOTHESIS 5: There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the age of the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions.

To determine whether age was a factor in the choice of leadership style by these administrators, they were divided into five age groups separated by ten year intervals. The data were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance and are presented in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV
ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE AGE OF THE ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style*</th>
<th>Age Grouping of Chief Student Affairs Administrators</th>
<th>Raw Score Mean</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 60 &amp; Above 30-39 40-49 50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>88.00 88.60 88.38 96.20 83.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSb 176.052</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>76.00 74.60 72.69 73.40 71.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSb 77.775</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>62.00 60.80 58.06 51.00 58.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSb 116.684</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>76.00 70.90 71.25 69.20 66.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSb 145.764</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>39.00 32.90 36.50 26.40 54.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSb 171.745</td>
<td>2.253</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 2 10 16 5 3
DF= 4, 31  P>.05 is significant
* Leadership Style:
  9/9: Team
  5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
  9/1: Task
  1/9: Country Club
  1/1: Impoverished
The null hypothesis was retained in all of the leadership style categories. As significance at the .05 level was approached in the 1/1 leadership style, Scheffé tests were calculated to discover whether there were any groups which were significantly different from the other groups. The Scheffé test made a comparison between the means of each of the possible pairs and combinations of groups.

**TABLE XV**

Scheffé tests for the 1/1 leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities according to the age of the administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Means</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>((M_1 - M_2)^2)</th>
<th>MS_w</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>114.24</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>158.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>371.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>461.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>361.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>191.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>121.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>721.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-9.50</td>
<td>-9.50</td>
<td>251.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-12.50</td>
<td>-12.50</td>
<td>501.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-16.00</td>
<td>-16.00</td>
<td>681.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-20.50</td>
<td>-20.50</td>
<td>141.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>111.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-30.50</td>
<td>-30.50</td>
<td>911.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-35.00</td>
<td>-35.00</td>
<td>811.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-40.50</td>
<td>-40.50</td>
<td>711.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-46.00</td>
<td>-46.00</td>
<td>611.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-51.50</td>
<td>-51.50</td>
<td>511.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-57.00</td>
<td>-57.00</td>
<td>411.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-62.50</td>
<td>-62.50</td>
<td>311.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-68.00</td>
<td>-68.00</td>
<td>211.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-73.50</td>
<td>-73.50</td>
<td>111.76</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-79.00</td>
<td>-79.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-84.50</td>
<td>-84.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-90.00</td>
<td>-90.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-95.50</td>
<td>-95.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-101.00</td>
<td>-101.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-106.50</td>
<td>-106.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-112.00</td>
<td>-112.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-117.50</td>
<td>-117.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-123.00</td>
<td>-123.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-128.50</td>
<td>-128.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-134.00</td>
<td>-134.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 36, Df = 4, 31 F > 2.69 is significant at .05 level

* Groups: 1 - Below age 30  4 - Ages 50-59
          2 - Ages 30-39  5 - Age 60 and above
          3 - Ages 40-49
According to the Scheffé test of all possible comparisons, there was no significant difference between any of the groups within the 1/1 (Impoverished) leadership style as the F-ratio had to equal or exceed 2.69 to be significant at the .05 level. The difference between groups four and five approaches significance. This indicates that the administrators who were sixty years of age and over reported a stronger preference for the 1/1 (Impoverished) style of leadership than the administrators between the ages of fifty and fifty-nine.

**HYPOTHESIS 6:** There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the years of experience as a chief student affairs administrator.

The years of experience that these administrators have had in the position of chief student affairs administrator on their campuses were divided into three groups to determine if this was a factor in the choice of leadership style used by these institutional officers. These groups were divided into the groups of five years or fewer, six to ten years, and eleven years and over. The data were analyzed using analysis of variance and are presented in Table XVI.

The null hypothesis was retained in all of the leadership styles except in the 1/9 style. There was a significant difference in the 1/9 leadership style at better than the .05 level of confidence; therefore, the null hypothesis was
TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT
AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO
THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A CHIEF
STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>F PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of Experience as Chief Student Affairs Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>6 -10</td>
<td>11 and over</td>
<td>MSₐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>92.26</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>85.20</td>
<td>200.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>71.42</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>93.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>189.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>730.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>36.58</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>54.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 19 12 5
P<.05 is significant
Df= 2, 33

* Leadership Style:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished

rejected in this style. To determine which of the groups
differ significantly from the other groups within this leadership style, a Scheffé test of all possible comparisons was
calculated from each combination of groups. These data are
summarized in Table XVII.
### TABLE XVII

**SCHEFFE TESTS FOR THE 1/9 LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF MEANS</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>$(M_1-M_2)^2$</th>
<th>$MS_w$</th>
<th>$F$ RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>41.86</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>356.08</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>7.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>153.76</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>267.98</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>5.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36  
Df= 2, 33  
* Groups:  
1 = 0 - 5 years of experience as chief student affairs administrator  
2 = 6 - 10 years of experience  
3 = 11 and over years of experience  
** Significant at the .05 level of confidence

The Scheffé test indicated that there was a significant difference between Groups and and three and between Groups three and Groups one and two combined at the .05 level of confidence within the 1/9 leadership style as the F-ratio exceeded that needed for the .05 level of confidence. Administrators with eleven and over years of experience reported less people-orientation in their leadership style than administrators with five or fewer years of experience and with all administrators with fewer than eleven years of experience as a chief student affairs administrator.
The analysis of variance was calculated for each of the three groups of administrators according to the size and complexity of the institutions to determine whether the years of experience of the administrators within these smaller groups was a factor in the choice of leadership style. Significant differences at the .05 level and better were found in three of the analyses. An F probability of .017 was calculated in the 1/9 style for Group I. The Scheffé test indicated the significant difference was between the administrators with five years and fewer of experience and those with eleven and over years of experience. This difference extended to include the administrators with five or fewer years of experience and all administrators with six or more years (combining groups two and three). In Group I, the larger, more complex institutions, the administrators with five or fewer years of experience reported more people-orientation than the administrators with more experience as chief student affairs administrator.

In Group II, no significant differences were found at the .05 level of confidence or better. In Group III, the smaller institutions, a F probability of .002 was found with the 5/5 leadership style. The Scheffé test indicated a significant difference between administrators with five or fewer years of experience and those with six to ten years of experience. No administrator in this group had eleven or more years of experience. In this group, administrators with
five or fewer years of experience reported more of a Middle-of-the-Road leadership style than those with more experience. Significance was approached in the 9/1 leadership style in Group III with an $F$ probability of .069.

**HYPOTHESIS 7**: There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the educational preparation of the administrator: academic, administrative, or religious.

In determining whether the educational preparation of the administrator affected the choice of leadership style, the major for the highest degree earned by the administrator was divided into five classifications: administration, student affairs, guidance and counseling, religion, and any academic area. These categories were chosen as being more definitive of the reported educational preparation of the chief student affairs administrators on the questionnaire than the three categories proposed in the original research question. The data were analyzed using the analysis of variance technique and are presented in Table XVIII.

The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference in the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities as analyzed by the educational background of these administrators.

**HYPOTHESIS 8**: There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the professional experience of the chief student affairs administrator.
TABLE XVIII
ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT
AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE EDUCATIONAL
PREPARATION OF THE ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style*</th>
<th>Major for Highest Degree</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>86.11</td>
<td>94.88</td>
<td>86.33</td>
<td>90.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>72.33</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>59.11</td>
<td>57.38</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>71.11</td>
<td>65.13</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>77.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>36.44</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36
Df= 4, 30
P>.05 is significant

* Leadership Styles:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished
To determine whether the previous professional experience of the chief student affairs administrators affects the leadership style of the administrator, the officers were divided into four groups according to previous experience. The first group included administrators whose only previous experience was in college teaching. The second group included those whose only previous experience was in lower level student affairs positions. The third group included all who had held positions in a religious field. The fourth group included administrators with experience in both teaching and student affairs. Three administrators who listed no previous experience in any of the three defined experience areas were not included in this analysis as their divergence did not lend themselves to grouping. The data were analyzed and are presented in Table XIX.

The null hypothesis was retained in three of the leadership styles: 9/9, 9/1, and 1/1. There was no significant difference in the style preference by administrators with previous professional experiences at the .05 level of confidence according to analysis of variance in these three leadership styles. The null hypothesis was rejected in the 5/5 and 1/9 styles as the F-ratio exceeded the ratio needed to be significant at the .05 level in these two styles.

A Scheffé test was made for the two leadership styles showing significant differences at the .05 level. In the 5/5
leadership style, none of the four groups showed a significant difference at the .05 level from any of the other groups according to this test.

TABLE XIX

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>Previous Experience</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Religious Field</td>
<td>Teaching and St. Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>79.67</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>89.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>72.83</td>
<td>77.11</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>68.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>59.44</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>51.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>69.44</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>47.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 33
Df= 3, 29

*Leadership Style:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished
In the 1/9 leadership style, a significant difference was indicated in the choice of this style between the administrators with teaching experience and those with religious occupation background and the officers with teaching and student affairs backgrounds; and between those with religious background and the other groups combined. Administrators with a religious field background reported more concern for people than administrators with both a teaching background and the combination of teaching and student affairs according to this test. The administrators coming from a religious field background reported more of a people-orientation than the other groups combined. The data from the Scheffé tests for the 1/9 style are shown in Table XX.

HYPOTHESIS 9: There is no significant difference with regard to the level of education of the chief student affairs administrator.

The administrators were divided into six groups to determine whether the level and/or type of education of the administrator affected the choice of leadership style. The groups for the analysis were as follows: Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.), Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), Specialist of Education (Sp.Ed.), Master of Arts (M.A.), Master of Education (M.Ed.), and Master of Religious Education (M.Rel.). The data were analyzed by the analysis of variance and are presented in Table XXI.
TABLE XX

SHEFFE TESTS OF THE GROUP DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE 1/9 LEADERSHIP STYLE FOR THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF MEANS</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>(M1-M2)^2</th>
<th>MS_W</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>196.00</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>3.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>101.20</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.44</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>240.25</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>3.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td>162.31</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>4.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 33
Df= 3, 29
*Groups:
1 - Teaching
2 - Student Affairs
3 - Religious occupations
4 - Teaching and Student Affairs
** Significant at .05 and better
TABLE XXI

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Probab.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Education**</td>
<td>MS$_b$</td>
<td>MS$_w$</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>85.43</td>
<td>90.57</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>87.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>74.43</td>
<td>73.36</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>74.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>53.29</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>69.86</td>
<td>68.79</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>65.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>37.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36
DF= 5, 30
P>.05 is significant
* Leadership style:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished

** Level of Education:
Ph.D.: Doctor of Philosophy
D.Ed.: Doctor of Education
Sp.Ed.: Specialist of Education
M.A.: Master of Art
M.Ed.: Master of Education
M.Rel.: Master of Religion
The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference in the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators with regard to the level or type of education of these administrators.

A second analysis was made collapsing the six groups into only two groups: administrators who have completed a terminal degree and those who have earned masters or specialist degrees. The data were analyzed by the analysis of variance and are presented in Table XXII.

**TABLE XXII**

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO DOCTOR'S OR MASTER'S DEGREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>MS_D</td>
<td>MS_W</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>88.86</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>3.259</td>
<td>170.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>73.71</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>6.293</td>
<td>72.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>56.43</td>
<td>60.47</td>
<td>142.682</td>
<td>112.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>69.14</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>121.318</td>
<td>133.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>35.81</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>202.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36

Df= 1, 34

P>.05 is significant

* Leadership Style:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished
There was no significant difference in the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions with regard to the level of education of these administrators. The null hypothesis was retained.

**HYPOTHESIS 10:** There is no significant difference with regard to the affiliation of the institution where the highest degree was obtained, i.e. public, private, church-related, Southern Baptist, or Southern Baptist seminary.

Another factor that may affect leadership style choice is the philosophy that a person may gain from the type of institution from which he receives the educational preparation for the administrative position. Three divisions were made to analyze this factor: private, public, and Baptist seminary. These divisions were made after summarizing the responses to the questionnaire. The analysis of variance was calculated and the data are presented in Table XXIII.

The null hypothesis was retained for the total group. There was no significant difference in any of the leadership styles at the .05 level of confidence.

This same analysis was completed with the administrators divided into the three institutional groups according to size and complexity. This additional analysis was made to determine whether a difference existed within this three division grouping concerning the leadership style according to the affiliation of the institution granting the highest degree
TABLE XXIII

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE AFFILIATION OF THE INSTITUTION GRANTING THE HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>F PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Baptist</td>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>89.32</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>4.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>73.64</td>
<td>73.41</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>3.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>36.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>71.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>331.482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36  11  22  3
Df= 2, 33
P>.05 is significant

* Leadership Style:
  - 9/9: Team
  - 5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
  - 9/1: Task
  - 1/9: Country Club
  - 1/1: Impoverished

earned. Only one of these analyses indicated significance at the .05 level or better using these divisions. The 1/1 style in the institutions in Group II showed an F probability of .004. None of the administrators in Group II obtained the highest degree from a Baptist seminary. The administrators in liberal arts institutions with enrollments over 1,000 who
received their highest degree from a private school had a stronger direction toward the 1/1 (Impoverished) leadership style than the ones who received their highest degree from a public institution.

No significant difference was found in the leadership style choice by the total group of administrators with regard to the affiliation of the institution granting the highest degree earned. A majority of the Baptist institutions do not have graduate programs in higher education or administration. Almost two-thirds of the administrators received their highest degree from a public institution of higher education. In contrast, two-thirds of the administrators received at least one of their degrees from a Baptist institution.

An analysis was made using three groups according to whether the administrators attended a Baptist institution, other private schools, or attended only public institutions for any degree earned. This additional analysis was made after seeing the distribution of institutions according to the questionnaire. The data were analyzed using the analysis of variance and are presented in Table XXIV.

The null hypothesis was retained in analyzing the leadership styles of these administrators according to the affiliation of the institution granting a degree on any level of preparation. There was no significant difference in any of the leadership styles at the .05 level of confidence.
HYPOTHESIS 11: There is no significant difference in the leadership style with regard to the administrative level of the chief student affairs administrator within the institution.

According to the questionnaire, thirty of the thirty-six administrators reported directly to the chief administrator of the institution. This question sought to determine whether there was a difference in leadership style choice by those who
report directly to the chief institutional officer and those who report to some lower level officer. The data were analyzed using the t-test as there were only two groups in the analysis. The data are presented in Table XXV.

**TABLE XXV**

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL OF THE OFFICER WITHIN THE INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Two-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report to President</td>
<td>Report to Lower Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>71.37</td>
<td>67.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36  Df= 34  P>.05 is significant


The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference in the leadership style with regard to the administrative level of these administrative officers.

**HYPOTHESIS 12:** There is no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the number of subordinates reporting directly to the chief student affairs administrator.
Another factor that may have an effect on the leadership style choice of these administrators is the number of subordinates reporting to the administrator. These officers were divided into three groups: five or fewer subordinates, six to ten subordinates, and eleven and over. The analysis of variance was calculated and the data are presented in Table XXVI.

**TABLE XXVI**

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF SUBORDINATES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN Number of Subordinates of Chief Student Affairs Administrators</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>F PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>6 -10</td>
<td>11&amp;over</td>
<td>MS_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>88.69</td>
<td>88.64</td>
<td>91.33</td>
<td>17.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>74.93</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>104.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>56.69</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>57.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>112.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>122.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36      16      14      6
Df= 2, 33  P>.05 is significant
* Leadership Style:
  9/9: Team
  5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
  9/1: Task
  1/9: Country Club
  1/1: Impoverished
The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference in leadership style in any of the five styles with regard to the number of subordinates reporting to the chief student affairs administrator in these institutions.

This same analysis was calculated dividing the administrators into the three groups according to the size and complexity of the institutions. This additional analysis was made to determine whether a difference in leadership styles existed with regard to this factor. Only one leadership style in Group II indicated significance with an F probability of .031. Scheffé tests indicated that administrators with eleven and more subordinates had a stronger preference for the 1/1 style than administrators with other numbers of subordinates.

HYPOTHESIS 13: There is no significant difference in the leadership style preference toward a people-orientation or a purpose-orientation.

To determine whether there was a significant difference in the choice between the people-oriented (1/9) leadership style and the purpose-oriented (9/1) leadership style, the chief student affairs administrators were analyzed by the total group and by each of the three size groupings of institutions using the t-test. Mean rankings of choice of these two leadership styles in relation to the other leadership styles were used from two sources: the Styles of Leadership Survey and the self-ranking statements from the questionnaire which was completed by each administrator. T-tests were calculated and the data are presented in Table XXVII.
TABLE XXVII

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE PREFERENCE TOWARD A PEOPLE-ORIENTATION OR A PURPOSE-ORIENTATION STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL GROUP*</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE**</th>
<th>Styles of Leadership Survey</th>
<th>Self-ranking from Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=36 N=39

* I - Large, complex institutions
  II - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment 1,000 and above
  III - Liberal arts institutions, enrollment under 1,000

** Leadership Styles:
  9/1: Task (Purpose-orientation)
  1/9: Country Club (People-orientation)

*** Significant at .05 level and better

The null hypothesis was rejected in six of the eight categories. There was a stronger preference for the people-oriented style of leadership among the administrators in Group I, Group III, and for all thirty-six administrators according to their responses on the Styles of Leadership Survey.
This same people-oriented preference was reported for Group II, Group III, and the total group on the self-reported ranking of the statements on the questionnaire.

The sex of the administrator might be another factor in the choice of leadership style. As this information was included in the questionnaire which was completed by these administrators, this factor was analyzed using the t-test. There were twenty-eight males and eight females in the groups for analysis. T-tests were calculated and the data are presented in Table XXVIII.

**TABLE XXVIII**

ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLE OF THE CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCORDING TO THE SEX OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE*</th>
<th>Sex of Chief St. Affairs Administrator</th>
<th>No. in Group</th>
<th>RAW SCORE MEAN</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Two-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89.86</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74.04</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57.18</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69.43</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 36
Df= 34
P>.05 is significant
* Leadership Style:
9/9: Team
5/5: Middle-of-the-Road
9/1: Task
1/9: Country Club
1/1: Impoverished
The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference in leadership style with regard to the sex of the administrator at the .05 level of confidence.

Summary

In this chapter, the data from the responses of thirty-nine chief student affairs administrators from Southern Baptist colleges and universities were tabulated and analyzed. The analysis was designed to determine whether significant differences existed in the leadership style of these student affairs officers with regard to various demographic and institutional variables.

In the first part of the chapter, the responses to a questionnaire were tabulated and summarized in tables. Observations concerning these data were given following each table.

The information obtained from the questionnaire gave a broad picture of the chief student affairs administrators in this group of institutions. The most prevalent title for these officers was Dean of Students, being given by sixteen (41.0 percent) of the institutions. Dividing the institutions into the three subgroups used in the study pointed out a difference in the larger, more complex institutions. The title of Vice-President for Student Affairs was the most common title for the institutions included in Group I.
The second question on the questionnaire dealt with personal characteristics. The most common age group for these administrators was between forty and forty-nine. The Group III institutions differed from the total group in that the thirty to thirty-nine age group was the most common age. Males outnumbered females in all three subgroups with the difference being eleven to one in Group I. For the total group, 79.4 percent of these administrators were males. A majority of the administrators in all three subgroups and in the total group reported directly to the chief institutional officer. The total percentage was 84.6 percent.

The fourth question related to the educational background of these administrators. The Doctor of Education degree was the most common degree held by the total group with twenty-two (56.4 percent) holding some terminal degree. Educational Administration was the most common major for the highest degree with various academic areas second. The majority (69.1 percent) received their highest degrees from public institutions, although two-thirds (66.7 percent) attended a Southern Baptist college or university sometime during their preparation and one-third received a degree from a Southern Baptist seminary.

The most common background of previous experience for these administrators was in a lower level of student affairs (59.0 percent) with college teaching second (51.3 percent). The majority (56.4 percent) had five or fewer years of
experience as chief student affairs administrator. Probably reflecting the size of the institutions, five or fewer subordinates was the most common range of number of subordinates reporting to this institutional officer in all three institutional subgroups.

The latter half of the chapter contained the information from the analysis of the data from the Styles of Leadership Survey which was completed by each administrator. The data was divided according to the information from the questionnaire and analyzed suing chi-square, analysis of variance, t-test, Spearman Rho, and the Scheffé test. The hypotheses were each stated in the null form for analysis purposes. The null was rejected at the .05 level of confidence or better.

In the statistical analysis of the leadership styles, an additional picture developed for these administrators. The 9/9 (Team) leadership style was the choice of the majority of the administrators with the 1/9 (Country Club) the next most prevalent choice. Dividing into the subgroups retained the 9/9 style for Groups II and III with 5/5 (Middle-of-the-Road) and 1/1 (Impoverished) tying for the most common choice by Group I.

The study included a series of statements on the questionnaire about the five leadership styles used in the Styles of Leadership Survey. These statements were ranked according to how the administrators believed the statements matched their
style of leadership. The officers reported they had a stronger inclination toward the more effective leadership styles (9/9 and 5/5) and less direction toward the least effective styles (1/1 and 1/9) in their self-ranking statements than as measured on the survey instrument.

There was a higher correlation between the self-ranked statements than the Styles of Leadership Survey rankings of choice when correlated with the "ideal ranking" of the leadership styles according to Blake and Mouton.

No significant difference in leadership style choice was found in eight of the factors in the study: size and complexity of the institution, age, educational preparation, level of education, affiliation of the institution granting the highest degree, administrative level in the institution, number of subordinates, and the sex of the administrator.

Significant differences were found in the choice of leadership style in three of the factors analyzed. These factors were years of experience, previous background and experience, and comparison of people-orientation and purpose-orientation.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

As modern times have mandated an emphasis on the effectiveness and efficiency of administration, various aspects of the role of the administrator have become the subjects of numerous studies. The role of leadership as a factor in the management process has received most of this attention. Higher education in general, and the student services domain in particular has become aware of the need for maximum effectiveness and efficiency in achieving its purposes. This is especially true in the private institutions of higher learning as the necessity of maximum efficiency is imperative to these institutions if their role in American higher education is to continue to be a viable one.

The leadership style of an identifiable segment of this private sector of American higher education was investigated in this study. Using the Managerial Grid concept of Blake and Mouton, which measures the strength of concern for people or concern for purpose/task in leadership, various factors were isolated and analyzed to determine their effect on the choice of leadership style used by these institutional officers.

As the "team" concept of leadership is considered by Blake
Mouton as the ideal leadership style, the findings and conclusions drawn from this study could be used for self-analysis in order to create staff development programs or to help in seeking administrators to fill future needs in the student services area.

The problem of this study was the lack of knowledge about the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities. Four purposes were identified for the study. The first of these purposes was to determine the prevalent leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities in terms of the Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid concept. The second was to determine whether self-reported leadership style is congruent with the leadership style determination obtained through an instrument developed to analyze leadership style. The third purpose was to determine whether certain factors affect the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators: size and complexity of the institution, age, years of experience as chief student affairs administrator, educational preparation, type of previous experience, level of education, affiliation of the institution granting the degree, administrative level in the institution, and number of subordinates. The last purpose was to determine whether the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrator is predominantly people-oriented or purpose-oriented. Thirteen hypotheses were generated from these four basic purposes.
The chief student affairs administrators of the forty-six colleges and universities affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention comprised the population of the study. A demographic questionnaire and an instrument developed to measure strength of leadership style choice was sent to each of these administrators. Responses were received from thirty-nine (84.8 percent) of the administrators after two mailouts and a telephone call. A seventy-five percent return was required for the study. Data from three of the responding administrators were included only in the descriptive data, as one did not return the survey instrument and two did not complete the survey instrument correctly.

The survey instrument used in the study was the Styles of Leadership Survey (Appendix F) developed by Hall and Williams. The instrument was developed around the Managerial Grid concept of Blake and Mouton. The questionnaire was developed for this study using questions needed to answer the factors given in the purposes of the study. A copy of this questionnaire may be found in Appendix G.

Data from the questionnaire were tabulated and presented in table form. The data from the survey instrument were analyzed through the North Texas State University Computer Center using various statistical techniques depending on the level of data and the characteristics of the hypothesis being analyzed. Chi-square, the t-test, analysis of variance
(one-way), Spearman Rho, and the Scheffé test were used in
the analyses. The .05 level of confidence was considered
to be the minimum for determining statistical significance
in the analysis of the data.

Findings

The findings from this study are divided into two
sections. The first section presents the findings from the
descriptive data from the questionnaire. The second section
relates the findings from the statistical analysis of the
Styles of Leadership Survey.

Descriptive Data

The following findings are in relation to the responses
to the questionnaire completed by thirty-nine of the forty-
six chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist
colleges and universities.

1. The most prevalent title for the chief student affairs
administrator is Dean of Students. Sixteen (41.0 percent)
of the institutions use this title. Seven other institutions,
making a total of 59.0 percent, use various other dean
designations for this official.

2. The most prevalent age range for the chief student
affairs administrators in these institutions is between
forty and forty-nine years. Sixteen (41.0 percent) or
these officers are within this age range.
3. The chief student affairs administrator in the smaller institutions are younger than these administrators in the larger institutions. Seven of twelve (58.3 percent) of the administrators in Group III are below age forty. Only two of the twelve (16.7 percent) of these administrators in Group I are below age forty.

4. The majority of the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions are male. Thirty-one (79.4 percent) of these officers are male. This majority of male administrators holds true in all three institutional subgroups. Eleven of the twelve (91.7 percent) of these officials are male in Group I, the larger institutions.

5. A strong majority of the chief student affairs administrators report directly to the chief institutional administrator. Thirty-three (84.6 percent) of the forty-six officials report to the chief institutional officer. Only the Executive Vice-President is listed by more than one chief student affairs administrator as the immediate superordinate other than the institutional president.

6. The majority of the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions hold a doctor's degree. Twenty-two (56.4 percent) of these officers have earned a terminal degree. None of the twelve chief student affairs administrators in Group I have earned a degree at this level.

7. The master's degree is reported to be the minimum degree requirement for the chief student affairs administrator
in these institutions. All of these administrators hold a master's degree or above.

8. Educational Administration is reported as the most common field of professional preparation for the highest degree for the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions. Twelve of these administrators majored in this area in their highest degree program.

9. The majority of the chief student affairs administrators earned their highest degree in a public institution. Twenty-five (64.1 percent) attended a public institution for this degree.

10. A degree from a Southern Baptist institution is reported by the majority of these chief student affairs administrators. Twenty-six (66.7 percent) of these administrators earned at least one degree from a Southern Baptist college or university during their educational experience.

11. A majority of the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions held a lower level position within the student affairs area before becoming a chief student affairs administrator. Twenty-three (59.0 percent) of these officers had previous experience as a subordinate in the student affairs area. Ten of the twelve chief student affairs administrators in Group I had previous experience in the student affairs area.

12. Experience in a religious occupation is not reported to be a major factor in the background of the chief student
affairs administrator in the larger institutions. Only one of the twelve administrators in Group I has previous experience in a religious occupation.

13. The majority of the chief student affairs administrators have five or fewer years of experience in their positions. Twenty-two (56.4 percent) of these officers have five or fewer years of experience in this position. All three of the institutional subgroups according to size and complexity have more administrators with five or fewer years of experience than any of the other of the three age group divisions. No administrator in Group III has more than ten years of experience in this position.

14. The majority of the chief student affairs administrators in this institutions have more than five subordinates reporting to them. Twenty-one (53.9 percent) of these administrators have more than five direct subordinates.

Analytical Data

The following findings, in relation to the thirteen hypotheses in the study, are derived from a statistical analysis of the data obtained from the administrators' responses on the *Styles of Leadership Survey*.

1. The chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities report the 9/9 (Team) style to be the strongest leadership style according to the analysis of hypothesis number one. A significant difference from the
uniform distribution of leadership styles exists according to the chi-square test of goodness of fit at the .02 level of confidence. Thirteen (36.1 percent) of the thirty-six administrators indicate 9/9 as their strongest style of leadership according to the weighted raw scores response average from the Styles of Leadership Survey. This is in contrast to ten (27.8 percent) for 5/5, seven (19.4 percent) for the 1/1 leadership style.

2. The chief student affairs administrators in Group I report a higher weighted choice of the 9/9 (Team) style in the self-ranking than on the Styles of Leadership Survey according to the analysis of hypothesis number two. This indication of preference is at the 0.026 level of confidence.

3. In the analysis of hypothesis number two, the thirty-six chief student affairs administrators report a preference for the 9/1 (Task) leadership style on the self-ranking more than on the Styles of Leadership Survey. This preference is significant at the 0.022 level. The mean ranking is 3.36 on the self-ranking statements in contrast to 3.89 on the Styles of Leadership Survey average ranking.

4. The chief student affairs administrators in Group I report themselves significantly higher (0.026 level) in the 1/9 (Country Club) style on the self-ranking than on the survey instrument according to the analysis of hypothesis number two. There is a mean ranking of 1.83 on the self-ranking statements in contrast to 2.83 on the Styles of Leadership Survey.
5. According to the analysis of hypothesis number two, the total group of thirty-six chief student affairs administrators reveal less direction toward the 1/1 (Impoverished) style on the self-ranking statements from the questionnaire than on the Styles of Leadership Survey. This direction is significant at the 0.001 level.

6. The direction of the t-values for the t-test in hypothesis number two indicate that these chief student affairs administrators report more task-orientation and less people-orientation than they see themselves to be. In all significant rank comparisons, except in the 1/1 style, the mean rankings of the self-ranked statements are higher than the Styles of Leadership Survey rankings.

7. There is a higher correlation between the self-ranked leadership style ranking with Blake and Mouton's "ideal ranking" than with the Styles of Leadership Survey rankings of style choice according to the Spearman Rho correlation used in the analysis of hypothesis number three. The highest correlation on the self-ranking statements is .750 and .200 on the survey instrument.

8. Chief student affairs administrators with five or fewer years of experience as a chief student affairs administrator report more of a people-orientation than those with more years of experience according to the analysis of hypothesis number six. This difference is significant at the
Further analysis with the Scheffé test indicates that the administrators with eleven or more years of experience report less people-orientation in their leadership style than those with ten or fewer or five or fewer years of experience.

9. In the analysis of hypothesis number six, the chief student affairs administrators in Group I with five or less years of experience report a more people-orientation than those with eleven or more years of experience. An F probability of .017 is obtained in the 1/9 style for Group I according to the analysis of variance. The F-ratio of 7.28 between the administrators with five or fewer years of experience and those with eleven or more years is significant beyond the .05 level according to the Scheffé test.

10. In Group III, the chief student affairs administrators with five or fewer years of experience report more of a 5/5 (Middle-of-the-Road) style of leadership than those with six to ten years of experience according to the analysis of hypothesis number six. An F probability of .002 is calculated for the 5/5 style according to analysis of variance. The F-ratio between administrators with five or fewer years of experience and those with six to ten years of experience is significant beyond the .05 level.

11. In the 1/9 (Country Club) style, the chief student affairs administrators with experience in a religious occupation report a more people-oriented style of leadership than those with teaching or teaching and student affairs
backgrounds according to the analysis of hypothesis number eight. The F-ratio of 5.35 is significant beyond the .05 level. Those with religious backgrounds also report a higher people-orientation than all of the other administrators combined according to the Scheffé test.

12. Chief student affairs administrators with a background in lower level student affairs areas report the 5/5 (Middle-of-the-Road) leadership style more than those with a teaching and student affairs background of experience according to the analysis of hypothesis number eight. The F-ratio of 10.30 is significant beyond the .05 level.

13. Within Group II, the chief student affairs administrators receiving their highest degree from a private institution report the 1/1 (Impoverished) leadership style more than those receiving their degrees from public institutions according to the analysis of hypothesis number ten. The 1/1 style in the institutions in Group II shown an F probability of .004 according to the analysis of variance.

14. Within Group II, the chief student affairs administrators with eleven or more subordinates report the 1/1 (Impoverished) leadership style more than those administrators with fewer subordinates according to the analysis of hypothesis number twelve. This difference is significant with an F probability of .031. The F-ratio between the administrators with eleven or more subordinates and both of the other
subordinate groupings combined is significant beyond the .05 level according to the Scheffé test.

15. The people-oriented (1/9) leadership style is rated stronger than the purpose-oriented (9/1) style by the total group of thirty-six chief student affairs administrators on both the self-ranked statements and the raw score rankings from the Styles of Leadership Survey according to the analysis of hypothesis number thirteen. The t-value of 4.05 for the Styles of Leadership Survey and the 3.53 for the self-ranking from the questionnaire are both significant at better than the .05 level.

16. For the chief student affairs administrators in Group I, there is a significant selection of the people-oriented (1/9) style of leadership over the purpose-oriented (9/1) style on the Styles of Leadership Survey according to the analysis of hypothesis number thirteen. The t-value of 2.42 is significant beyond the .05 level. This indicates that this group of administrators report that they are more people-oriented than they believe they are according to their self-ranked statements.

17. For the chief student affairs administrators in Group II, the responses on the self-ranked statements indicate a stronger people-orientation than purpose-orientation according to analysis of hypothesis number thirteen. The t-value of 2.82 on the self-ranked statements is significant at better than the .05 level. This comparison indicates that
these administrators report they are more people-oriented than their actual leadership style indicates according to the Styles of Leadership Survey.

18. There is a stronger inclination reported towards the people-orientation for the chief student affairs administrators in Group III on both the Styles of Leadership Survey and the self-ranked statements according to the analysis of hypothesis number thirteen. The $t$-value of 3.57 on the Styles of Leadership Survey and 2.84 on the self-ranked statements are both significant at better than the .05 level.

19. The following are not reported to be statistically significant factors in the leadership style in use by the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities according to the analysis of the hypotheses in this study: size and complexity of the institution, age of the administrator, level of education, affiliation of the institution granting a degree, administrative level within the institution, number of subordinates, educational preparation of the administrator, or the sex of the administrator. None of the statistical analyses for the thirty-six administrators are significant at better than the .05 level for these factors.

Conclusions

In relation to the purposes of the study and within the delimitations established, the following conclusions are
drawn from the responses to the questionnaire which was completed by each administrator and the analysis of the Styles of Leadership Survey responses.

1. The chief student affairs administrator is considered to be in a first line administrative position in Southern Baptist colleges and universities. Thirty-three of the thirty-nine administrators report directly to the chief institutional administrator. On thirty-six of the campuses this administrator carries the title of Dean or Vice-President.

2. The majority of the Southern Baptist colleges and universities have employed personnel with the professional experiences and education necessary to serve as the chief student affairs administrators in their institutions. The master's degree is considered to be the minimum requirement. The majority hold a degree beyond the master's degree. A degree in educational administration is the most common field of preparation with student services ranking second as the main area of preparation. The majority have had experience in student affairs areas prior to their present position. The majority have attended Southern Baptist colleges and universities as students and therefore know the purposes and philosophies of the institutions. In the larger institutions, professional preparation in administration and student affairs is preferred to a background in teaching or in a religious occupation.
3. A lack of seniority, which is usually associated with positions at the second organizational level of an institution, is evident in the chief student affairs administrator position on these campuses. The majority (56.4 percent) of these administrators have five or fewer years of experience in the position. Especially is this lack of experience characteristic of the smaller institutions as eight of the twelve (66.7 percent) administrators in Group III and nine of the fifteen (60.0 percent) of the administrators in Group II have five or fewer years of experience in this position. Only five (12.8 percent) have over ten years of experience as a chief student affairs administrator. No administrator in Group III has over ten years of experience.

4. According to the Blake and Mouton standard, the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist campuses are aware of what constitutes effective leadership style. The 9/9 style is the highest weighted choice of leadership style by these administrators. The administrators in Group I ranked the 9/9 style higher on their self-ranking statements than on their responses on the Styles of Leadership Survey. The self-ranked statements on the 1/1 style, the least effective style according to Blake and Mouton, are ranked lower than the ranking for this style on the survey instrument. Ranking the 9/9 style higher and the 1/1 style lower on the self-ranking than on the survey instrument is an indication of more awareness of effective leadership than
their actual usage of leadership skills according to their responses on the Styles of Leadership Survey.

5. Southern Baptist chief student affairs administrators report a preference for the 1/9 (Country Club) leadership style over the 9/1 (Task) style in contrast to the Blake and Mouton research which indicates that the 9/1 style is the more effective of the two leadership styles. In ranking the mean scores on both the self-ranking statements and the raw score means from the Styles of Leadership Survey, the 1/9 style is ranked higher than the 9/1 style for the total group and for all three subgroups. For the total group, the mean rank for the self-ranked statements from the questionnaire is 2.23 for the 1/9 style and 3.41 for the 9/1 style. On the survey instrument, the mean rank for the 1/9 style is 2.53 and 3.89 for the 9/1 style. As previously noted, the chief student affairs administrators are not as people-oriented as they rate themselves to be. The self-ranked statements have higher average rankings than the average rankings from the Styles of Leadership Survey in the 1/9 leadership style.

6. Experience in the field as a chief student affairs administrator results in a more purpose-oriented style of leadership. For the total group and Group I and Group III, the administrators with five or fewer years of experience have a higher raw score mean in the 1/9 (people-oriented) leadership
style than the administrators with eleven and more years of experience. This difference is significant at the .002 level of confidence for the total group. In Group I the administrators with five or fewer years of experience report a more people-oriented style than the purpose-oriented at a .017 level of confidence. The Scheffé test indicates a significant difference between the five and fewer years of experience and those with eleven and more years of experience at better than the .05 level in this group.

7. The chief student affairs administrators in these institutions know more about effective leadership style than they actually practice. Assuming the ideal ranking of leadership styles by Blake and Mouton to be the standard leads to this conclusion. The self-ranked statements report a much higher correlation with the ideal ranking (.750) than the correlation of the responses from the Styles of Leadership Survey to this ideal ranking (.200).

8. Among the factors that were studied are years of experience, previous professional background, and the institution granting the highest degree. According to the analysis of their responses on the Styles of Leadership Survey, these factors are significantly related to the leadership style given strongest consideration by the chief student affairs administrators of Southern Baptist colleges and universities. This finding implies that leadership, for these administrators, is largely an
individual choice, and is not strongly dependent upon the various demographic and institutional factors thought to be important in choosing one's leadership style.

Recommendations

Several recommendations have been stimulated by this study of the leadership style of the Southern Baptist chief student affairs administrators.

1. Because the chief student affairs administrator is one of the major positions on Southern Baptist campuses, it is recommended that institutional presidents and boards of trustees review existing policies for selecting these administrators and begin using evaluative procedures concerning leadership style in their hiring procedures. Factors such as years of experience, previous professional background, and institutions granting a degree are shown to influence leadership style for various groups of their present administrators in student affairs.

2. The student affairs administrators in this study report a preference for the 9/9 style of leadership described by Blake and Mouton to be the ideal leadership style. Because this direction is noted among these administrators and is considered from research to be the most effective style, it is recommended that Southern Baptist colleges and universities place emphasis in developing professional growth programs designed to reinforce this 9/9 (Team) leadership style for these administrators.
3. Because the chief student affairs administrators on Southern Baptist college and university campuses report a strong preference for a people-oriented leadership style in contrast to a purpose-oriented style, it is recommended that the tendency to change leadership style as experience is gained in the position be analyzed by these administrators. A majority of these administrators were found to have five or fewer years of experience in the position. It was also found that the leadership style became more purpose-oriented as the chief student affairs administrators became more experienced in their positions.

4. As the research of Blake and Mouton addresses the issue of leadership effectiveness, it is recommended that further studies be made concerning the effectiveness of the leadership of the chief student affairs administrators in these institutions. The present study did not address this issue.

5. Inconsistencies are noted in self-perception and the responses to the survey instrument on leadership style in this study. It is recommended that further studies be made to include the perceptions of superordinates and subordinates of the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators of these institutions. The perception of significant others could be used to examine the validity of the self-perception of leadership style.
6. Only three factors studied were found to be significant in the choice of leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities. It is recommended that additional studies be made that replicate this study of factors that might influence leadership style with other groups of church-related institutions. Such studies would provide comparisons with other similar institutions as to the leadership characteristics of the chief student affairs administrators.
APPENDIX A

Letter Mailed with Questionnaire
APPENDIX B

Letter from Dr. Walker
Dear Administrator:

The enclosed questionnaire and survey instrument are part of a dissertation at North Texas State University concerned with a study of the leadership style of the chief student affairs administrators in Southern Baptist colleges and universities. The questionnaire and instrument are being sent to the chief student affairs administrator in all senior level colleges and universities that are affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention. (See enclosed letter from Dr. Arthur Walker, Jr.)

Your response to the enclosed questionnaire and Styles of Leadership Survey will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

I can assure you that strict confidentiality will be used in gathering the data and publishing the results. No institution, or individual, will be identified in the dissertation. After checking a list to verify the receipt of the questionnaire from your institution and making a notation of those desiring a copy of the abstract, the cover sheet will be removed and destroyed.

Thank you for your assistance in this research project.

Sincerely,

Dennie Richardson

Enclosures
APPENDIX C

Cover Sheet
APPENDIX D

Follow-up Letter
March 14, 1979

Dear Student Personnel Administrator:

Mr. Dennie Richardson of Weatherford, Texas, a graduate student at North Texas State University, is preparing a dissertation on the personal perception of leadership patterns among student personnel administrators. Mr. Richardson is personally known to Dr. Jack Terry of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary and Dr. Bob Johnson of the Seminary Extension Division. Both of these men have written excellent letters of recommendation of him and his work. He is seeking a high degree of return on the instruments which he is sending to student affairs administrators and I join him in asking you to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Arthur L. Walker, Jr.

ALW: cb
APPENDIX E

Institutions Participating in Study
APPENDIX F

Styles of Leadership Survey
CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME: ________________________________

NAME OF INSTITUTION: ________________________________

ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION: ________________________________

Would you like to receive a copy of the abstract of the study?

YES ___ NO ___

This sheet will be separated and destroyed after recording the receipt of a response from your institution and recording the names and institutions of those desiring a copy of the abstract.

Thank you,

[Signature]

[Name]
APPENDIX G

Questionnaire
APPENDIX H

Data from Styles of Leadership Survey

Raw Data
Dear Administrator:

Recently you were mailed a questionnaire and survey instrument concerning a research project I am completing for a dissertation at North Texas State University. To date, I have not received a response from you. If you did not receive the materials packet, please let me know so that another may be sent to you. I have enclosed a postcard for your convenience.

Summer is a busy time; however, I would especially appreciate your help in the completion of this study.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dennie Richardson
APPENDIX I

Data from Styles of Leadership Survey

T-Scores
SOUTHERN BAPTIST
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN STUDY

GROUP I

Baylor University
Carson-Newman College
Furman University
Hardin-Simmons University
Mercer University
Mississippi College
Oklahoma Baptist University
Ouachita Baptist University
Samford University
Stetson University
University of Richmond
Wake Forest University

GROUP II

Averett College
Belmont College
Campbell University
Cumberland College
Dallas Baptist College
Gardner-Webb College
Grand Canyon College
Houston Baptist University
Howard Payne University
Louisiana Baptist College
Mars Hill College
Southwest Baptist College
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
William Carey College
Wingate College

GROUP III

Blue Mountain College
Bluefield College
California Baptist College
Campbellsville College
East Texas Baptist College
Georgetown College
Hannibal-LaGrange College
Judson College
Missouri Baptist College
Mobile College
Tift College
Virginia Intermont College
STYLES OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

A survey of the assumptions and practices which individuals employ in their roles as leaders

by
Jay Hall, Ph.D.
Martha S. Williams, Ph.D.
A WORD ABOUT THE STYLES OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

Please Read Carefully: The following survey of 60 items concerns the behavior of individuals as they function as leaders of groups and organizations. A variety of situations and dimensions common to groups have been included in the survey in an attempt to cover the full range of behavior in such situations and, thereby, to provide you with meaningful information about yourself as a leader.

Each major category, e.g., "Implementation," has been represented by three different situations. Five alternative patterns of individual behavior or attitudes have been supplied as possible responses to each situation. Thus, each major category has a total of 15 items which must be answered.

Each of the five alternatives to each situation is slightly different from the other four. Therefore, read all five alternatives before answering so that you can select the alternatives most and least characteristic of you.

There are no right or wrong answers. The best answer is the one which is most descriptive of you. Therefore, answer honestly, since only realistic answers will provide you with any useful information about yourself.

Instructions: From each five alternatives, select the one which is most characteristic of you and place the letter designate of that item at the point on the scale which reflects the degree of "characteristic-ness" that item is for you. Then, select the alternative which is least characteristic of you and place its letter on the appropriate point on the scale. Once you have found the most and least characteristic alternatives, enter the letters of the remaining alternatives within this range according to how characteristic each alternative is. For example, on a given set of five items you might answer as follows:

| Completely Characteristic | a | : | c | : | d | : | b | : | e | : | Completely Uncharacteristic |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                           | 10| 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |   |

Copyright © 1968, Teleometrics Int’l.

This inventory is copyrighted. The reproduction of any part of it by mimeograph, photostat, or in any other way, whether the reproductions are sold or are furnished free for use, is a violation of the copyright law.
SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

By placing the letter designations for alternative ways of handling the leadership situations described in The Styles of Leadership Survey on a ten point scale, you have "weighted" each of these alternatives with respect to how much utility each of them has for your handling of the situation. Therefore, it is possible to obtain an overall profile statement of your leadership preferences by simply considering the weights given by you to similar leadership alternatives. In the present inventory, five styles of leadership are sampled; each of the five alternatives given for a leadership situation corresponds to one of these five leadership styles. Thus by arranging all similar alternatives together it becomes possible to add the weights given to these and, in the process, to obtain an index of your style strength on five different leadership styles. This is the rationale underlying the scoring of this inventory.

Inside this cover (just detach the seal to your left and pull this page out and over) you will find a Scoring Form. This form provides for an arrangement of similar-styled alternatives in the same column. That is, the 12 alternatives reflecting a given style of leadership have been listed in a column down the page. Since there are five styles of leadership represented in this inventory, there are five columns of alternative designations presented in the Scoring Form. To score the inventory, you simply go back through the inventory—taking one leadership situation and its five alternative solutions at a time—and find the scale value which characterizes the space in which you have placed the letter designation of each alternative. This scale value becomes your score for each item. Notice the example below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value "9" becomes the score for alternative a; the value "7" is the score for alternative b, and so on. In determining your raw score on the five styles of leadership contained in the inventory, transpose the scale values for each alternative to the place indicated for it on the Scoring Form. Once this is done, it is simply a matter of adding up the scores common to a given style. Instructions for this procedure and for additional interpretive steps may be found on the Scoring Form.

Now detach the seal to your left and turn this page out and over to reveal the Scoring Form.
CONCERNING A PHILOSOPHY OF LEADERSHIP. The opinions, attitudes and assumptions people make regarding the accomplishment of goals through others may be considered to reflect a general leadership philosophy. In turn, an individual’s leadership philosophy is often an index of the way he leads and, consequently, of his success. Below are listed some areas of philosophic concern to leaders.

A. Most leaders recognize the fact that a variety of goals or needs — both individual and organizational — operate in the average work situation. In general, how do you view the relative importance of these needs?

   a. I feel that while the needs of both individual members and the organization are important considerations, in the final analysis the needs of the organization should prevail.

   b. I feel that I can best insure a smooth running organization by first attending to the needs of my followers and providing the conditions for high morale.

   c. I feel that both the needs of individual members and the organization are equally important in determining the quality of organizational performance and that neither can be sacrificed if optimal results are to be obtained.

   d. I feel that the needs of the organization come first and that subordinates are obligated to sacrifice their personal goals when necessary in order to maintain a high quality of performance.

   e. I feel that the tasks of the organization are dictated primarily by organizational charters, and the individual member—regardless of rank or needs—can do little to alter them significantly.

      Completely Characteristic: 5 4 3 2 1

B. The leader’s job is to accomplish work through people. What relationship between leaders and other members do you feel to be the most effective for accomplishing this?

   a. I feel that the best relationship is one in which the leader ultimately places emphasis on the morale and well-being of the other members rather than on the requirements of the job.

   b. I feel that the best relationship is one in which the leader plans and directs the work of the members and the members implement these plans and directions in a reasonable period of time.

   c. I feel that the best relationship is one characterized by autonomy in the work situation and minimal contact between leaders and other members.

   d. I feel that the best relationship is one in which both the leader and members work together in meeting organizational goals and individual needs for job satisfaction.

   e. I feel that the best relationship is one in which both the leader and the members are willing to give a little and take a little when necessary to get the job done.

      Completely Characteristic: 5 4 3 2 1

C. Evaluation of organizational effectiveness is the leader’s way of determining how well his group has achieved its goals and of isolating areas for improvement. The way in which evaluation is handled often affects both planning and implementation functions for attaining future objectives. How do you feel the evaluation function should be handled?

   a. I feel evaluation should be used to stimulate interest, develop high morale, and provide for individual growth within the organization; and that, therefore, I should encourage members to make their own evaluations of the way in which the organization is functioning.

   b. I feel that evaluations should be treated as a shared responsibility and, therefore, the members and I should meet together to critique, evaluate, and plan the improvement of the functioning of the organization.

   c. I feel that, on the basis of reports, comparisons with the performance of others and my knowledge of the various task requirements, I should personally evaluate each member’s performance and determine the areas in which improvements are needed.

   d. I feel that in order to place the responsibility for evaluating organizational effectiveness where it may best be used, I should pass on to the other members any evaluative comments and suggestions for improvement made to me by “V.I.P.’s” from our own and other organizations.

   e. I feel that after consulting with the other members individually, I should make an overall report and then meet with them in order to encourage improvement in the areas I have decided require it.

      Completely Characteristic: 5 4 3 2 1
### SCORING FORM

**Step 1:** In the spaces provided below, write the scale value number which corresponds to the space in which you placed each of the alternative letters for each of the leadership situations described in the Styles of Leadership Survey. Letter designations for the five alternatives are not arranged in alphabetical order in the form below; therefore, you will have to look for the letter of concern and place the scale number you have used in characterizing that item's utility for you to the right. Complete this data fill-in before going to the next step, which will be totaling of scores. The procedure for this will be explained at the bottom of this page in Step 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9/9</th>
<th>5/5</th>
<th>9/1</th>
<th>2/9</th>
<th>1/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-A. c.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-B. d.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-C. b.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-A. d.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-B. c.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-C. d.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-A. e.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-B. b.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-C. b.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-A. d.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-B. c.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-C. e.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

**Step 2:** Once all scale values have been entered into their proper spaces on the above scoring form, total up the values in each column. For each three scale values per column (that is, for each major breakdown of the survey) there is a space provided in parentheses for the sub-score total. Fill in these values; this will give you a sub-score for each style for each of the components of leadership. Thus, you can measure your style tendencies for philosophy, goal setting and planning activities, implementation, and evaluation periods. Once these sub-totals have been computed, you may then total these for a total style score. The total style score for each of the five leadership styles may be entered in at the bottom of the form in the spaces provided. When you have done this, go on to the Step 3 instructions.

**Step 3:** The scores you have obtained so far represent raw scores. These must be converted to what is called T-Scores so that you can gain some information about how your score compares with those of other leaders. The conversion table for transforming your raw scores into T-Scores will be distributed to you separately. You will notice that there is a table for total style scores and four other tables for your component scores. Look up the raw scores you have obtained for each style and then read across to the column appropriate to that style for the T-Score equivalent of this raw score. Enter this T-Score in the space provided on the Profile Summary Sheet which appears to the left of this page. Total scores should be arranged at the top in descending order of magnitude for a summary of your style preferences, and component T-Scores should be entered in the matrix which appears at the middle of the adjoining page. Once the necessary conversions have been made and all T-Scores entered in on the Profile Summary Sheet, you may then begin to plot your component scores on the graphs provided.
May 10, 1979

Mr. Dennie Richardson
1410 East View Drive
Weatherford, Texas 76086

Dear Mr. Richardson,

Thank you for ordering 50 copies of the Styles of Leadership Survey for use in your dissertation research; they were shipped yesterday.

You may consider this official permission to use the survey for research. Because of copyright law, our instruments cannot be reproduced in any way; however, you are welcome to use a few sample questions in your appendix.

We will be very interested to see your completed project; please let us know if we may be of further help.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Donnell
Research Associate

SMD
CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Your official title: ______________________________________

2. Personal Characteristics:
   A. Age: Below 30__ 30-39__ 40-49__ 50-59__ 60+__
   B. Sex: Male__ Female__

3. Directly responsible to whom?
   President____ Principal Academic Officer____
   Other____ (Specify: ________________________________)

4. Educational Background?
   Degree held Major Institution Granting Degree
   ________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________

5. Previous Professional Experience: No. of Years
   Teaching in Post-secondary institutions
   (Subject area: ______________________) __________
   Student Affairs (Positions: ________________) __________
   Religious (Positions: ________________) __________
   Other (Specify: ______________________) __________

6. How many years of experience as Chief Student Affairs Administrator?
   __________

7. Number of professional staff members who are directly responsible to you in the student affairs area. (Do not include clerical or part-time personnel): __________
8. Consider all of the following statements describing possible leadership styles. Rank the statements from most to least characteristic of your leadership style; 1 is most characteristic and 5 is least characteristic. When you finish ranking the style statements, there should be only one of each number from 1 to 5.

1. Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable friendly organization atmosphere and work tempo.

2. Work accomplishment is from committed people; interdependence through a "common stake" in organization purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect.

3. Exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate to sustain organization membership.

4. Adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out work with maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level.

5. Efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree. A leader's responsibility is primarily to plan, direct, and control the work.
# DATA FROM STYLES OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

## RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Number</th>
<th>Leadership Style *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* - Leadership Styles:
  9/9 - Purpose is from integration of task and human requirements (Team)
  5/5 - Purpose comes first, but morale cannot be ignored. Push enough to get the work done, but give enough too to get the morale necessary. (Middle-of-the-Road)
  9/1 - Men are a commodity just as machines. A leader's responsibility is primarily to plan, direct, and control the work. (Task)
  1/9 - Purpose is incidental to lack of conflict and "good fellowship." (Country Club)
  1/1 - Purpose is unobtainable because people are lazy and indifferent. Sound and mature relationships are difficult to achieve because conflict is inevitable. (Impoverished)

** - Respondents indicated only most and least characteristic answer; therefore, totals are incomplete.

*** - No Styles of Leadership Survey returned.
DATA FROM STYLES OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

T-Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Number</th>
<th>9/9</th>
<th>5/5</th>
<th>9/1</th>
<th>1/9</th>
<th>1/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* These standardized scores have a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten. They are based on the data obtained from 2844 leaders in education, civic, business, industry, government, and service organizations.

** Leadership Styles:

9/9 - Purpose is from integration of task and human requirements. (Team)

5/5 - Purpose comes first, but morale cannot be ignored. Push enough to get the work done, but give enough too to get morale necessary. (Middle-of-the-Road)

9/1 - Men are a commodity just as machines. A leader's responsibility is primarily to plan, direct, and control the work. (Task)

1/9 - Purpose is incidental to lack of conflict and "good fellowship." (Country Club)

1/1 - Purpose is unobtainable because people are lazy and indifferent. Sound and mature relationships are difficult to achieve because conflict is inevitable. (Impoverished)

*** Respondents indicated only most and least characteristic answer; therefore, totals are incomplete.

**** No Styles of Leadership Survey returned.
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