

Leadership and Adaptability styles of Deans and Department Chairpersons at Three Institutions of Higher Education in Jordan

Dr. Aieman A. AL-Omari

Department of Education Foundations and Administration
Faculty of Educational Sciences
Hashemite University

Abstract

The objective of this study is to identify leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairpersons as perceived by them at three institutions of higher education in Jordan. With regard to leadership style, both deans and department chairs selected 'selling' as their primary leadership style, and selected 'participating' as their secondary style. Regarding style adaptability, deans and department chairs came in the middle range of scores. Scores in this range usually indicate a pronounced primary leadership style with less flexibility into the secondary styles. Finally, implications for practice are provided for deans and department chairpersons.

Introduction

The literature addressing leadership theories and models in higher education tends to consider college presidents and upper-level administrators as leaders, and rarely focuses on mid-level managers, deans and department chairs, for their leadership styles. Despite the fact that nearly 80 % of all administrative decisions in higher education are made at the department level (Wolverton, Gmelch, Wolverton, & Sarros, 1999; Hilosky, & Watwood, 1997). Department chairs are slow to gain recognition as leaders and agents of change (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995).

This study focuses on this category in an attempt to provide for a concentrated study in positions of leadership.

The importance of an educated population has been emphasized for a long time in Jordan. Milestones Acts (Education Act 1964, 1994, and 2004, Higher Education Act 1980 and 1985) have been passed to ensure

widespread access to higher education among citizens. The first public Jordanian university, The University of Jordan, was established in 1962. Yarmouk University followed in 1976, and eight more public universities were established in different parts of the Kingdom since that date. In 1989 the Council of Higher Education endorsed the first policy document authorizing the establishment of private universities. Amman University, the first Jordanian private university, was established in 1990. An impressive number of twelve more private universities were founded since that date (Altal, 1998).

At present, there are ten public and thirteen private universities in Jordan. The Bachelor's degree is offered at both types, while Master's and Doctorate degrees are confined to public universities, except for "Amman Arab University for Graduate studies", which is a private university specialized in offering Master's and Doctorate degrees (Altal, 1998).

The situational leadership model developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) was used as the framework for this study. Therefore, by using the situational leadership model as a framework, and the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD)-Self instrument, this study investigates the leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairs as perceived by them, and how demographic variables (discipline, experience in higher education, and experience in current position) influence leadership styles and style adaptability levels of them at three Public Institutions of Higher Education in Jordan.

Theoretical Framework: The Situational Leadership Model

As a theoretical framework of this study, the situational leadership model, developed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (1996) is based on the interrelationships among three salient elements of group dynamics: First, amount of guidance and direction (i.e., task behavior) a leader provides to members of the organization; second, amount of socio-emotional support (i.e., relationship behavior) a leader provides to members of the organization; and third, readiness levels (i.e., maturity levels) that followers exhibit in working on tasks necessary for the achievement of organizational goals. This concept provides leaders with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of readiness of their subordinates.

Hersey et al. (1996), as well as other leadership theorists such as Fiedler (1967) and Blake and Mouton (1964), maintain that no single leadership style is appropriate for all situations. Effective leaders adapt their leadership behaviors to the readiness levels of subordinates. In the situational leadership model, the two dimensions of task and relationship are related to a third dimension: the maturity levels of the group or organization, or rather its readiness.

Readiness in situational leadership is defined as the extent to which a subordinate demonstrates the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific assigned task. Readiness is not a personal characteristic; it is not an evaluation of a person's traits, values, or age. Readiness is how prepared a person may perform a particular task (Hersey et al., 1996). Four leadership styles that reflect behaviors along two dimensions. The first dimension, Task Behavior, consists of one-way communication and activities that are highly directive. In other words, the leader is explicit about assigning duties and responsibilities to be met by their subordinates. Leadership behaviors within this dimension include telling them what to do, and how, when, and where to do the assigned tasks.

The second dimension, Relationship Behavior, focuses on the leader's facilitative ability to reach desired goals, and consists of two-way communication and providing support, encouragement, and positive psychological feedback. According to the Situational Leadership model, leadership styles refer to four salient communication patterns the leader may use in talking to followers, which are telling, selling, participating, and delegating.

Effective leaders determine which leadership style is most appropriate for them by first assessing the readiness level of the subordinates, which is their ability and willingness to perform the task. The two major components of readiness are ability and willingness. Ability is the knowledge, experience, and skill that an individual or group brings to a particular task or activity. Willingness is the extent to which an individual or group has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996).

After identifying the readiness level of the individual or group they are attempting to influence, the leader determines the most appropriate leadership style. Hence, style adaptability is the extent to which the leaders are able to vary their style in response to the demands of a particular situation

or problem. On the basis of guidelines for interpreting style adaptability, the lower range of scores, 0 to 23, indicates a need to develop the ability to diagnose task readiness, (i.e., the situation, and to use an appropriate leadership style in response to that situation). The middle range of scores, 24 to 29, reflects a moderate degree of adaptability. Lastly, the upper range of scores, 30 to 36, indicates that the leader can accurately diagnose the ability and willingness of followers in a particular situation and adjust their leadership style accordingly.

All leaders have a primary leadership style and that most leaders have a secondary leadership style. A leader's primary leadership style is defined as the behavior pattern used most often when attempting to influence the activities of others, for example, a preferred subordinate. A leader's secondary leadership style is the behavior pattern most often used only on occasion. Further, leaders have one primary leadership style, and they tend to use one of the four basic leadership styles described in Situational Leadership in most leadership situations. However, they may have no secondary leadership style or they may have up to three secondary styles (Hersey et al., 1996).

For deans and department chairpersons' positions, formal training, instruction, or orientation positions are often non-existent (Bennett, 1982; Tucker, 1984). Deans and department chairpersons are placed in charge of academic units without actual knowledge of people management skills or how to accomplish group goals. These academics are given responsibility without proper advising or instruction, and some have difficulty in this situation at the expense of their respective departments. Recommendations for dean and department chairperson training and workshops are found in the works of Bennett (1982) and Tucker (1984). As Redwood, Goldwasser, and Street (1999) acknowledge, "some leaders are born, but most need help."

Therefore, deans and department chairpersons, especially those new to their positions, can confront their new challenges with fewer problems if they understand essential elements for developing a culture of proactive change. Deans and department chairpersons are expected to be agents of change, college professionals, and mentors guiding faculty and staff through team building and professional development. These differing perceptions of the position place further multiple, conflicting, and consequential pressures upon deans and department chairpersons (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Sarros, 1999; Kapel & Dejnozka, 1979).

The studies addressing the leadership styles of deans and department chairpersons are limited (Almgadi and Alnaji, 1994). Most of the research has focused on specific and different topics such as their transition from research and teaching to academic management (Arter, 1981), their dilemmas and stress in leadership (Cleveland, 1960; Wolverton, Gmelch, Wolverton, & Sarros, 1999), their position of conflict (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972; Wolverton, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 1999), their management skills and mobility (Sagaria, 1988; Sagaria & Krotseng, 1986), and their role in governance and decision making (Baldrige, 1971). Given this limited research, there is a need to further study leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairpersons at three public universities in Jordan.

Statement of the Problem

As academic administrators, deans and department chairpersons are called upon to interact with and influence others in leading their faculties, and administrative cabinets. These two groups, the faculties and administrative cabinets, each with varied responsibilities, hierarchical relationships, educational backgrounds, attitudes, and personalities, present to deans and department chairpersons differing leadership situations. Whether a dean or department chairperson can manage these situations in an equal and effective manner given their own individual leadership style and background, may determine the amount of satisfaction a dean or department chairperson garners from their position. The interaction of a dean's or department chairperson's leadership style with the group leadership situations within the faculty and administrative cabinet can greatly influence the success of the dean or department chairperson with these groups as well as with the institution.

The problem as presented seeks to explore leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairpersons as perceived by them at three public universities in Jordan, and to investigate the differing leadership situations with which a dean and department chairperson are presented, and to relate these situations to their perceived leadership styles.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to identify leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairpersons as perceived by them at three public institutions of higher education in Jordan. The following research questions were developed for the study.

- 1 - How do deans and department chairpersons perceive their leadership styles?
- 2 - What is the average style adaptability level among deans and department chairpersons?
- 3 - Are there significant mean differences in leadership styles for deans of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experiences in current position?
- 4 - Are there significant mean differences in leadership styles for department chairs of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experiences in current position?
- 5 - Are there significant mean differences in style adaptability levels for deans of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experiences in current position?
- 6 - Are there significant mean differences in style adaptability levels for department chairs of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experiences in current position?

Significance of the problem

Most of the literature on organizational leadership concerns the leadership style and the relationship of a principal leader of a single group that the leader is perceived to lead. Such a view of organizational leadership admits to only one hierarchical relationship, a leader of a subordinate group. This approach to understanding organizational leadership styles does not adequately replicate the most complex situation in a university where the principal leaders, the deans and department chairpersons, are expected to lead equally well multiple groups, one of which is hierarchically superior and another of which is subordinate to the dean and department chairperson.

Results of this study have important implications for deans and department chairs. By understanding their leadership styles and style adaptability level, deans and department chairs can use such information to design effective leading strategies. With deans and department chairs knowing their subordinates', they will be better prepared to help subordinates achieve success and objectives. Therefore, this study may help in seeking feasible approaches to help deans and department chairs

find the most effective ways of leading. The result of this study will also help fill in the gap in the literature related to the lack of research in higher education and the contradictory results regarding the leadership styles and style adaptability levels among deans and department chairs.

Operational definitions

Terms are operationally defined as of the tool used; (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996):

Leadership: The process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996).

Leadership Style: The behavior pattern a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others. This comprises four styles:

- Style 1 (Telling): This leadership style is characterized by above-average amounts of task behavior and below-average amounts of relationship behavior. It is appropriate when an individual or group is low in ability and willingness and needs direction. It emphasizes directive behavior in which the leader identifies the roles of followers and tells them what, how, when, and where to do various tasks.

- Style 2 (Selling): This leadership style is characterized by above-average amounts of both task and relationship behavior. The task behavior is appropriate because people are still considered unable, but because they are trying, it is important to be supportive of their motivation and commitment. The leader establishes and maintains two-way communication and provides sufficient support and reinforcement so that followers will psychologically accept the leader's decisions.

- Style 3 (Participating): This style is characterized by above-average amounts of relationship behavior and below-average amounts of task behavior. The decision-making procedure being shared by both the leader and follower characterizes this style. The leader maintains the role of confidence in the aptitude of his followers

- Style 4 (Delegating): This style is characterized by below-average amounts of both relationship and task behavior. The followers are allowed to take charge and decide for themselves what, how, when, and where to do various tasks. The leader shows complete confidence in his followers' aptitudes and decisions

Style Adaptability: The degree to which leaders are able to vary their style according to the demands of a given situation, per the Situational Leadership Model.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The following are limitations and resulting delimitations of the current study:

- 1 - The study is limited to the department chairs and deans at three public Institutions of Higher Education in Jordan.
- 2 - This inquiry into leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairs at three of Public Institutions of Higher Education in Jordan. Therefore, the study findings cannot be generalized to other areas of education or other administrative positions within or outside of the universities studied.
- 3 - The data collection and analysis of the study are limited to three public Institutions of Higher Education. Therefore, the findings of this study should not be interpreted representative of the views of other deans and department chairs at other academic institutions.
- 4 - Only predefined leadership styles are evaluated using the survey instrument. Therefore, findings of this study may not be inclusive of leadership styles that are personally unique or dependent upon the individual holding the position of dean or department chair.

Methodology

The Population and Sample of the Study

The population of concern is all ten public universities in Jordan. The sampling frame of institutions is represented by the listing of public universities in each region of Jordan (North, Middle, and South).

Stage one of the sampling process was institution selection. A random selection of institution was choosing from each of three regions in Jordan. From the three selected institutions, academic deans and department chairs were chosen. Specifically, deans and department chairs in the disciplines of science and humanities were considered for selection.

The population in all three universities was (34) deans and (121) department chairpersons. The sample from the population was taken as a purposive trial. A total of 150 survey packages were mailed and 97 responses were received (21 deans and 76 department chairpersons), for an 84% response rate.

Research Design

A survey research design was used in this study. Kerlinger (1986) describes survey research as a “useful tool for educational fact-finding” (p. 386) and “is best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes” (p. 386). It is a methodological technique requiring systematic collection of data from samples of populations through questionnaires or interviews. It is especially appropriate for making descriptive studies of large populations (Kerlinger, 1986). The nature of the present study requires obtaining quantitative data from a sample of a large population. A self-administered questionnaire is efficient and offered the advantage of contact with a large number of subjects in a relatively short period of time.

This study is quantitative and uses descriptive research design to investigate the leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairpersons as perceived, and examines how leadership styles may be affected by selected variables.

Instrumentation

Data are collected using the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD)-Self Instrument. The LEAD-Self Instrument is used in this study to evaluate behaviors displayed by deans and department chairs, as they perceive themselves. The LEAD-Self Instrument yields four style scores and one normative adaptability score from 12 management situational questions.

The LEAD-Self Instrument consists of 12 management situations and four possible leadership style responses for each: 1) a high task-low relationship behavior; 2) a high task-high relationship behavior; 3) a high relationship-low task behavior; and 4) a low relationship-low task behavior. The respondent selects the answer that most closely matches how they think they would typically respond in a given situation.

The LEAD-Self Instrument is designed to measure self-perceptions of three dimensions of leadership behavior: 1) style; 2) style range; and 3) style adaptability. Style and style range are indicated by scores in four quadrants of the situational leadership model: quadrant 1, high task and low relationship behavior; quadrant 2, high task and high relationship behavior; quadrant 3, high relationship and low task behavior; and quadrant 4, low relationship and low task behavior. The dominant leadership style of a respondent is defined as the quadrant with the highest frequent responses on the LEAD-Self Instrument; the

minimum to maximum score range for each quadrant is 0-12. A respondent's supporting style (or styles) is defined as a style they might apply on occasion. At least two responses in a quadrant are required for a style to be considered a supporting style.

The degree to which an individual's leadership behaviors are appropriate to the demands of a given situation is known as style adaptability. Hersey and Blanchard developed a scoring procedure for style adaptability. For each of the 12 situations presented in the LEAD-Self Instrument, the leadership behavior with the highest probability of success is scored a 3 and the least appropriate is scored a 0. Thus, style adaptability scores range from 0 (i.e., the highly unlikely instance in which a respondent's leadership behaviors are by no means appropriate for a given situation) to 36 (i.e., the respondent's leadership behaviors are maximally appropriate), with scores below 23 representing an ineffective ability to vary style according to leadership situations, and scores above 30 representing an effective ability to vary style according to the situation (Center for Leadership Studies, 2002).

The stability of the LEAD-Self Instrument, according to Greene (1980), is moderately strong. For example, in two administrations separated by a six-week interval, 75 percent of managers maintained their dominant style, and 71 percent maintained their supporting styles. Pre- and post- correlations for both the dominant and supporting styles were 0.71, and each was significant ($p < .01$) (Greene, 1980). For this study, the researcher used the Arabic version of LEAD - Self Instrument that was translated by (Almgadi and Alnaji, 1994). Validity and reliability of the instrument was tested, The reliability value was (0.791) and seemed high enough for use with Jordanian population.

Data Analysis

Quantitative descriptive statistics were used to find the prevalent leadership style among all deans and department chairpersons at the three public universities in Jordan. Means and Standard Deviations scores were used to find the average style adaptability level among all deans and department chairs surveyed. A two-tailed t-test was used to determine any differences on the mean scores of leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairpersons. Multivariate Analysis of Variance MANOVA and an analysis of the variance ANOVA comparing leadership mean scores for each of the demographic variables was used. Tukey HSD post hoc were used as follow-up tests.

Results

Leadership Styles of Deans and Department Chairpersons

Question 1: How do deans and department chairpersons perceive their leadership styles?

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations for Deans' and Department Chairpersons' LEAD-Self Quadrant Scores

	Deans (N = 21)		Department chairpersons (N = 76)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Quadrant 1, high task and low relationship behavior (telling)	1.43	1.99	1.58	1.94
Quadrant 2, high task and high relationship behavior (selling)	5.29	1.59	5.20	1.69
Quadrant 3, low task and high relationship behavior (participating)	4.76	1.70	4.33	1.67
Quadrant 4, low task and low relationship behavior (delegating)	.52	.75	.89	.97

Table 1 shows that both deans and department chairpersons selected selling (high task/ high relationship) as their primary leadership style with mean scores on this dimension of 5.29 and 5.20, respectively. Additionally, both groups ranked participating as their secondary leadership style.

Table 2: t-Test for Equality of Means: Deans' and Department Chairpersons' LEAD-Self Quadrant Scores

	T	df	Significance (2-tailed)
Quadrant 1, high task and low relationship behavior (telling)	-.313	95	.755
Quadrant 2, high task and high relationship behavior (selling)	.215	95	.830
Quadrant 3, low task and high relationship behavior (participating)	1.048	95	.297
Quadrant 4, low task and low relationship behavior (delegating)	-1.616	95	.110

To see if there are any significant differences between the deans' and department chairpersons' LEAD-Self quadrant scores, table 2 shows a two-tailed t-test for equality is used. The results show no significant differences exist between the two groups (deans and department chairpersons) in all LEAD-Self quadrant scores.

Style Adaptability level of Deans and Department chairpersons

Question 2: What is the average style adaptability level among deans and department chairpersons?

Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations for the Deans' and Department Chairpersons' Style Adaptability Scores on the LEAD-Self

	Deans (N = 21)		Department chairpersons (N = 76)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Style Adaptability (Range: 0 to 36)	26.71	4.85	24.47	3.75

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for the deans' and department chairpersons' style adaptability scores on the LEAD-Self Instrument. The deans had a mean score of 26.71, while the department chairpersons had a mean score of 24.47. On the basis of guidelines for interpreting style adaptability scores suggested by Hersey, and associates, it appears that, overall, the deans are in the middle range of scores, yet very close to the upper range. The department chairpersons, on the other hand, are in the middle range of scores.

Table 4: t-Test for Equality of Means: Deans' and Department Chairpersons' Style Adaptability Scores on the LEAD-Self

	t	Df	Significance (2-tailed)
Style Adaptability (Range: 0 to 36)	2.267	95	.026*

* $p < .05$

Table 4 shows the results of a two-tailed t-test for equality of means to determine whether there was a significant difference between the deans' and department chairpersons' style adaptability scores on the LEAD-Self

Instrument. The results show significant differences between the deans' ($M = 26.71 \pm 4.85$) and department chairpersons' ($M = 24.47 \pm 3.75$), $t(95) = 2.267$, $p = .026$ style adaptability scores on the LEAD-Self instrument. Thus, the deans had significantly higher scores for style adaptability than the department chairpersons.

Leadership Styles and Demographic Variables

Question 3: Are there significant mean differences in leadership styles for deans of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experiences in current position?

Regarding to experience in higher education variable, all deans' experience in higher education was in long level (over 10 years). There are fewer than two groups for dependent variables style 1, style 2, style 3, and style 4, no statistics are computed. Therefore, a Two-Way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of disciplines and experience in current position on the four styles of dean's leadership style.

Table 5: Two-Way Multivariate Tests for Leadership Styles (Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating) for Deans Disciplines and Experience in Current Position

Effect	Wilks' Lambda Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Discipline	.680	2.201	3	14	.133
Experience in Current Position	.585	1.433	6	28	.237
Discipline X Experience in Current Position	.852	.812	3	14	.508

Table 5 presents the Two-Way MANOVA results. MANOVA results indicate that discipline (Wilks' Lambda = .680, $F(3, 14) = 2.201$, $p = .133$), experience in current position (Wilks' Lambda = .585, $F(6, 28) = 1.433$, $p = .237$), and interaction between disciplines and experience in current position (Wilks' Lambda = .852, $F(3, 14) = .812$, $p = .508$) no significantly affect the combined dependent variable of leadership styles (Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating).

Question 4: Are there significant mean differences in leadership styles for department chairs of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experience in current position?

A Three-Way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of disciplines, experience in higher education, and experience in current position on the four styles of department chair's leadership style.

Table 6: Three-Way Multivariate Tests for Leadership Styles (Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating) for Department Chairs Disciplines, experience in higher education, and Experience in Current Position

Effect	Wilks' Lambda Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Discipline	.871	2.768	3	56	.05*
Experience in higher education	.908	.920	6	112	.483
Experience in Current Position	.685	3.884	6	112	.001*
Discipline X Experience in higher education	.925	.742	6	112	.617
Discipline X Experience in Current Position	.826	1.878	6	112	.091
Experience in higher education X Experience in Current Position	.850	.786	12	148.-454	.664
Discipline X Experience in higher education X Experience in Current Position	.873	.649	12	148.-454	.797

Table 6 presents the Three-Way MANOVA results. MANOVA results revealed significant differences between disciplines categories (Wilks' Lambda = .871, $F(3, 56) = 2.768$, $p = .05$), and significant differences among experiences in current position (Wilks' Lambda = .685, $F(6, 112) = 3.884$, $p = .001$) on the combined dependent variable of leadership styles (Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating). Univariate and Tukey HSD post hoc tests were conducted as follow-up tests.

Table 7: ANOVA Summary for the Department Chairs' Leadership Styles regarding their Disciplines and Experience in Current Position

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Telling	127.271	1	127.271	41.307	.000*
	Selling	1409.396	1	1409.396	509.254	.000*
	Participating	959.784	1	959.784	394.891	.000*
	Delegating	43.946	1	43.946	50.645	.000*
Disciplines	Telling	10.661	1	10.661	3.460	.068
	Selling	.858	1	.858	.310	.580
	Participating	16.792	1	16.792	6.909	.011*
	Delegating	8.718E-03	1	8.718E-03	.010	.921
Experience in Current Position	Telling	47.968	2	23.984	7.784	.001*
	Selling	27.779	2	13.889	5.019	.010*
	Participating	8.698	2	4.349	1.789	.176
	Delegating	7.190	2	3.595	4.143	.021*
Error	Telling	178.702	58	3.081		
	Selling	160.519	58	2.768		
	Participating	140.969	58	2.431		
	Delegating	50.329	58	.868		
Total	Telling	472.000	76			
	Selling	2267.000	76			
	Participating	1633.000	76			
	Delegating	132.000	76			

Table 7 presents ANOVA results. ANOVA results indicate that leadership style (participating) significantly differs for disciplines ($F(1, 58) = 6.909$, $p = .011$). Leadership style (telling) ($F(2, 58) = 7.784$, $p = .001$), (selling) ($F(2, 58) = 5.019$, $p = .010$), and (delegating) ($F(2, 58) = 4.143$, $p = .021$) significantly differs for experiences in current position.

Table 8: Means and Standard Deviations for the Department Chairs' Leadership Style (Participating) regarding their Disciplines

Discipline	Mean	SD
Science	4.870	.345
Humanities	3.732	.262

Table 8 shows the significant difference for discipline among department chairs with participating leadership styles, that department chairs with science discipline are more (participating) leadership style than humanities department chairs.

The means and standard deviations for the Department Chairs' Leadership Styles (telling, selling, and delegating) as a function of the experience in current position are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Means and Standard Deviations for the Department Chairs' Leadership styles regarding their Experience in Current Position

Leadership style	Experiences in Current Position	Mean	SD
Style 1 (telling)	Short (less 5 years)	2.864	.397
	Middle (5-10 years)	1.017	.469
	Long (over 10 years)	.818	.396
Style 2 (selling)	Short (less 5 years)	4.209	.376
	Middle (5-10 years)	5.761	.444
	Long (over 10 years)	5.667	.376
Style 4 (delegating)	Short (less 5 years)	.566	.211
	Middle (5-10 years)	1.467	.249
	Long (over 10 years)	.729	.210

Table 10: Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for the Department Chairs on Leadership Styles regarding to experience in current position

Leadership Styles	Experiences in Current Position	Short	Middle	Long
Style 1 (Telling)	Short	-	.016*	.000*
	Middle	.016*	-	.630
	Long	.000*	.630	-
Style 2 (Selling)	Short	-	.033*	.019*
	Middle	.033*	-	.987
	Long	.019*	.987	-
Style 4 (Delegating)	Short	-	.021*	.275
	Middle	.021*	-	.292
	Long	.275	.292	-

* $p < .05$

Table 10 presents Tukey HSD results. Tukey HSD results for (Telling) and experiences in current position indicate that department chairs with short experience in current position significantly differ from those with middle and long experiences in current position.

(Selling) and experiences in current position indicate that department chairs with middle experience in current position significantly differ from those with short and long experience in current position. (Delegating) and experiences in current position indicate that department chairs with middle experience in current position significantly differ from those with short and long experience in current position.

Style Adaptability Level and Demographic Variables

Question 5: Are there significant mean differences in style adaptability levels for deans of different disciplines, experience in higher education, and experiences in current position?

Regarding to experience in higher education, all deans' experience in higher education was in long level (over 10 years). There are fewer than two groups for dependent variables style adaptability level, no statistics are computed. Therefore, a Two-Way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the effects of the disciplines and experiences in current position on deans' style adaptability levels.

Table 11: Two-Way ANOVA Summary for the Deans' Style Adaptability Level regarding their Disciplines and Experience in Current Position

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	71.002	1	71.002	317.030	.000
Disciplines	6.410E-03	1	6.410E-03	.029	.868
Experiences in Current Position	2.439	2	1.220	5.446	.016*
Discipline X Experiences in Current Position	2.314	1	2.314	10.333	.005*
Error	3.583	16	.224		
Total	102.000	21			

In Table 11, the results for the ANOVA indicated no significant effect for disciplines, $F(1, 16) = .029$, $p = .868$, a significant main effect for experience in current position, $F(2, 16) = 5.446$, $p = .016$, and a significant interaction between disciplines and experience in current position, $F(1, 16) = 10.333$, $p = .005$.

The means and standard deviations for the Deans' style adaptability levels as a function of the two variables discipline and experience in current position are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Means and Standard Deviations for the Deans' Style Adaptability Levels regarding their Disciplines and Experience in Current Position

Discipline	Experiences in Current Position	Mean	SD
Science	Short (less 5 years)	18.750	1.320
	Middle (5-10 years)	24.708	.852
	Long (over 10 years)	30.667	1.078
Humanities	Short (less 5 years)	26.833	1.078
	Middle (5-10 years)	28.333	1.525
	Long (over 10 years)	28.000	1.867

Because the interaction between disciplines and experience in current position was significant, we chose to examine the method simple main effects, that is, the differences among experiences in current positions for science and humanities disciplines separately. To control

type I error across the two simple main effects, we set alpha for each at .025. There were no significant differences between experiences of current position for sciences, $F(2, 16)=2.50$, $p=.9$, but there were significant differences for humanities, $F(2, 16)=5.16$, $p=.01$.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate the three pairwise differences among the means for humanities, with alpha set at .008 (.025/3 = .008) to control for Type I error over the three pairwise comparisons. The deans with middle experience in current position had significantly upper style adaptability level than either the deans with short or long experiences in current position. There were no significant differences between the long experience and middle experience in current position.

Question 6: Are there significant mean differences in style adaptability levels for department chairs of different disciplines, experiences in higher education, and experiences in current position?

A three-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the effects of the disciplines, experience in higher education, and experience in current position on department chairs' style adaptability levels.

Table 13: Three-Way ANOVA Summary for the Department Chairs' Style Adaptability Level regarding their Disciplines, Experience in higher education and Experience in Current Position

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	31328.600	1	31328.600	2793.101	.000*
Disciplines	21.211	1	21.211	1.891	.174
Experiences in higher education	49.988	2	24.994	2.228	.117
Experiences in Current Position	180.623	2	90.312	8.052	.001*
Disciplines X Experiences in higher education	19.921	2	9.960	.888	.417
Discipline X Experiences in Current Position	10.675	2	5.337	.476	.624
Experiences in higher education X Experiences in Current Position	108.258	4	27.065	2.413	.059
Disciplines X Experiences in higher education X Experiences in Current Position	54.231	4	13.558	1.209	.317
Error	650.552	58	11.216		
Total	46578.000	76			

In Table 13, a three-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the effects of discipline, experience in higher education, and experience in current position on the department chairs' style adaptability levels. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between the independent variables, but significant main effect for experience in current position, $F(2, 58) = 8.052$, $P = .001$.

The means and standard deviations for style adaptability levels as a function of the experience in current position are presented in Table 12.

Table 14: Means and Standard Deviations for the Department Chairs' Style Adaptability Levels regarding their experience in current position

Experiences in Current Position	Mean	SD
Short (less 5 years)	22.094	.758
Middle (5-10 years)	25.456	.894
Long (over 10 years)	26.171	.756

Table 15: Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for the Department Chairs on Style Adaptability Level regarding to experience in current position

Experiences in Current Position	Short	Middle	Long
Short	-	.047*	.001*
Middle	.047*	-	.550
Long	.001*	.550	-

Table 15 presents Tukey HSD results. Tukey HSD post hoc test were conducted as follow-up test. The results of this analysis indicate that the department chairs with middle and long experiences in current position had significantly upper style adaptability level than either the deans with short or long experiences in current position. There were no significant differences between the long experience and middle experience in current position.

Discussion and Conclusions

Summary of findings

With regard to leadership style, both deans and department chairs selected selling (high task/high relationship behavior) as their primary

leadership style, and selected participating as their secondary style. With selling as the main category of leadership style, deans and department chairs appear to acquire the acceptance of their faculty and staff and carryout the behaviors most wanted or needed by them. According to the Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. (2002), the followers in this style are confident and willing to take responsibility but are unable to do because of lack of expertise.

Regarding style adaptability, deans and department chairs fell in the middle range of scores. According to the Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. (2002), the middle range reflects "...a moderate degree of adaptability. Scores in this range usually indicate a pronounced primary leadership style with less flexibility into the secondary styles".

Based upon the findings of this study, it could be concluded that leadership styles of deans are not significantly affected by demographic variables. There was insufficient evidence to show that a significant difference exists for leadership styles of deans as perceived by them and their discipline, their experience in current position. For experience in higher education, there are fewer than two groups for dependent variables style 1, style 2, style 3, and style 4, no statistics are computed.

Contrary to deans' leadership style, it could be concluded that the leadership styles of department chairs are affected by demographic factors. A significant difference exists between the leadership styles of department chairs and their disciplines in participating. The results indicated that department chairs in science discipline differ significantly from department chairs in humanities disciplines in participating style of leadership. There is insufficient evidence to show that a significant difference exists between the leadership styles of department chairs and their experience in higher education. A significant difference exists between leadership styles among department chairs regarding their experience in their current position. A difference was regarding telling, selling, and delegating leadership styles.

The results indicated that telling style of department chairs with short experience in current position differ significantly from department chairs with middle and long experience in current position. Also, the results indicated that selling style of department chairs with middle experience in current position differ significantly from department chairs with short and long experience in current position. In addition to

that, the results indicated that delegating style of department chairs with middle experience in current position differ significantly from department chairs with short and long experience in current position. Professional and organizational development in communication, decision-making, and problem solving abilities improve the quality of decisions made at college and department level.

Style adaptability levels of deans and department chairs at the three Jordanian universities evaluated for this study are not significantly affected by their discipline. Also, results of the study indicated that regarding factor experience in higher education, there are fewer than two groups for dependent variables style adaptability level for deans therefore no statistics are computed. For department chairs no significant difference exists between style adaptability levels among department chairs regarding their experience in higher education. A significant difference exists between style adaptability levels among deans regarding their experience in their current position, and interaction between discipline and experiences in current position. The results indicated that there were no significant differences between experiences in current position for science discipline, but there were significant differences for humanities discipline. The deans with middle experiences in current position had significantly upper style adaptability level than either the deans with short or long experiences in current position.

In addition to that a significant difference exists between style adaptability levels among department chairs regarding their experience in their current position. The results indicated that the department chairs with middle and long experiences in current position had significantly upper style adaptability level than the department chairs with short experience in current position.

Discussion of findings

Universities expect their deans and department chairs to lead effectively, and as such, have a role to play in ensuring that their deans and department chairs lead well (Wolverton, Gmelch, Montez, & Nies, 2001). In spite of the fact that leadership adaptability and effectiveness is difficult, the results of this study suggest that deans and department

chairs in this sample are performing well and their style adaptability level were in the upper middle range. It should be noted that the sample size limits generalizability.

An organization's reputation is reliant on those who labor to produce the end result, but the element that holds the organization together lies midway between that workforce and its perceived leadership (Wolverton et al., 2001). In higher education, academic deans and department chairs fill that role. Despite strong scholarly credentials, academic deans and department chairs often find themselves under-prepared to deal with situations that require balancing the agendas of executive administration, external constituents and the faculty that they manage and represent (Wolverton et al., 2001). Research suggests that deans and department chairs serve in a leadership role that has strong political and social ramifications (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Sarros, 1999).

Based upon Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Sarros (1999); Kapel & Dejnozka (1979); and Bolton and Boyer's (1972) studies, professional and organizational development in academic colleges and departments helping deans and department chairs improve their capabilities to address at their own level the broad problem that faces developing their leadership style and style adaptability. At the same time developing educational plan, improving teaching effectiveness, and improving relationship among faculty, staff, and students. Therefore, deans and department chairpersons, especially those new to their positions, can confront their new challenges with fewer problems if they understand essential elements for developing a culture of proactive change.

Recommendations

While this study has added to the empirical base of knowledge about the leadership styles and adaptability level of deans and department chairs at three public universities in Jordan. The following recommendations are made as a result of the findings of this study:

Theoretical Recommendations

- 1 - More research is needed with a larger sample from higher education settings to confirm the results of this study.

- 2 - Further research could be conducted to establish whether there are differences between the leadership styles of male and female deans and department chairs at public institutions of Jordanian higher education.
- 3 - There is a need to explore the relationship of leadership styles and style adaptability between private and public institutions with different groups.

Practical Recommendations

- 1 - Colleges and universities should encourage faculty members to utilize available leadership style instruments to assess their leadership styles. This assessment can then be used for help in dealing with administrative situations, class preparation, designing class delivery methods, choosing educational technologies.
- 2 - Administrators of higher education institutions should establish a university-based center that educates deans and department chairs of their leadership styles and the weaknesses and strengths associated with their style. The center can also be used to help them choose the right style in the right time and place based on the situations needs.

Leadership training in higher education needs to be geared not only to those in leadership roles, but to those who have the capacity to occupy those roles in the future. LEAD-Self Instrument provides the means to obtain pre-assessments that can be used to identify training topics. This instrument can be used to provide a post assessment to help understand the effectiveness of the training.

Those who lead an institution must realize the context in which an institution operates. They must understand the need for sequential leadership and use institutional resources to ensure the proper preparation of its leadership.

أساليب القيادة والمواءمة لدى عمداء ورؤساء الأقسام في ثلاث من مؤسسات التعليم العالي في الأردن

د. إيمان أحمد العمري

قسم أصول التربية والإدارة - كلية العلوم التربوية
الجامعة الهاشمية

تكونت عينة الدراسة من (٢١) عميد كلية و(٧٦) رئيس قسم أكاديمي. وتم استخدام المتوسطات الحسابية وتحليل التباين للمتغيرات المتعددة وتحليل التباين أحادي الاتجاه في تحليل بيانات الدراسة. وأسفرت نتائج الدراسة عن أن عمداء ورؤساء الأقسام اختاروا الأسلوب القيادية "البيع" بصفة رئيسة، والأسلوب القيادية "المشاركة" بصفة ثانوية. أما مدى المواءمة فقد كان ضمن المدى المتوسط لكل من عمداء ورؤساء الأقسام.

REFERENCES

- 1 - Almgadi, A.M., & Alnaji, M.A. (1994). Leadership style of deans in King Faisal University in eastern area. **Journal of Arab Universities League**, 29, 208.
- 2 - Altal, Ahmad (1998). Higher Education in Jordan. Amman, Jordan.
- 3 - Arter, M.H. (1981). Career advancement from institutional research to academic utilizing institutional research. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR), Minneapolis, May 17-20, ERIC Document No. 205119.
- 4 - Baldrige, V.J. (1971). **Academic governance**. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- 5 - Bennett, J. (1982). Ambiguity and abrupt transitions in the department chairperson's role. **Educational Record**, 63(4), 53-56.
- 6 - Blake, R.R.; and Mouton, J.S. (1964). **The Managerial Grid**. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- 7 - Bolton, C. K.; & Boyer, R. K. (1973). Organizational development for academic departments. **Journal of Higher Education**, 44(5), 352-369.
- 8 - Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. (2002). LEAD Directions: Directions for self-scoring and analysis.
- 9 - Cleveland, H. (1960). The dean's dilemma: Leadership. **Public Administration Review**, 20, 22-27.
- 10 - Feltner, B.D.; & Goodsell, D.R. (1972). The academic dean and conflict management. **Journal of Higher Education**, 43(9), 692-701.
- 11 - Fiedler, F.E. (1967). **A theory of leadership effectiveness**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 12 - Glaser, C.; & Smalley, B.S. (1995). **Swim with the dolphins: How**

women can succeed in corporate America on their own terms. New York: Warner Books

- 13 - Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1995). **Chairing an academic department.** Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- 14 - Gmelch, W.H., Wolverson, M., Wolverson, M.L., & Sarros, J.C. (1999). The academic dean: An imperiled species searching for balance. **Research in Higher Education**, **40**, 717-740.
- 15 - Greene, J.F. (1980). Executive summary for the LEAD-Self Manual. Unpublished report. San Diego, CA: The Center for Leadership Studies.
- 16 - Hersey, P.; & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). **Management of organizational behavior.** NJ: Prentice -Hall, Inc.
- 17 - Hersey, P.; Blanchard, K.H., & Johnson, D.E. (1996). **Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (7th ed.).** Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 18 - Hersey, P.; & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). **Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (4th ed.),** R. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice -Hall, Inc.
- 19 - Hilosky, A.; and Watwood, B. (1997). Transformational leadership in a changing world: A survival guide for new chairs and deans. Paper Presented at the Sixth Annual International Conference of the Chair Academy, Reno, NV, Feb. 12-15.
- 20 - Kapel, D.E.; & Dejnozka, E.L. (1979). The education deanship: A further analysis. **Research in Higher Education**, **10**, 99-112.
- 21 - Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). **Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.).** Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- 22 - Redwood, S.; Goldwasser, C.; & Street, S. (1999). **Action management.** New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- 23 - Sagaria, M.A.; & Krotseng, M.V. (1986). Deans' managerial skills: What they need and what they bring to a job. **Journal of the College and University Personnel Association**, **37**(2), 1-7.
- 24 - Sagaria, M.A. (1988). Administrative mobility and gender: Pat-

- terns and prices in higher education. **Journal of Higher Education**, **59**(3), 306-326.
- 25 - Tucker, A. (1984). **Chairing the academic department: Leading among peers**, 2nd edition. NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- 26 - Wolverton, M.; Wolverton, M.L.; & Gmelch, W.H. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. **Journal of Higher Education**, **70**, 80-106.
- 27 - Wolverton, M.; Gmelch, W.H.; Montez, J.; & Nies, C.T. (2001). **The changing nature of the academic deanship**. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D. C.
- 28 - Wolverton, M.; Gmelch, W. H.; Wolverton, M. L.; & Sarros, J.C. (1999). Stress in academic leadership: U.S. and Australian department chairs/heads. **The Review of Higher Education**, **22**(2), 165-185.

ملحق

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته،،

بين يديكم إستبانة تهدف إلى التعرف على النمط القيادي الذي تتبعونه في تعاملكم اليومي مع مرؤوسيك (أعضاء هيئة التدريس، الإداريين، الطلبة.. الخ) في جامعتكم الموقرة.

يرجى تعاونكم في الإجابة على مفردات الاستبانة التي تحتوي على اثنتي عشرة حالة، وإذا أردتم معرفة نمطكم الإداري فسوف نزودكم به، علماً بأن إجاباتكم ستبقى سرية.

وتفضلوا بقبول خالص التحية

بيانات عامة:

- رتبتي الأكاديمية () أستاذ - المركز الوظيفي:
 - () أستاذ مشارك () عميد كلية
 - () أستاذ مساعد () رئيس قسم
 - () محاضر () عضو هيئة تدريس
 - () مدرس () أخرى
- عدد سنوات الخدمة في هذه الجامعة: النوع:
 - () أقل من ٥ سنوات () أنثى
 - () ٥ - ١٠ سنوات () ذكر
 - () أكثر من ١٠ سنوات
- عدد سنوات الخدمة في المركز الوظيفي الحالي:
 - () أقل من ٥ سنوات
 - () ٥ - ١٠ سنوات
 - () أكثر من ١٠ سنوات
- عدد سنوات الخدمة في التعليم العالي بشكل عام:
 - () أقل من ٥ سنوات
 - () ٥ - ١٠ سنوات
 - () أكثر من ١٠ سنوات

وصف فاعلية وتكيف القائد

تعليمات:

أفترض أنك تواجه كل من الحالات الأتية عشرة التالية، كل حالة يمكن معالجتها بواحد من أربعة تصرفات. اقرأ كل حالة بعناية مركزة، فكر فيما تفعل إزاء كل حالة، ثم ضع دائرة حول رمز الحل الذي تراه مناسباً لتصرفك في مثل هذه الحالات.

الرقم	الحالة	الأسلوب المستخدم
١-	في الآونة الأخيرة لم يعد مرؤوسوك متجاوبين لمحدثاتك الودية معهم واهتمامك الواضح برضايتهم، وأصبح إنتاجهم متدنياً بشكل مطرد.	أ - أؤكد على استخدام إجراءات محددة، وعلى ضرورة إنجاز المهمة. ب - أوضح استعدادي للمناقشة، ولكن لا أفرض نفسي عليهم. ج - أتكلم مع مرؤوسي، وأحدد بعد ذلك الأهداف. د - أتعهد ألا أتدخل في شؤون مرؤوسي.
٢-	الملاحظ أن إنجازات مرؤوسيك في ازدياد، وأنك لا تزال تعمل للتأكد من أن كل مرؤوسيك يدركون مسؤولياتهم، كما يدركون مستوى الأداء.	أ - أكون علاقة صداقة مع مرؤوسي للاستمرار في التأكد من أنهم يدركون مسؤولياتهم، كما يدركون مستوى الإنتاج المتوقع منهم. ب - لا آخذ أي إجراء محدد. ج - أعمل كل ما أستطيع لأجعل المرؤوسين يشعرون بأهميتهم وأهمية مشاركتهم. د - أؤكد على أهمية المهمة والوقت المحدد لإنجازها.
٣-	مرؤوسوك غير قادرين على حل المشكلات بأنفسهم، وببطبيعة الحال تركت لهم الأمر، ومع ذلك لا تزال علاقتهم الشخصية وإنتاجيتهم في مستوى جيد.	أ - أعمل مع مرؤوسي، ونشترك معا في حل المشكلات. ب - أدع مرؤوسي يحلون مشكلاتهم بأنفسهم. ج - أعمل بسرعة وبحزم لتوجيه وتصحيح الوضع. د - أشجع مرؤوسي على العمل على حل المشكلات، وأدعم مجهوداتهم.

الرقم	الحالة	الأسلوب المستخدم
٤-	لديك النية في إجراء بعض التغيير، سجل مرؤوسيك يشير إلى جودة إنجازهم، ومع ذلك هم يحترمون مبدأ التغيير.	أ - أدع جميع مرؤوسي يشاركون في تطوير التغيير مع عدم المبالغة في التوجيهات. ب - أعلن عن التغيير ثم أعمل على تنفيذه والإشراف عليه عن قرب. ج - أدع مرؤوسي يقومون بتحديد اتجاهاتهم. د - آخذ بعين الاعتبار اقتراحات مرؤوسي، على أن أوجه التغيير بنفسني.
٥-	خلال الأشهر القليلة الماضية، تدنى مستوى أداء مرؤوسيك وأصبحوا غير مهتمين بتحقيق الأهداف، وكانت إعادة تحديد المسؤوليات والمهام قد ساعدت بشكل كبير في الفترة الماضية. فمرؤوسوك ما زالوا بحاجة إلى التذكير بصورة مستمرة لإنجاز مهماتهم في الوقت المحدد.	أ - أدع مرؤوسي يحددون اتجاهاتهم. ب - آخذ بعين الاعتبار اقتراحات مرؤوسي، ولكن أتأكد من تحقيق الأهداف. ج - أعيد تعريف المهام والمسؤوليات ثم أشرف على ذلك بعناية. د - أدع مرؤوسي يشاركون في تحديد الأدوار والمسؤوليات، مع عدم المبالغة في التوجيهات.
٦-	تم التحاقك بمؤسسة تسير بكفاءة عالية، كان مديرها السابق شديدا وحازما، تود أن تحافظ على البيئة المنتجة بالإضافة إلى تحسين العلاقة الإنسانية داخل إطار المؤسسة.	أ - أعمل ما أستطيع لأجعل مرؤوسي يشعرون بأهميتهم وأهمية مشاركتهم. ب - أؤكد على أهمية المهمة والوقت المحدد لإنجازها. ج - أتعهد أن لا أتدخل في شؤون مرؤوسي. د - أشرك مرؤوسي في اتخاذ القرارات، وأتأكد من تحقيق الأهداف.
٧-	تود إجراء تغيير في تنظيم المؤسسة، والذي سوف يكون شيئا جديدا على مرؤوسي مجموعتك الذين ساهموا ببعض الاقتراحات التي تهدف إلى التغيير المطلوب، علما بأنهم يمتازون بالإنتاجية والمرونة في العمل.	أ - أعدد التغيير وأشرف عليه بعناية. ب - أشرك مرؤوسي في تطوير إجراءات التغيير، وأدع لهم الحرية في عملية التنفيذ. ج - أستعد لعمل التغييرات كما اقترحت، ولكن أحافظ على السيطرة على عملية التنفيذ. د - أتجنب المواجهة، وأدع الأمور تجري بشكل طبيعي.

الرقم	الحالة	الأسلوب المستخدم
٨-	إنتاجية مرؤوسيك وعلاقاتهم الشخصية جيدة ولكن لديك بعض الشعور بوجود نقص في توجيه مرؤوسيك.	أ - أدع مرؤوسي دون تدخل من جانبي. ب - أناقش الموقف مع مرؤوسي، وبعد ذلك أأخذ الإجراءات اللازمة للتغيير. ج - أأخذ الخطوات اللازمة لتوجيه مرؤوسي للعمل بطريقة واضحة ودقيقة. د - أساند مرؤوسي في مناقشة المشكلة مع عدم المبالغة في التوجيهات.
٩-	عيتك رئيسك على رأس مجموعة عمل، كانت قد فشلت في إعداد التوصيات المطلوبة للتغيير في الوقت المحدد، حيث إن مرؤوسيك لا يعرفون أهدافهم بوضوح، وكان حضورهم للجلسات ضعيفا، واجتماعاتهم أصبحت عبارة عن مناسبات اجتماعية، علما أن لديهم المواهب التي تساعد في إنجاز المهمة.	أ - أدع مرؤوسي يحلون مشكلاتهم بأنفسهم ب - آخذ بعين الاعتبار توصيات مرؤوسي، وأتأكد من تحقيق الأهداف. ج - أعيد تحديد الأهداف، وأشرف عليها بعناية. د - أدع مرؤوسي يشاركون في تحديد الأهداف بحرية.
١٠-	على الرغم من أن مرؤوسيك معروفون بقدرتهم على تحمل المسؤولية، إلا أنهم لم يتجاوبوا مع تعليماتك الخاصة بتحديد معيار جديد لمستوى الإنجاز المطلوب.	أ - أدع مرؤوسي يشاركون في تحديد المواصفات بدون رقابة. ب - أعيد تحديد مستوى الإنجاز وأشرف عليه بعناية ج - أتجنب المواجهة من خلال عدم ممارسة الضغوط على مرؤوسي وأترك الموقف بدون تدخل. د - آخذ بعين الاعتبار توصيات مرؤوسي وأتأكد من تحقيق المواصفات الجديدة.
١١-	حصلت على ترقية في وظيفة جديدة، وكان المشرف السابق لا يتدخل في شؤون مرؤوسيه، وعلى الرغم من ذلك استطاعوا السيطرة على مهامهم واتجاهاتهم والعلاقات الشخصية فيما بينهم في حالة جيدة.	أ - آخذ الخطوات اللازمة لتوجيه مرؤوسي للعمل بطريقة واضحة ودقيقة. ب - أشرك مرؤوسي في اتخاذ القرارات وأشجع المشاركة الجيدة. ج - أناقش وضع الإنجاز في الماضي مع مرؤوسي، ثم اختبر الحاجة إلى تطبيق إجراء جديد. د - أستمّر في ترك مرؤوسي دون تدخل من جانبي.

الرقم	الحالة	الأسلوب المستخدم
١٢-	أفادت المعلومات الحديثة عن وجود بعض الصعوبات الداخلية بين مرؤوسيك، علما بأن سجلاتهم تشير إلى إنجازهم العالي وحفاظهم بفاعلية على أهداف المؤسسة بعدية المدى، وأنهم كانوا يعملون معا بانسجام خلال السنة الماضية وجميعهم مؤهلون للقيام بالمهمة.	أ - أحاول عرض حلّي على مرؤوسي ثم أختبر الحاجة إلى تطبيق إجراء جديد. ب - أدع مرؤوسي يحلون مشكلاتهم بأنفسهم. ج - أتصرف بسرعة وبحزم لتصحيح الموقف، وتبني التوجيهات. د - أشارك في مناقشة المشكلة مع مرؤوسي مع تقديم الدعم لهم.

