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CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This thesis investigated the idea that leaders of environmental quality organizations respond to influences arising out of the organization itself as well as the social milieu in which it exists.

In the past, the study of social movements has been approached from many perspectives. These included, but have not been limited to, the social psychological perspective (French & Snyder, 1959), the social problems perspective (Mauss, 1975), and the encompassing perspective of collective behavior (Smelser, 1961). The latter claims to include the definitive study of social movements in the generic sense. Receiving considerably less attention was the organizational perspective, especially as it related to the study of social movement organization leadership. This orientation, as well as that of social movements, was used to examine leadership in environmental quality organizations. Research questions and accompanying propositions were drawn from a general statement by Zald and Ash (1966) which dealt with social movement organizations. In particular, two propositions relative to leader behavior were tested with data collected from a mail survey of environmental quality organizations. These propositions were based on the idea that leader behavior, to
some extent, is a reflection of changing environmental influences. Zald and Ash (1966) conceived of leader behavior in terms of Gusfield's (1966) typology of leadership style, which saw leader behavior as falling along a mobilizing-articulating continuum. Two influences, the movement organization's value orientation and membership requirements, were examined to determine their effect on leader behavior.

**Statement of the Problem**

Zald and Ash (1966) have presented a series of propositions centering upon the change process in social movement organizations. Two of these propositions addressed the concept of organizational leadership. These propositions were selected for study since they permitted a comprehensive test of the leadership component of the Zald and Ash construction. They were tested with data gathered from 40 environmental quality organizations and are presented below in their original form.

**Proposition 1.** An exclusive organization is almost certain to have a leadership which focuses on mobilizing membership for tasks, while the inclusive organization is readier to accept an articulating leadership style.

**Proposition 2.** The MO (movement organization) oriented to individual change is likely to have a leadership focused on mobilizing sentiments, not articulating with the larger society. Organizations oriented to changing the larger society are more
likely to require both styles of leadership, depending on the stage of their struggle.¹

These two propositions were presented by Zald and Ash (1966) in a theoretical synthesis of social movement organizational growth and decline. One of their major theses was that leadership in SMOs undergoes a variety of transformations that are dependent upon adaptation to changing environments. They illustrate these changing environments by dichotomizing the source of influence on leader behavior into the internal and external environments. Internal influence may be seen as demands placed upon leaders by members of the particular organization. External influence may be seen as those forces which effect the organization's contribution to the social movement and which originate in the social milieu that the organization operates within. Examples of internal influence would include internal pressure for an increase in the vehemency with which organizational positions are expounded as well as demands for increased communication between leaders and members. Along the same line, examples of external influence would include the need to buffer what may be considered extreme organizational positions on selected topics so they may appear more acceptable to influential groups or individuals in the social milieu. A further example of external influence is illustrated by the need to expand the

¹The second half of Proposition 2 referred to the state of the movement organization's struggle. This addressed some aspect of the social movement organization's movement towards its goals over time. As no data were collected with regards to this time-goals consideration, this portion of Proposition 2 was not considered.
organizational influence by arranging alliances between the organization and similar organizations.

Drawing together these ideas of sets of influences and borrowing from Gusfield (1966), it has been noted that leaders function in dual environments (internal and external environments). The major question addressed in this study was: "To what degree is leader behavior determined by attention to dual environments, as reflected by internal and external influences?"

The above two propositions were designed to answer this question by focusing upon three different variables. These are leadership style, membership type, and value orientation. The first of these, leadership style, was selected as a reflection of varying degrees of attention a leader would direct at the internal and external environments. This variable, as originally proposed by Gusfield (1966), has been scaled along a continuum with the extremes being represented by articulating, and conversely, mobilizing styles of leader behavior. The extreme of articulating behavior is illustrative of the leader focusing upon the external environment. This is the case because of the need to communicate and exchange ideas and promises as one is trying to maintain or increase the relative position of one's own organization in the social milieu. The mobilizing extreme is illustrative of a leader focusing upon the internal environment. This is justified by the need to maintain adequate numbers of members, as well as to placate possible schisms that may be developing among the members. Or as Gusfield (1966) noted:
"The role of the mobilizer demands that the leader act to maintain the movement’s sense of unique mission by upholding the doctrines and convictions which differentiate it from other movements and from the behavior it is attempting to change. . . As an articulator the leader must be prepared to meet halfway the publics and organizations of the total society" (p. 142).

In the same discussion Gusfield (1966) went on to point out that, although a mobilizing style of leadership is appropriate when dealing with the internal environment and an articulating style is appropriate in dealing with the external environment, "leaders who perform their tasks in ways which maximize one role in the set may endanger the performance of the other role" (p. 142).

This statement underscores a major problem with typologies. As analytical distinctions are made in an effort to clarify a concept, they often tend to mask the realities of a situation where ideal type categories are reified to the point of ignoring the naturally occurring combinations that exist. Through this disclaimer Gusfield (1966) has dealt with this problem and accommodated it into his perspective.

The second variable, membership type (as mentioned in Proposition 1), was included due to the degree to which it reflects which aspect of the dual environment would be having a greater influence on the leader's behavior. This variable was placed on a continuum with the terms inclusive and exclusive representing the extremes. According to Proposition 1 inclusive membership requirements are more closely associated with an articulating rather than mobilizing style of leadership, which is seen as being
associated with exclusive requirements. The inclusive organization may be seen as one where membership opportunities are open to all interested individuals. The exclusive organization may be seen as the opposite where membership is available to a select few. These two membership types may also be differentiated on the basis of member commitment and base of support. These aspects will be expanded in the context of later chapters relating to the operationalization of this variable.

The third variable is that of the organization's value orientation, which is referenced in Zald and Ash (1966). In the form which it appears in Proposition 2, the distinction is made between an orientation of changing individuals and one of changing the larger society. The source of this distinction is Lang and Lang (1961). Borrowing their terminology, the designation of inward and outward value orientations was used, with the idea of inward value orientations being consistent with changing individuals, and outward value orientations being consistent with changing the larger society. As with the two prior, this variable was placed on a continuum with the extreme values being indicated as inward or outward movement organization. The distinction between inward and outward orientation was similar to the idea of mobilizing and articulating styles of leadership. This was the case due to both variables being broad enough to consider organizationally as well as contextually based influences, both important to the present study.
Significance of the Problem

In 1965 George Gallup asked a nationwide sample which three of a list of ten national problems "should get the most attention from government in the next year or two" (Mitchell, 1978). The category of "reducing pollution of water and air" was ranked ninth by virtue of being chosen by merely 17% of respondents. In April of 1970 (Earth Day) this procedure was repeated and the above category was ranked second this time, being chosen by 53% of the respondents. What this change shows is that many persons became concerned with the quality of the environment in a relatively short period of time. Since April 1970 other polls have shown similar results in terms of a high and stable, if not increasing, level of environmental concern. Recent work, however, has pointed towards a certain amount of disagreement regarding trends in the level of environmental concern. Mitchell (1978), after analyzing a national sample of over 1,000 individuals for the Resources for the Future National Environmental Survey, has concluded that "the environment has apparently joined education and health as an enduring public concern" (p. 2). Conversely Dunlap and Van Liere (1977) have documented a decline in levels of support using data from a 1970-1974 panel study of 1,634 Washington State residents. They traced this to an idea put forth by Mauss (1975) which postulated that as steps were taken to address the social problem, the public felt (correctly or incorrectly) that the problem was being solved. But, like earlier
exist substantial support for the environment. These events seem to illustrate that the American public still feels that environmental quality is important.

In an impressive work on environmental sociology Buttel and Morrison (1977) pointed out that, although the study of the environmental movement signaled the beginning of environmental sociology, it does not dominate the field. This point is made in an effort to delineate the focus of this study in that, while a focus on environmental sociology is presented here, it is basically limited to the study of the environmental movement per se. The authors further pointed out what they have termed to be "important needed areas of research" (p. 4). Included in this listing was the testing of propositions similar to those of Zald and Ash (1966), particularly those focusing upon environmental social movement organizations. The authors noted that this focus is important because of the diversity, number, and rapid change characteristics of social movement organizations.

Thus, having noted the role of the environmental movement in the general area of environmental sociology as well as the utility of studying the environmental movement organization, attention was directed towards the social movement organization in the environmental movement. Albrecht (1976) has pointed out that the environmental movement is already institutionalized (p. 149). He illustrated this by directing attention to the legislative and legal impacts of
the movement such as the Air Pollution Control Act of 1972, the Clean Water Act of 1972, and the case of the Association of Data Processing Services, Inc., v. Camp (397 U. S. 150) which held that interests that may be injured included aesthetic, historical, cultural, and recreational in addition to economic (also see Sierra Club v. Morton, 305 U. S. 727). Albrecht further illustrated the degree of institutionalization by noting that various new federal agencies have been created to deal with environmental issues (Environmental Protection Agency and the President's Council on Environmental Quality). All this pointed out that there are many aspects to the environmental movement aside from environmental movement organizations. Environmental movement organizations are only a part of the environmental movement, but an extremely important part. One reason for this is because they represent one avenue through which people may become involved in the movement, whereas bureaucratic procedures may tend to discourage efforts of other types.

Moving from the level of the movement organization to that of leadership, the significance of this study is illustrated in yet another way. In a discussion regarding the importance of leadership to the development and style of a social movement organization compared to other organizations Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1976:338) noted:

"Because the situation of the movement organization is unstable, because the organization has few material incentives under its control, and because of the non-routined nature of its tasks, the success or failure of the movement organization can be highly dependent on the quality and commitment of the leadership cadre and the tactics they use."
The idea that Zurcher and Kirkpatrick were trying to convey was that the importance of organizational leadership is not consistent across all types of organizations. In fact they explained just how critical leadership was in the area of social movement organizations. This idea served to further illustrate the significance of this study's focus upon leadership by showing just how central a role it may play.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE

Theoretical Background

Leaders in social movement organizations react and adapt to changing environments. This has been addressed with attention to the general areas of organizational leadership, social movement organization leadership, and leadership in environmental quality organizations. Initially the literature surrounding the construction and testing of the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions is discussed with a concentration on the relationship between leadership and the organizational environment. The second section of related literature was included to expand upon the ideas presented above.

Drawing from the early work of Selznick (1948, 1957), the functionalist perspective was the frame of reference for this study. As it provided the theoretical background for Zald and Ash (1966), its use was seen as necessary. This perspective revolves around the idea that the organization was seen to be similar to, but by no means identical to, a biological organism. As this analogy was drawn, it illustrated the idea that an organization responds to a changing environment by adapting to changes in ways that fulfill its needs. These needs are seen as secondary in importance to the basic need of organizational self-maintenance (Selznick, 1948:29).
A lower-level need, integral to self-maintenance, was that of leadership responding to the influences of other organizations as well as those of the members of their organization. The idea of attending to influence from both inside and outside of the organization was addressed by Selznick (1948:29) by listing five "imperatives" relating to the "maintenance of the system as a generic need." Of these five, two dealt solely with the internal environment of the organization and one with its external environment (the other two discussed both). At a later date Selznick (1957) had expanded the idea of internal and external environments in the context of a discussion regarding how leaders should define the mission of the organization. He argued that leaders should take two factors into account:

"... 1) the internal state of the polity: the strivings, inhibitions, and competencies that exist within the organization; and 2) the external expectations that determine what must be sought or achieved if the institution is to survive" (p. 67, 68).

Thus, Selznick provided a vehicle for viewing the roles played by the internal and external environments in determining leader behavior. He accomplished this by directing attention to the basic organizational need of self-maintenance and describing how it is related to internally and externally present influences on leader behavior.

Joseph Gusfield (1966) further elaborated the above idea in a work on leadership in social movement organizations. He presented
the idea that leaders function in dual environments. Noting that movements seek to make changes in the society's value and normative structure, he concluded that leaders need to be "... cognizant of the non-member and his potentialities as friend or foe of the mission" (p. 139). Through this process the movement organization was seen as being drawn into the power structure of society and must act to maintain or increase its position in that power structure. This was accomplished by the tempering of traditional doctrines as well as considering added interests. This process was successful when people were attracted to the movement organization as possible recruits or supporters. Gusfield saw this type of situation as calling for an articulating style of leadership where the leader:

"As an articulator of the movement in the total society, he must learn the limits and possibility of actions in light of the power and ideologies of influential persons and organizations outside of the movement. He must attempt to sway these to the uses of the movement as best as may be done" (p. 140).

On the other hand, Gusfield noted that leaders must also attend to demands placed upon them by organizational members. He argued that this was necessary because movements seek to impose objectives on the social structure that are not consistent with those already accepted. To this end, the commitment of members to the movement organization and its leadership was seen as vital to the movement organization's success or failure. Thus, Gusfield viewed the development of both a separate identity of the movement organization and strong ties between leaders and members as highly important in terms of achieving movement organization objectives. He has, therefore, designated
leader behavior that is consistent with these types of interests as exhibiting a mobilizing style of leadership.

In short, Gusfield has created a typology of leader behavior which he has designated as leadership style. He was careful to note, however, that both types of leadership style, mobilizing and articulating, are not exclusive of each other in that a leader may exhibit degrees of both styles of leadership depending upon the situations involved. This focus pointed out the need to treat leadership style as lying on a continuum ranging from an articulating style to a mobilizing style, and was the approach utilized by this study.

Related to the idea of leadership style was that of the value orientation of the social movement organization. Lang and Lang (1961) presented an interesting discussion of this notion in a chapter on the organizational characteristics of social movements. Although theirs was not a pioneer work in this area (see Sighele, 1894 and Park & Burgess, 1924), they did differentiate between inwardly and outwardly oriented movements:

"Inward movements aim at renovating and renewing the life of the community from within by remolding individuals and getting them to concern themselves with absolute values" (p. 498).

"Outward movements seek to recast the social order from without, through a change in laws and in the institutional structures" (p. 498).

While Lang and Lang (1961) failed to make the overt transition from the social movement level to the social movement organization level, they did imply this leap, however, by focusing attention on
the central role of the organization in the social movement (p. 504). They pointed out that many of those involved in the movement did not hold positions in the movement organization but they were none the less vital to the movements success. This point is also implied by Gusfield (1966) in his discussion regarding the recruitment of organizational members.

Throughout the Zald and Ash (1966) synthesis many propositions were presented focusing upon social movement organizations. Using the previous discussion as theoretical background for extrapolation, they formulated the two propositions focusing upon leadership. The framework within which these propositions were developed was that of the functionalist perspective. Drawing this from Selznick (1948) they noted a focus upon "... the relation of leadership to organizational transformation" (p. 329). This being their general focus, they indicated an even more precise focus upon the movement organization and the environment in which it exists. They listed three interrelated aspects of the environment which affect the growth and transformation of the movement organization. The first of these was germane to the present study:

"Changing conditions in the society increase or decrease the potential support base of the MO (movement organization); there is an ebb and flow of supporting sentiments" (p. 330).

The ebb and flow of sentiments, although a vital aspect of the movement organizations environment, does not affect all movement organizations in the same way. Acting in an intervening manner between the movement organization and the ebb and flow of sentiments
are two dimensions of the organization itself. These are: (1) the value orientation of the movement organization (Lang & Lang, 1961), and (2) the organization's membership requirements (Zald & Ash, 1966). As the dimension of the movement organization's value orientation has been discussed earlier, it will not be belabored at this point. The concept of membership requirements has been described by Zald and Ash (1966) as exhibiting the extremes of inclusive and exclusive membership requirements. These extremes can be differentiated on the basis of member commitment and membership accessibility. Those organizations with exclusive membership requirements will have highly committed members with member status open to only those few meeting stringent membership requirements. Conversely, those organizations with inclusive membership requirements will have members with only marginal commitment to the organization and membership will be available to the majority of those desiring it.

It has been noted that the membership requirements and value orientations of the movement organization act in an intermediary fashion to offset (positively or negatively) the effects of the environment on the movement organization. The connection between organizational leadership and the two organizational dimensions mentioned above is well made here if one considers a statement by Meyer (1978). He stated: "The function of leadership . . . is to mediate between environmental uncertainties and organizational structure" (p. 203). The idea of "environmental uncertainties" bears a strong resemblance to Zald and Ash's (1966) "ebb and flow of sentiments." As an organization moves towards the attainment of
its goals it must have the support of some segment of society at best and society's indifference at worse. This support has the potential of being extremely uncertain as well as extremely important as mentioned above. So if one views the leader in terms of Meyer's (1978) conception of dealing with "environmental uncertainties" an obvious way of doing this is before they effect the movement organization and have their impact. Drawing this together with Zald and Ash's (1966) idea of membership requirements and value orientations acting in an intermediary fashion between the "ebb and flow of sentiments" and the movement organization, it was not too great a leap to assume that one way a leader could mediate "environmental uncertainties" would be to adjust his/her leadership style in accordance with the movement organization's membership requirements and value orientations.

Based upon the above, the following propositions, presented by Zald and Ash (1966) were the focus of this study. These propositions investigated the concepts of articulating and mobilizing styles of leadership and their relation to the structural influence of membership requirements and value orientations.

1. "An exclusive organization is almost certain to have a leadership which focuses upon mobilizing membership for tasks, while the inclusive organization is readier to accept an articulating leadership style" (p. 339).

2. "The MO (movement organization) oriented to individual change is likely to have a leadership focused on mobilizing sentiments, not articulating with the larger society. Organizations oriented to changing the larger society are more likely to require both styles of leadership, depending on the stages of their struggle" (p. 339).
In a comparative analysis of two organizations involved in an antipornography crusade, Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1976) tested many of the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions. In general, they found support for all the propositions including number 1 cited above. Unfortunately they omitted, for some unmentioned reasons, the testing of number 2. Aside from providing the only reasonable test of Zald and Ash's propositions published to date, Zurcher and Kirkpatrick supplied a rationale for focusing upon the leadership propositions as this study does. They noted: "In our opinion, almost all of the Zald-Ash propositions depend for validity and continuity upon holding constant the intervening variable of leadership style" (p. 285, 286). This further substantiated the idea of leaders acting to mediate between the movement organization and the "ebb and flow of sentiments" (Zald & Ash, 1966:330) in society.

**Related Literature**

Having placed this study into perspective by examining its immediate theoretical groundings in the previous section, the following section examines the broader areas of organizational leadership and the environments of organizations. In each area attention was devoted to both the organizational perspective and the collective behavior/social movements perspective. In this case dual orientations were seen as necessary due to the unique character of social movement organizations, being organizations in one sense and, at the same time, being vital components of a social movement.
Before moving on to the organizational perspective on leadership, two brief notes are in order centering upon the earlier quote by Meyer (1978) regarding how leadership functions as an intermediary between environmental uncertainties and organizational structure. What was being implied in this statement was that influences originating in the external environment of the organization were acted upon by leadership. In the present study the concept of the organizational environment was expanded to include elements of the internal environment of the organization, a point addressed in more depth later in this review. Secondly, the variables of membership type and value orientation may also have been conceptualized as elements of structure. In this study they were seen as representing avenues through which influences, originating in the internal and external environment, may be expressed.

Leadership

Organizational Perspective

As noted by Meyer (1975): "sociological theories of organizations have all but ignored the question of leadership" (p. 203). Sparse early work in this area can be traced solely to Weber (1946) in his classic description of leadership types. Weber discussed the role that legitimate domination played for different types of leaders. He presented a typology of leaders based on this conception of domination by classifying the legitimacy of leaders into three categories. The first of these was that of the charismatic leader.
who maintains position by virtue of extraordinary personal qualities (such as wisdom and holiness). The second was that of the traditional leader. This person acquired and maintained position by virtue of traditional norms which allow leadership to be passed on to family relations. Finally, a third type of leader, the rational-legal leader, acquired and maintained position by virtue of bureaucratic rules which justified formal rank or office. Weber saw the existence of bureaucratic structure as a condition essential to the management of administration. Additionally he stated: "Once it is fully established, bureaucracy is among those social structures which are hardest to destroy" (p. 228). It was because of this early focus upon bureaucracy, with its almost static interpretation of administrative functioning, that there has been little attention directed towards leader behavior.

Some of the few major leadership studies done in the area of organizations took place at Ohio State University. An excellent summary of this work is provided in a recent book by Stogdill (1974). This series of studies examined the dimensions of leadership surrounding informal relationships existing among persons affiliated with the organization as well as formal relationships. Using data from the Ohio State studies, Hersey and Blanchard (1969) noted that successful leadership depended upon: (1) adaptation to members as well as structure and (2) adaptation to the external environment. Thus Hersey and Blanchard illustrated two dimensions of leadership that dealt with formal and informal structure.
Although these dimensions were not consistent with the leader dimensions addressed by this study, by virtue of directing attention to determinates of these dimensions, their discussion lent support to the idea of internal and external environments of organizations having some impact upon leader behavior.

In that Gusfield (1966) designated his typology of leader behavior as "functional areas of leadership," it was useful to examine what other actions have been designated as leadership functions. Stogdill (1974) has reviewed classical as well as more contemporary behavioral theories addressing executive functions. He designated the functions of planning, organizing, and controlling as falling within the realm of more classical theories which pursue a rational approach to organizational functioning. Secondly, he presented a longer list of functions representative of more contemporary authors which utilize a social model of organizational functioning. These range from "defining objectives and maintaining goal direction" through "facilitating group action and interaction" and include those offered by Krech and Crutchfield (1948). The latter authors offered a rather long list of functions that include, consistent with this study, both "external group representative" and "controls of internal relationships." These two functions were of particular interest because of their overwhelming consistency with the externally oriented function of articulation and with the internally oriented function of mobilization. Additionally, in that the present study utilizes a social model of organizational functioning, the comparison was well justified.
Selznick (1957) has also addressed the functions of organizational leadership. He proposed a four part typology composed of (1) definition of institutional mission and goals, (2) creation of a structure for the accomplishment of purpose, (3) defense of institutional integrity, and (4) reevaluation of internal conflict. Viewed from the perspective of the present study the relevance of the later two was obvious. The defense of institutional integrity was consistent with the idea of an articulating style of leadership in that both concepts focused on the external environment of the organization and described efforts to mediate its effects on the organization. The only difference between these ideas was that the present study's focus on an articulating style of leadership tended to direct attention to ways in which the external environment may have had a positive or negative effect while Selznick's perspective tended to focus on only avoiding the negative consequences.

The major issue to be considered when examining leader functions was whether they adequately explained leader behavior within its context. This being the case it was not surprising that so many different typologies exist because they were developed in such diverse contexts as the military group, the corporation, and the therapy group. To say that different organizational contexts present different sets of leader functions is not to say that functions present are totally dependent upon context. Rather, a more accurate description would take the form of specific functions presenting themselves in a more or less overt fashion, depending
upon their context. Along these lines it was not inconsistent with previous work to posit the functions of mobilizing and articulating styles of leadership as existing within social movement organizations. But caution should be exercised so as not to imply that the functions focused upon in this study are the sole functions of leadership in social movement organizations.

The next section considers the concept of leadership, as found in the social movements/collective behavior literature. Although there has been some overlap between this literature and that proceeding, there was enough of a unique character to this area to warrant separate consideration.

Social Movements Perspective

Although the present study drew from basically a functionalist perspective, much of the social movements literature did not fit into such a neat package. For whatever reasons (perhaps the overwhelming nature of the task), the social movements literature contains work ranging from the perspective of symbolic interactionist (Klapp, 1972) through structure functionalism (King, 1956). From these perspectives have come work representing such specialties as social psychology, associations, and organizational theory. All together these works form the area known as the social movements literature (or from a wider base—collective behavior). This does not imply that there is a massive amount of literature in this area due to exhaustive examination from each possible perspective.
Indeed, one shortcoming of this literature group is that it contains such an unorganized mixture of work that examination from one perspective tends to leave as many areas unexplored as questions unanswered. For these reasons, as well as the need to present an accurate assessment of the social movements area, work illustrating perspectives other than the functionalist were included in the present review but were not totally integrated due to differences in focus.

Early conceptions of leadership have been labeled the trait theories of leadership. Basically this school of thought viewed the leader as an individual who has attained, maintained, and furthered his/her position by virtue of personal attributes (see Partridge et al., 1934; Murphy et al., 1937; Jennings, 1943; Froman, 1962). Gouldner (1965) addressed the positions of this school of thought within the context of a reader on leadership. Discussing the possible existence of universal leadership traits, he concluded that: "At this time there is no reliable evidence concerning the existence of leadership traits" (p. 34). This refutation of the trait theory was not mentioned to imply that the personal qualities of individual leaders have no bearing on their leadership qualities. This is readily apparent when one considers the personal appeal, and its effect upon popularity of such charismatic leaders as Martin Luther King, Jr. and John F. Kennedy. One author who has accommodated the idea of universal traits is Case (1933). He presented the idea that leadership results from the conjuncture of (1) certain personality traits, (2) a unique social situation, and (3) an event
that disrupts the flow of routine tasks.\footnote{Although the focus of the present study is that of \#2 and \#3 above, this is not to discount the usefulness of \#1. Rather, due to Gouldner's (1965) evaluation, as well as the overwhelming complex effect of personality transformation following position attainment (see Hulett, 1945), this component was not addressed.} His contribution lied not only in that he addressed the situation and the event but that he viewed leadership as the result of their interaction among themselves as well as with personal qualities.

This study treated leadership as a functional adaptation to influences arising from both the internal and external environment of the organization. This idea did not go as far as to imply that the leader of the social movement organization solely determines its success or failure, or for that matter even its course of action. This idea was illustrated by C. W. King (1956):

"Minimal leadership competence is essential for the survival of a movement, to be sure, but even understanding leadership is no guarantee of survival. Rather, the type of leadership required at different stages is the consequence of a complex combination of many conditions, including for example, the kind of goals, the nature of the opposition, and the degree of unrest in the society" (p. 71-72).

Another qualification necessary in discussing leadership in social movements was the issue of the single leader. This study took the position that a particular social movement may have more than one leader. This point was illustrated by Turner and Killian (1972): "... there are many leaders in every movement, some of whom are completely unknown to the bulk of the adherents" (p. 391). While this justified the idea of organizational leaders being seen
as such within the social movement, the issue of the single leader within the organization was still to be resolved. The idea of a single organizational leader idea was accepted in the present study for the following reasons: (1) the small size of social movement organizations compared to commercially or industrially based organizations and the accompanying need for less administrative leadership, (2) the limited and nominal remuneration available to leaders of social movement organizations and its effect upon the willingness of organizational members to serve in official capacities, and (3) the practical considerations involved in identifying leaders, other than those designated as such, and the rating of their leadership status.

At this point it was appropriate to consider how various authors in the social movements area have conceived of leadership. At one end of the range of authors addressing this question lied the work of W. B. Cameron (1966). Consistent with his conception of the life cycles of social movements (he contended they were too complex and unique to discern any pattern what-so-ever) he noted that leaders should be identified as such by virtue of simply having some followers. Representative of the other end of the range of leadership conceptions was that offered by Tannenbaum (1968) (more of a general sociological focus than social movements specifically):

"To most sociological writers leadership is the exercise of power or influence in social collectivities, such as groups, organizations, communities, or nations."
The work of these two writers served to illustrate the definitional gap between authors. This being the case it did not seem too extreme of a transgression to ignore, or assume accurate, past conceptions of leadership and rely simply upon position. As will be recalled, this is exactly the route that the present study has taken and, acknowledging limitations as to the theoretical expansion of leader power and accompanying relations, was deemed as justified.

**Environment of the Social Movement Organization**

**Organizational Perspective**

Early work in the area of organizational processes took upon the perspective of a closed system. This concept of a system has a short but interesting history in the social science literature. The year 1943 marked the date of the first social science use of the system concept (Rosenbluets, Wiener, & Bigelow, 1943). In a rather short period of time various writers (especially Wiener, 1950 and von Bertalanffy, 1962) advanced this idea to the point of its use in research settings (Hage, 1974). Basically, the system concept revolved around the idea of a self regulatory process. This process consisted of a specific task with inputs and outputs as well as a feedback loop from the outputs back into the inputs which in turn modified the result of the task process. A commonly used example of self regulation is that of a household thermostat which is activated when the air temperature falls below a set point and is deactivated when the desired temperature is reached. This
application is illustrative of an open system as opposed to the closed system. A central tenet to the idea of a closed system was that external influences (those not directly related to the organization) play no role in explaining organizational structure or functioning. Relative to the present study, the implication was that a closed system approach dealt only with elements of the internal environment, while excluding consideration of the external environment. Meyer (1978) has evaluated the status of this idea within the context of contemporary literature:

"I think the issue of open versus closed systems is closed, on the side of openness. Few researchers or theorists are likely to accept the premise that organizations, save for cloisters, can be analyzed without reference to events occurring externally, and even the cloisters are now in doubt" (p. 18).

So, for the most part it appears that, as far as the literature on organizations in concerned, the conception of this study, of both the internal and external environment as having some impact on organizational functioning, was consistent with contemporary thought. The present study utilized the open systems approach and, although the terminology is different, the congruence was apparent.

In Weber's 1922 work entitled *Economy and Society* the idea of organizational-environment interrelations was explored. This writing is introduced in order to answer two basic questions. First, why should research attempt to delineate the effects of the environment? In a discussion regarding the promotion of bureaucracy, Weber pointed to society's impact upon administration. He explained:
"But in the modern state, the increasing demand for administration also rests on the increasing complexity of civilization" (p. 972).

To be sure, Weber did not intend to imply that the complexity of civilization was the sole stimulus to expanded administration. Rather he also mentioned such stimuli as the creation of standing armies, the development of public finances, technical communication, and social welfare tasks. The point to be made was that the external environment of the organization (including not only an increasingly complex civilization but also the related concepts mentioned above) influenced administrative functions. This was consistent with the focus of this study in that it substantiated the idea of an open system of organizational functioning as well as its implication of the central role palyed by the external environment of the organization.

The second question to be answered was, given the above justification for dealing with the environment of the organization, what was the likelihood of effective administrative functioning with regards to environmental influences? At this point, the concept of environmental influences deserved some further examination. This was the case because one may be led to assume a somewhat static set of influences for similar organizations. Weber (1968) addressed this point directly through the following excerpt:

"The extent and direction of the course along which economic influences have moved, as well as the manner in which political power relations exert influence vary widely" (p. 986).

Allowing for widely varying influences of the organizational environment, Weber nonetheless viewed the likelihood of effective
administrative functioning in a positive fashion. In a discussion relative to the promotion of bureaucratization Weber noted:

"Under otherwise equal conditions, rationally organized and directed action is superior to every kind of collective behavior and also social action opposing it" (p. 987).

This statement presented one problem. Weber viewed organizational administration, including the leadership component, as functioning on a rational basis. The present study took upon the perspective of a social model. Considering, however, the points made above this limitation was not as significant as may seem apparent. First, the application of a rational model did not effect the credibility of the argument made for the influence of increasing complexity of society on administrative functioning. Secondly, even though the nonrational aspects of successful administrative functioning were not considered, this is not to say that rational considerations were not present in the social model.

Thus the work of Weber has helped to answer two basic questions regarding environmental influences on administrative functioning. These questions, in addition to dealing with issues basic to organizational functioning, provided further theoretical grounding for the present study.

In 1967 James Thompson presented the argument that organizations interact with their environment. From what he has designated as the "natural systems approach" he presented the idea that the technology of the organization and the uncertainties which arise from the external environment influence organizational behavior.
Citing such authors as Barnard (1938), Selznick (1949) and Clark (1956) he noted that:

"This stream of work leads to the conclusion that organizations are not autonomous entities; instead the best laid plans of managers have unintended consequences and are conditional or upset by other social units--other complex organizations or publics--on whom the organization is dependent" (p. 205).

Although Thompson (1967) failed to address the question of the role played by leadership in terms of the above conception, he did offer a loose definition of the composition of the external environment of the organization. Through noting the efforts of publics and other organizations Thompson has provided justification for the contention that the external environment of the organization has some effect on its operation. Emphasis on external sources of influence was consistent with the example presented earlier of external influences leading to the need to direct attention to alliances between competing organizations as well as to buffer established positions.

The present study took the perspective that the organization's membership type and value orientation were elements of the organization that function as avenues through which influences originating in either the internal or external environment of the organization may come to bear upon the organization. The following paragraphs consist of a review of how these two concepts have been utilized in previous organizational writings.

The concept of organizational membership has been approached from a variety of perspectives in the organizational literature.
Unfortunately, these applications have been directed mainly at the commercial or productive organizations (see Roethlisberger et al., 1939). What was of interest to the present study, however, was organizational membership in the informal (voluntary) organization. As opposed to the commercial organization, in which members receive monetary compensation, members of informal organizations are drawn to membership for other reasons. Mott (1965) presented one rationale for persons seeking membership in informal organizations.

"The association often serves as a channel of communication from individuals or small groups to a larger units in society. Indeed, in large and complex societies, the association may be the individual's only effective means to influence the decisions of larger units" (p. 79).

Various authors have expanded upon this idea in the direction of determinants of voluntary association membership (Smith, 1972; Payne et al., 1972; Mulford & Klonglan, 1972, all in Smith, 1972). These researchers have focused upon the more abstract dimensions surrounding membership such as attitudes and values, individual traits, and social structure often to the exclusion of basic questions of eligibility or membership requirements. Smith and Reddy (1972) addressed this problem in a work examining determinants of voluntary action. These authors examined both formal and informal eligibility criteria and, although they made the distinction between participation and actual membership, their major contribution lay in their recognition of the sparceness of research in this area.

In a discussion providing examples of official eligibility requirements they stated:
"... formal eligibility criteria for official membership in voluntary associations and programs have received almost no systematic comparative research attention" (p. 311).

Further on they noted:

"Since these informal and often implicit eligibility criteria are usually more subtle and at the same time more important than formal criteria, the fact that such criteria have very rarely, if ever, been studied systematically and comparatively is a first class scientific tragedy" (p. 312).

As this situation was unfortunate for the field in general, it was equally, if not more so, unfortunate for this study. It can only be hoped that the present study, and others focusing upon eligibility criteria, will help to remedy this situation.

Social Movements Perspective

This section addresses the environment of the social movement organization from the perspective of the social movements literature. Issues considered include: (1) delimiting the environment, (2) traditional conceptions of the environment, and (3) components of the environment of the social movement organization. Attention was directed towards all of the above areas with a concentration upon the components of the social movement organizations environment as they occupied a major position in the present study.¹

As far as can be discerned, through this review, the

¹As with the section focusing upon the social movements literature on leadership, the same types of theory group cautions should be observed in this section.
terminology of internal and external environments were relatively novel concepts and may be traced solely to Gusfield (1966) and perhaps Homans (1950). Other writers in this area have preferred to focus upon internal versus external dynamics, development, and influences (see for example C. W. King, 1956). Perhaps this may be traced to the now resolved debate between open versus closed systems. Another possible reason for conceptualization to have taken a nonenvironmentally oriented perspective was that delineation of the social movement boundaries has been a task largely ignored, perhaps due to its inability to absorb established concepts. As previously discussed, this study departed from traditional conceptions of internally and externally classified phenomenon. Rather it took the position that characteristics of social movements need not be classified as either belonging exclusively to the internal or external environment, but their effects may be observed in both.

This contention was further supported by the work of social psychologist George Homans (1950). In a work focusing upon elements of group structure Homans made a convincing argument for the conceptual boundaries of group behavior. Not being content with the description of group structural components he moved on to note what he designated internal and external systems of group functioning. His major contribution (unfortunately more recognized in the field of social psychology than in social movements) was not that he identified three components common to both systems (activity, interaction, and sentiment), but rather that he classified them...
according to the function served by each system. He noted that:

"...the elements of a group behavior: sentiment, activity, and interaction... the internal system is the state of these elements and of their interrelations, so far as it constitutes a solution—not necessarily the only possible solution—of the problem: How shall the group survive in its environment?" (Homans, 1950:90)

"...the internal system—the elaboration of group behavior that simultaneously arises out of the external system and acts upon it" (Homans, 1950:109).

Consistent with the previous point, Homans saw the two systems as being interrelated to the point where it was difficult to operationally separate them. The present study also viewed the environment of the social movement as being dynamic. This being the case, the particular environment of each organization was also seen as being dynamic and therefore having the potential of uniqueness. On this basis, the environments of each social movement organization deserved individual attention.

The above points having been made, the way was paved for discussion of the characteristics of social movement organizations that allow differentiation as to how the effects of these characteristics determine leadership style.

As will be recalled, the characteristics of social movement organizations of interest to this study were the organization's value orientation and membership type. The concept of value orientation has a history similar to that of environmental boundary delineation. This is noted because it is a rather elusive concept,
having been conceived of in many forms all which are similar in focus. Furthermore, the present study viewed the value orientation of an organization as the focus of changes which the social movement organization wishes to initiate. This variable saw either the organizational members or society as the focus of change and an organization may focus on varying degrees of either. This had nothing to do with neither the direction nor content of change, only what group was the focus of change. The direction and content of change have been addressed by other concepts such as ideology and its terminological counterparts of goals and missions.

Turner and Killian (1972) have described the value orientation of social movement organizations as having two components: ideology and goals. In discussing what the ideology means to most adherents, they stated:

"... ideology supplies a vague but comfortable assurance of the rightness and effectiveness of the movement and a set of resources to employ in promoting the movement among the unpersuaded and in defending the movement from its enemies" (p. 270). This statement was not meant to be totally applicable to all adherents, for all individuals interpret and justify their position on the basis of their past experiences and present life situations. But as a general statement it was applicable to most adherents. In terms of the previous discussion regarding context and direction of change, the organizational ideology encompasses both.

If ideology is seen as a rather abstract concept, goals may be viewed as their concrete representation. A military analogy is
useful at this point to help make the distinction more apparent. The term strategy is used in military circles to describe the general focus of a military unit such as attaining a favorable position. Tactics, on the other hand, describe methods that may be used to implement strategy. The same is true in distinguishing between ideology and goals. Goals are established and acted upon in an effort to fulfill the organizational ideology. This is not meant to imply that for all practical purposes the concepts are identical. Indeed, effective goals must take into consideration the practical aspects of implementation such as credibility, possibility of attainment, and symbolic value. The point to be made in this discussion is that, acknowledging potential differences in context and direction, the focus of change (member or society) was the same for the organization's ideology as well as its goals.

Again turning to Turner and Killian (1972), the case was made for distinguishing between a member and a societal focus for change. They noted:

"Goals and ideology may point in two broad directions. They may point towards changing individuals directly or toward changing social institutions" (p. 274-275).

As is apparent, this description was quite consistent with the previous discussion but further examination revealed a potentially major difference. This difference lies along the time dimension and revealed an evolutionary bias. In a discussion focusing upon value oriented movements they postulated:

"Movements for personal transformation characteristically shift toward a societal manipulation
emphasis when they have achieved some success and added persons of influence to their membership" (p. 275).

Although their time reference was supported through consideration of success and personal influence, it was nonetheless different from the present study. The present study viewed a social movement organization's value orientation as a reflection of its ideology (as discussed above) and not bound by time constraints.

The second characteristic of the social movement organization of interest to the present study was that of membership type. This variable was dichotomized into the categories of inclusive and exclusive membership types and referred to openness of membership requirements as well as member responsibility towards achieving organizational goals.

Past studies of social movement organization members have focused upon two basic issues. First, why were individuals drawn to membership in social movement organizations, and secondly, on what basis were they recruited? Although member motivation is a valid focus it was not applicable to this study due to the idea that this study makes only a cursory referral to membership, this being selection and its effect on leadership style. Therefore, attention was directed only towards the issue of selection (recruitment).

W. B. Cameron (1966) conceived of membership in terms of three categories. These were (1) exclusive, which is consistent with the exclusive conception of the present study, (2) receptive, again
consistent with the inclusive conception presented above except that members are not sought after but most individuals desiring so are allowed to join, and (3) proselytizing, in which potential members are sought after by recruiters. Those social movement organizations in the second and third categories would fall into the inclusive category of the present study. Cameron's distinction was useful in terms of a detailed analysis of membership type but for the purposes of the present study such a fine distinction was not seen as providing any additional explanatory power.

**Environmental Sociology**

The study of the environmental movement has been conceived of as falling within the realm of the social movements area in sociology. In contrast to other social movements (temperance, suffrage, etc.) the environmental movement has been extensively studied\(^1\) although, as is the case with the entire field of social movements, the perspectives utilized are not consistent in terms of theoretical orientations.

Initially work took the form of a focus upon conservation and preservation (Albrecht, 1976; Nash, 1965; & Jones, 1965). This took two general directions. First, it described the turn of the century change in the types of persons concerned with the idea of preservation (Nash, 1965). In this context it was found that class distinctions (preservation was traditionally an upper class concern) tended to provide no useful distinction between those

---

\(^1\)See Buttel and Morrison, 1977.
holding pro-preservation attitudes and those who did not, thus, leading to a broader base of support. Second, early work in this area also centered around the questioning of the growth ethic in terms of conserving resources (McCarthy, 1973). In that this resulted in federal intervention (i.e., Forest Reserve Act of 1891), issues such as states rights also came into the picture. This preservation-conservation focus appears to have dominated work in this area through the 1960s.

As a result of the continuing efforts of the preservationists as well as the increasing importance of the energy situation, the environmental movement grew immensely during the 1960s to culminate in Earth Day (April 22, 1970). Analyzing the literature of the sixties provided an interesting insight into the development of the present day literature on the environmental movement. Examining a well known bibliography on Environmental Sociology (Buttel & Morrison, 1977), a pattern seemed to appear in terms of sources of publication. Looking only at articles in journals published from the mid-fifties through the late sixties, there are no journals representing the social sciences. Rather, these journals represented, in an applied manner, the natural sciences (Glacken, 1956; Nash, 1963). The remaining bibliographic entries (dated from the late sixties on) were highly representative of the social sciences. The point being that the study of the environmental movement, in its present form, has a rather short history, perhaps also helping to explain the unorganized nature of the literature.
Present day research has utilized a variety of theoretical perspectives. These have included, but were not limited to, (1) the collective behavior/social movements perspective (Albrecht, 1972) which was a partial focus of the present study, (2) the organizational perspective (Kronus, 1977), also a focus of the present study, and (3) the social problems perspective (Mauss, 1975), one of the newer entrants into the study of the environmental movement. Methodologically, the more recent literature focusing upon the environmental movement has taken a variety of forms. Ranging from Tryzna's 1973 depiction of the environmental movement as a global phenomenon (thus implying comparative possibilities) through Albrecht's 1976 historical analysis, the literature also included examples of case studies (Gillesspie, 1975) as well as those of advanced survey techniques (Dunlap & Dillman, 1976). All this pointed to genuine and varied efforts directed towards understanding the environmental movement.

Drawing from the work of the newer group of social problems researchers interested in the environmental movement, Buttel and Morrison (1977) presented an intriguing statement regarding the organization of the environmental movement literature and future directions which may prove fruitful. They suggested that all exiting literature be grouped under the heading of Environmental Sociology and the distinction should be made between the study of the environmental movement per se and the study of environmental problems (i.e., resource conservation, pollution, energy).
was not to say that the two areas are independent. Rather they argued that this type of focus will help to direct attention towards the broad context of Environmental Sociology, thus leading to increased understanding. Additionally these authors provided justification for investigating the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions, as previously mentioned by noting that they "provide a useful and basically unexplored set of propositions for research. . .." (p. 4).

So, as discussed above, there exists quite a variety of research in the area of Environmental Sociology. Unfortunately, even though the present study's focus upon the social movements and organizational perspective has been utilized previously, there has been little attention directed towards the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions. In that two of these propositions form the basis of the present study, perhaps this will help to rectify this situation.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Research Site

In order to test the propositions a mail survey was conducted of 57 organizations concerned with environmental quality, as cited in the Encyclopedia of Associations (Fisk, 1977). This type of organization was chosen in an attempt at providing analytic continuity with the illustrations provided by Zald and Ash (1966) and Gusfield (1966) as well as with a more contemporary study investigating voluntary associations within the environmental movement by Kronus (1977). In each instance, social movement organizations were the primary unit of analysis, a distinction quite consistent with contemporary environmental quality organizations.

Eight-six organizations appeared in the section regarding environmental quality in the above reference. Twenty-nine of these were omitted on the basis of one of the following criteria: (1) the address of the organization was not available, (2) the organization had concluded activities, (3) the organization functions as an information clearinghouse, and (4) the organization was a technical type of program with no membership listing. The last two criteria were included on the basis of the Zald and Ash (1966) definition of a social movement organization. They stated that:
"... organizations through which social movements can manifest themselves are different from 'full-blown' bureaucratic organizations in two ways. First, they have goals aimed at changing the society and its members; ... Second, MOs (movement organizations) are characterized by an incentive structure in which purposive incentives predominate" (p. 329).

These two criteria were addressed by the first portion of this definition in that they had goals aimed at providing a service to some segment of society, not changing the society. Another way of conceiving of those organizations which were included was that they were actively concerned with environmental quality.

It was assumed in this study that the listing of environmental quality organizations, in the reference cited above, represented the most comprehensive listing of its type. This having been the case, the data collected represented an entire population and analysis and subsequent findings proceeded under this idea.

Data Collection

During the summer and fall of 1978, 57 organizations were mailed identifiable copies of the questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix 1). Three mailings took place in July, August, and late September. Two of these were follow-up mailings to nonrespondents. These mailings took place 4-6 weeks apart; a period which may seem rather long but which was seen as necessary due to the time of year and the distracting influences acting upon respondents at that time.
The questionnaires were mailed to the chief official of each organization. The names of chief officials were included in the listing from Fisk (1977). In selecting the chief official Fisk (1977) used the following definition:

"Chief official and title: Many organizations employ a full-time executive to handle their affairs. The individual holding this position may have the title of secretary, executive secretary, or executive vice president, although other titles are sometimes used, such as president, general manager, managing secretary, or editor. If the organization does not employ a full-time executive, the name of the elected secretary or president has been provided."

This definition of the organization's chief official may seem somewhat loose when contrasted with some of the more theoretical leadership schemes from the area of small groups (Bales & Slater, 1955) and organizations (Weber, 1947). Nevertheless, in spite of the looseness of this definition, those individuals who were designated as the chief official were seen as leaders in this study for practical reasons. The foremost of the reasons was that for a more accurate or theoretically consistent designation of leadership to be made, a much more detailed investigation of each of the specific organizations would have been called for. This task would be so immense that it would have approached the level of case studies of all 57 organizations which was beyond the scope of this study.

Despite the designation of leaders as simply those indicated as so in Fisk (1977), there were still problems in terms of the leadership status of respondents. This was the case because some respondents' names and ranks did not match up with those in the
listing of organizations. Therefore their leadership status came under question. In order to rectify this situation, further contact was made in November, 1978. At that time, a letter was sent to those individuals in question requesting information as to those persons who held higher positions than themselves in the organization as well as their titles. Eight such letters were mailed with four being returned. Allowances were made for all eight of those letters mailed per the information that respondents provided or failed to provide. Of those four returned a review of the responses provided information as to the respondents' leadership status. On this basis respondents were categorized as to if they reasonably fit the definition of the organizations chief official. The four nonrespondents were classified the same as those who didn't fit the definition, therefore erring on the extreme of exclusion so as to allow for consideration of those not fitting the leader definition.

To summarize, of the 86 organizations listed in Fisk (1977), 57 were selected as the research population. From the time of the initial mailing through the time of the second mailing 24 responses (42.1%) were returned. The second mailing produced seven (12.3%) additional responses from nonrespondents of the first mailing. The third and final mailing produced nine (15.8%) more responses to result in a total of 40 responses, which computes to a total return rate of 70.2%. In addition to the 40 respondents, a total of five (8.8%) individuals replied that they could not complete
the questionnaire for one reason or another. Overall this computed to a rate of 80% being accounted for which was impressive in its own right.

Three factors may help to account for such a high return rate. First, organizational leaders may tend to process a certain amount of correspondence daily, thus making it more likely that they would consider cooperating with the questionnaire request as a matter of routine. On the other hand, an individual receiving a similar request at his/her residence, who may not be accustomed to dealing on a regular basis with correspondence, may be less likely to respond. Secondly, the subject matter of the questionnaire may have interested those receiving it either in the direction of wanting to assist in an effort similar to their goals, or along the lines of somehow feeling the need to defend their organization through their response to the questionnaire. Finally, respondents may have been persuaded to respond for logistic reasons. The number of mailings (3) and/or the long duration of time (5 months) over which their responses were solicited may have had an effect on respondents' willingness to cooperate. Although the above reasons are purely speculative, the return rate of 70.2% was higher than expected.

Operationalization of Variables

There were three major variables of interest to this study. These were: (1) leadership style, (2) membership type, and (3) value orientation. Within the context of the questionnaire 19 questions
were asked that focused upon these three variables (see Appendix 1). Of these, 14 addressed the idea of leadership style, 3 dealt with membership type, and 1 with value orientation. The arrangement may seem rather inconsistent but considering the central role that leadership type plays in the two propositions as well as the more straight-forward nature of the other variables, it appeared justified. It should also be noted that this study used self-report data, but considering the aims and resources available, use of such data was justified.

**Leadership Style**

Background information for this variable was drawn mainly from the original work of Gusfield (1966). Of the 14 questions devoted to leadership style in the questionnaire, five focused upon the same indicator, institutional contacts (items #8-#12). In a discussion of leadership in the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Gusfield (1966) pointed to the need for an articulating leader to find points of access to and to interact with major societal institutions. On this basis, these questions were included to measure the frequency of leader contacts with groups or individuals representative of each of the following institutional areas: political, religious, economic, cultural, and educational. Additionally, examples were provided with each question to help avoid ambiguities. Furthermore, while a form of the Likert format (ranging from "very frequently" to "very seldom") was used to
measure frequency of contacts, another portion of the questions asked respondents to indicate the specific number of contacts. Both portions used the same time frame "in the last year," again to avoid any ambiguities. Finally, scores on both portions of the five questions were summed to provide an overall picture of the frequency of institutional contacts.

The second leadership style indicator was that of the uniqueness of the organizations' doctrines. Gusfield (1966) noted that:

"The role of a mobilizer demands that the leader act to maintain the movement's sense of a unique mission by upholding the doctrines and convictions which differentiate it from other movements and the behavior it is attempting to change" (p. 142).

This indicator focused upon the first portion of the above quote and assumed, for all practical purposes, that an organization's doctrines and mission were identical (both being more related to ideology than to goals). Respondents were asked, in this case, to compare their organization's doctrines to those of organizations not involved in the environmental movement and to agree or disagree with the statement that their organization's doctrines were unique (item #1). A five category standard Likert-format was used, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." It was expected that a mobilizing leader would be more likely to agree than an articulating leader.

The third leadership style indicator centered upon the latter portion of the preceding quote. This indicator was that of the degree to which the organization's doctrines provided clear-cut
alternatives to non-environmentally sound practices (item #2). Therefore, the focus here was upon the behavior that the organization was trying to change (i.e., pollution, strip mining). Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with this idea (again using the standard Likert-format). Mobilizing leaders were again expected to be more likely to agree than articulating leaders.

The next four indicators of leadership style centered upon the idea of the commitment of the leader to the movement organization. As Gusfield (1966) noted: "As a mobilizer, the leader is expected to be zealous in his commitment to the movement." (p. 142). Unfortunately, Gusfield did not go on to define commitment and thereby provide indicators for use in this study. One writer who has addressed this issue is Lipset (1954). In a chapter entitled The Political Process in Trade Unions: A Theoretical Statement (Berger, 1954), Lipset made the distinction between two types of leaders. This distinction centered on the position a leader would fall into on a committed-careerist continuum, with the extremes being designated as "calling" leaders and "careerist" leaders. This seems to imply a connection between a leader feeling a "calling" of sorts to his/her position and commitment to the organization. Lipset did make this connection in a discussion regarding leaders who felt a "calling" to be at least a part of the reason they now occupy that position.

"The foreman is the leader who sees in the union something to which he can dedicate himself. Such men are characterized by strong convictions and a sense of responsibility" (p.111).
In consideration of the above, it was not a leap of faith to designate the idea of a leader's feeling of a calling of sorts as being representative of a leader's commitment to the movement organization. Thus it was expected that a mobilizing leader would be more committed than an articulating leader, although some degree of commitment was expected from most leaders. Accordingly, respondents were asked straightforwardly whether their decision to take their leadership position was based on a calling of sorts (item #3). Again responses were comprised of standard Likert choices.

The second commitment indicator of leadership style dealt with the leaders' commitment to the environmental movement and its political ideology. In discussing again those union leaders who were characterized by a calling to their present positions, Lipset (1954) noted that they:

"... have entered the labor movement as a result of a commitment to a political ideology which views the labor movement as an instrument to be used to gain a desired social goal" (p. 112).

Thus, this indicator asked respondents if their decision to enter the environmental movement was based upon a commitment to a political ideology which viewed the environmental movement as an instrument to be used to achieve a safe and secure environment (item #4). Again, using standard Likert response categories it was expected that mobilizing leaders would be more likely to agree with this statement than articulating leaders.

The third commitment indicator was that of the frequency of member contact by leaders (item #5). This indicator came from
Lipset's (1954) discussion of how the two types of leaders may be no different in terms of democratic practices but "committed" leaders were often more accessible to the membership. On this basis respondents were asked how often in the last six months they had contacted with members. Response categories ranged from "very often" to "never," with three appropriate alternatives in between. Mobilizing leaders, being more committed, were expected to have a higher frequency of contact with members than articulating leaders.

The final commitment indicator of leadership style was that of the importance of the education of organizational members (item #6). Still discussing calling leaders, Lipset (1954) stated that:

"Concern with the 'education' of the rank and file is more likely to be found in unions led by 'calling' leaders than in those led by 'careerist'" (p. 116).

Along these lines, respondents were asked if concern for member education, on environmental issues, was a major focus of their organization. Using standard Likert response categories, it was expected that mobilizing leaders would be more likely to agree than articulating leaders.

The eighth indicator of leadership style was that of the leaders willingness to compromise. Gusfield (1966) addressed this at length following his discussion of commitment. He noted that the mobilizing leader must be:

"... intransigent towards groups in the society whose views and interests are not the same. He must reject the effort to moderate the gap between his movement and the position of potentially friendly publics. He refuses to temporize with evil, to compromise principle or to blunt sharp controversy" (p. 142).
He may have intended this to have been a part of the commitment discussion but this idea came under question when one considered a leader who may have been highly committed but nonetheless recognized the value of compromise in the negotiating process. For this reason, the indicators of commitment and compromise were treated separately in this study.

On this basis respondents were asked if they had often compromised with groups or individuals that had expounded positions not consistent with the positions of their organization (item #7). Five response categories were used ranging from "very often" to "never" with articulating leaders expected to have compromised to a greater degree than mobilizing leaders.

The ninth indicator of leadership style concerned the organization's communication and the major direction it tends to take (item #13). As Gusfield (1966) noted it is the articulating leader who takes the organization's message to society and tries to gain its acceptance. Therefore it was expected that the articulating leader would tend to direct a substantially larger proportion of the organization's communication effort towards targets external to the organization. Accordingly, respondents were asked to select one of a series of statements describing their organization's communication. Five alternatives were offered with extremes represented by communication "almost totally with members" and "almost totally with nonmembers." The qualifier of "almost" was added to imply a recognition of the necessity of both types of communication in any established organization.
The final indicator of leadership style dealt with consistency of goals across organizations. The focus of this indicator was "other" environmental quality organizations, in this case, and was included to measure the extreme form of mobilizing leadership style (item #18). This was noted in recognition of the idea that not all mobilizing leaders would accept the notion that their organization was dissimilar to other environmental groups through holding a broad conception of their goals. Furthermore, those leaders defining their goals broadly may be doing so to gain acceptance external to their organization and thus may be considered to be leaning towards the articulating extreme. On this basis leaders were asked to select one of five response categories which represented the degree of consistency of their organization's goals with other environmental quality organizations. Five response categories ranged from "highly consistent" through "very different," with the mobilizing leader expected to respond that the two sets of goals were different.

**Membership Type**

The second variable to be considered was that of membership type, i.e., whether the organization had inclusive or exclusive membership requirements.

If individuals are encouraged to join, through few if any stipulations, membership requirements may be said to be inclusive. Alternatively, if people are discouraged from joining, through stringent stipulations, the membership requirements may be said to
be for the most part exclusive. This being the case, respondents were asked to select a phrase which best described the membership requirements of their organization (item #14). Five response categories were offered ranging from "open to all" through "open to very few." Inclusive organizations were expected to be more likely to have open requirements than exclusive organizations.

A second area where exclusive and inclusive organizations differ, and therefore providing two other indicators of membership type, was that of member support of the organization. Zald and Ash noted:

"The inclusive MO (movement organization) typically requires little activity from its members. On the other hand, the exclusive organization . . . requires a greater amount of energy and time to be spent in movement affairs. . . ." (p. 331).

The second indicator of membership type, therefore, was the degree of responsibility felt by members towards the achievement of organizational goals. This was addressed by offering responses ranging from "great responsibility" to "very little responsibility," with three responses in between, and asking leaders to indicate which response best represents the responsibility towards organizational goals felt by members (item #15).¹

The final indicator of membership type addressed the idea of the organization's base of support. In that the exclusive organization

¹Leaders responding for members raised some question of validity, practical considerations prevented any other approach.
would tend to have fewer members due to restrictive requirements, it is to be expected that members may not be able to support the organization's activities without external assistance. To assess the degree of member support, the percentage of the organization's annual budget contributed by members was solicited (item #16). In increments of 20%, respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of their organization's annual funding contributed by its membership. It was expected that organizations with inclusive membership requirements would show a high percentage of member funding than organizations with exclusive requirements.

**Value Orientation**

The final variable to be considered was that of the value orientation of the organization. Reducing Lang and Lang's (1961) typology to its essentials it has been noted that an organization with an outward value orientation would have, as its focus for change, the institutional structure of society. Additionally, drawing also from Turner and Killian (1972), it has been noted that organizations with inward value orientations tend to focus upon member change. To this end, leaders were asked if they agree or disagree with a statement describing the focus of their goals as changing society versus changing individual members. Likert response categories of five choices ranging from strongly agree through strongly disagree were offered to respondents. It was expected that leaders of organizations with outward value orientations
would be more likely to agree than those with inward value orientations.

**Data Analysis**

In the present study two techniques of data analysis were utilized. In order to test the first proposition regarding membership type and leadership style, the ordinal level tau-b coefficient was used. To test the second proposition, centering upon a member focused value orientation and a mobilizing leadership style, the technique of percentage table analysis was used. Although consistency would seem to point towards utilization of the same technique for the testing of both propositions, the nature of the propositions themselves prevented such a practice and analysis proceeded accordingly.

The coefficient tau-b is an ordinal level measure of association with a proportional reduction of error (PRE) interpretation (see Kendall, 1948). This implied (relative to the present study) that, although knowing the median value of respondent's leadership scores would enable one to make a more accurate estimation of individual leadership scores than random guessing, knowledge of an organization's individual membership requirements would reduce this error to some degree (therefore the proportional reduction in error). This interpretation was not the only one contained in the literature surrounding the tau-b coefficient. Malec (1977) viewed the PRE interpretation as being somewhat limited. However,
in spite of Malec's objection, a tau-b coefficient was computed between each leadership indicator and the indicators of membership type.

As opposed to the first proposition, where a measure of association was computed between two variables, the second proposition only considered those respondents indicating a member focused value orientation and not those representing the fully scaled value orientation indicator. This being the case the use of percentage table analysis was highly appropriate and was utilized to test the second proposition.

As previously mentioned, in that this study dealt with an entire population inference was not warranted and therefore not considered. A counter-argument to this approach, however, has been made by Blalock (1972) who saw the idea of computing inference measures on population data as a useful practice. He defended this on the basis of viewing the population under study as simply a portion of a larger population (in the present study--as perhaps voluntary associations in general). This study challenged his idea on the basis of statistical assumptions upon which inference measures are based. Foremost among these assumptions was the idea of a randomly generated and selected sample from the available population.\footnote{As it was not possible to enumerate the units of future populations, random selection leading to inference was also not possible.} For even though non-response may result in less than a complete population being considered, those not considered did not
represent a random group any more than those included, thus no case exists for a random based argument. Furthermore, the return rate for the present study being rather high (70.2%) tended to nullify criticism, to a certain degree, regarding a nonrepresentative data set. Having made the above point centering upon inference, it was necessary to specify decision rules for determining the degree of support for the propositions. Considering the size of the data set (40 observations) and the two techniques employed in analysis (tau-b and percentage tables), three rules were established with which to interpret findings. Although these rules could not be statistically supported (lacking inference considerations) they nonetheless were necessary. Towards this end a tau-b coefficient of at least .25, for each indicator based relationship, was designated as representing the minimum value necessary to support the relationship under investigation. This may seem a rather low value upon which to claim potential support, but considering the exploratory nature of the present study as well as the unrefined nature of work in the social movements area, this figure was justified. Second, this figure was consistent with those coefficients (r) found acceptable by researchers involved in the Ohio State studies (Stogdill, 1974). Additionally, considering that the number of respondents was rather low to begin with (n=40), as well as the nonrandom nature of their selection from the population (n=57), a group of 30 respondents per indicator based relationship was deemed minimal for a coefficient to be seen as useful. Regarding the second technique of percentage table analysis, the same
rule was applied focusing on a minimum of 30 observations per comparison. Additionally, the two categories representing the mobilizing extreme of leadership style were combined and compared with the collapsed values of a member focused value orientation in order to achieve suitable cell sizes. In this case the overall comparison was: of those organizations exhibiting a member focused value orientation, what percentage of leaders had a mobilizing style of leadership compared to those who did not? To complete the second portion of the decision rule scheme, differences of at least 10% between mobilizers and nonmobilizers were required before support was deemed to exist. Justification for the selection of this figure centered upon the low number of respondents, of which 10% at least equalled 4, and potential problems in achieving acceptable cell sizes.

A final note is in order with regards to two types of leadership variables. First, respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of contacts with major societal institutions. This was recorded in two ways. Respondents were initially asked to designate which category best described the frequency of organizational contacts with each institution ("very frequently"--"very seldom"). Then they were asked to specify the amount, if possible. As expected, very few respondents complied with the specification request and its contribution was seen as minimal within the context of the decision rules. The categorical response portion of this indicator was, however, answered by most respondents and therefore
showed promise. Second, in an effort to synthesize the broad number of responses to both forms of this indicator, two summary indices were computed: (1) the institutional contact index, where the categorical responses to the five institutional areas were summed to yield possible scores ranging from 5 through 25, and (2) specified institutional contact index, where the specified number of contacts for each of the five institutional areas were summed to yield a composite score.

The Propositions

In terms of the operationalized variables of leadership style, membership type, and value orientation, which number 19 indicators, a total of 60 separate propositions could have been constructed and tested to address the propositions. In that this would have presented a rather monotonous picture of the comparisons of interest, a scheme was developed for presenting the operationalized propositions in a more concise manner. The following constructions represent this effort and address Propositions 1 and 2, respectively. Regarding the second proposition focusing upon leadership style and value orientation, it will be recalled that (for reasons previously elaborated upon) only the first half could be tested. This proposed that a mobilizing style of leadership was associated with a member focused value orientation (individual change), but nothing could have been said concerning an articulating leadership style. This situation, along with requiring different analytic techniques,
implied differences in the following constructions which are apparent upon examination.

**Proposition 1**

1a. The percent of the organizations' budget contributed by members and,

1b. The members' responsibility to organizational goal achievement and,

1c. The openness of organizational membership requirements will all be positively and substantially (tau-b .25) related to each of the following indicators of leadership style.

I. The uniqueness of the organization's doctrines.

II. The degree to which organizational doctrines provide clean-cut alternatives to nonenvironmentally sound practices.

III. The degree to which a leader feels that he/she was "called" to their present position.

IV. The leaders' commitment to the ideology of the environmental movement.

V. The frequency of leader-member contact.

VI. The extent to which the organization deems member education as an important focus.

VII. Frequency of instrumental leader compromise with nonenvironmentally oriented groups.

VIII. Communication direction, drawing from a member/nonmember perspective.

IX. The extent to which the organizations' goals are consistent with other environmental quality organizations.

**Proposition 2**

2a. Those organizations with a member focused goal direction will be substantially associated with those leadership
In that univariate analysis revealed that only two respondents fell into the two member focused categories of the value orientation variable, reconstruction of the operationalized form of Proposition 2 was necessary. Although this did change the form of the proposition, this was seen as being of no serious consequence due to the symmetry of the relationship. To achieve suitable cell size, the operationalized form of Proposition 2 was restated along the following lines:

2a. Those organizations with leaders exhibiting a mobilizing style of leadership will be substantially more associated with the value orientation indicator extreme of a nonsocietal focus (categories of member focus and both equally) than with a societal focus to the point of a 10% difference existing between those exhibiting a societal focus and those not.

Implied in the above restatement was the idea that categories were collapsed for the reason of making valid comparisons. Regarding the value orientation indicator, this was collapsed by combining the two categories representing the societal focus into one societal focus category. Also the two categories representing a member focus were combined with the intermediate category of both equally to form the category of nonsocietal focus. This indicator, which originally was represented by five categories, was dichotomized into two categories. The leadership style indicators, which originally were represented by five categories, were modified by collapsing the two categories which represented the mobilizing style of leadership. This collapsing of the leadership style
indicators did not include the articulating or intermediate categories of the indicators due to the form of Proposition 2a. It should be noted, however, that if the leadership style indicators had been completely collapsed, it too would have two categories of nonmobilizing and mobilizing in order to claim consistency with Proposition 2. The importance of this lay in its relation to minimum cell sizes necessary for valid comparison. This was the case because of the decision rule which demanded a minimum of 30 observations for a comparison to be seen as useful. In that, however, this rule applied to the entire distribution a modification was necessary. Taking this 30 observations and dividing by 4 (number of collapsed cells) revealed a figure of 7.5 which, rounded to 8, represented the minimum cell size necessary, considering that only one-half of the distribution (mobilizers only) were being considered. This means that only those comparisons where each of the two cells were at least 8 were considered a valid test of Proposition 2.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A variety of techniques were available with which to handle survey data of the type found in this study. Considering both the content and format of the propositions to be tested, the techniques of percentage table analysis as well as the coefficient tau-b were selected for use. The analysis was basically descriptive, utilizing the ordinal level of measurement, and tested propositions implying two way causation, thereby pointing towards a symmetrical measure of association. Analysis proceeded along the lines of considering the 19 indicators as representative of the particular variables under consideration. To this end, the following three sections focus upon (1) univariate aspects of the indicators as well as the variables, (2) bivariate considerations, including the zero order testing of the propositions, and (3) conditional relationships, those manipulations which served to specify under which conditions particular relationships seemed to hold up. As will be recalled, from previous discussion in the methods section, three decision rules were established with regards to support being shown for the propositions. These rules deemed a 10% difference in percentaged cells as necessary to support the value orientation—leadership style proposition and a tau-b coefficient of at least .25 being
necessary to support the membership type-leadership style proposition, with a N of 30 being necessary for both comparisons. The arbitrary nature of these rules (owing to a lack of inference considerations) should lead the reader to consider not only whether results fit the rules but also how closely they fit and if others come close. Additionally, readers should consider the idea that the data set was partially based upon respondents recollections including perceptions of themselves and their organizations. In that perceptions effect not only interpretations of present and future events but also past events, leader perceptions may have played a role in relationships discovered.

While reading this section the reader may want to occasionally refer to questionnaire responses found in Appendix 1 as well as Appendix 2, which identified indicators by their numeric representation.

Univariate Analysis

Within the context of the instrument some items were stated in the negative and others in the positive. This was done in an effort to reduce potential bias on the part of respondents. To place these indicators into a format for comparison, responses were reversed where necessary. In terms of leadership style, this resulted in indicators showing a high value (up to 5 in most cases) as representing a mobilizing style of leadership. To examine the leadership indicators by themselves, median and interquartile range scores were computed (see Table 1).
Table 1
Median and Inter-Quartile Range Scores for All Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Q*</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inter-quartile range
Considering first the leadership indicators, the median scores ranged from 2 through 5 with 11 of 14 being 3 or more (see Table 1). This tended to indicate that most respondents exhibited a mobilizing style of leadership. This may be traced to the population, the instrument, or both and will be addressed at a latter point. In terms of the interquartile ranges for these indicators, the distribution was further explored. These scores ranged from .8 through 3.4 with 11 of 14 (not consistent with above median ratio) values falling between 1 and 2. Considering the possible range of 5 scores, and therefore a maximum value of 4.0, for this statistic, one characteristic of the indicators was apparent. This is that the leadership indicators did not discriminate well between mobilizers and articulators. This conclusion was not absolute, however, because it may have been affected by the population under study.

One leadership indicator was different from the rest in that it asked respondents to categorically respond to a series of questions regarding the frequency of their organization's contacts with major societal institutions. One item was devoted to each of the following institutional areas: (1) political, (2) economic, (3) educational, (4) religious, and (5) cultural. These areas were individually included in the previous discussion of leadership style indicators but the index created through their summation was not. This index was found to have a median value of 10 (scores ranging from 0-19) which may be viewed as a middle value, defying interpretation.
Additionally, the interquartile range score for this index was 6.0, which, when viewed as a proportion of possible responses, was consistent with the other indicators which were found to be lacking in discriminating power. Another perspective was gained when these institutional areas were ranked from greater to less frequent contact with environmental quality organizations. The results of this ranking were (1) political, (2) economic, (3) educational, (4) cultural, and (5) religious.

As alluded to above, 6 of the leadership indicators were alternative forms of other leadership indicators. Five of these were the result of asking respondents to specify (after categorically responding) the number of contacts with specific societal institutions their organization has had in the last year. (The sixth was a summary index.) As expected these items produced a rather low response rate (n = 8 through 14) and therefore their utility with regards to analyzing the propositions was minimal. As these items asked respondents to draw upon detail of up to a year in age, the low response rate was understandable and pointed to the need to treat responses as tentative. This having been the case, responses to the specific institutional contact items were simply ranked so as to show which institutional areas may have been contacted more by environmental quality organizations than others. The ranking of these institutional contact items resulted in (from most to least contacts): (1) political, (2) economic, (3) educational, (4) religious, and (5) cultural. This was almost identical to the previous ranking.
of societal institutions through responses to the categorical format of this indicator except for the reversal of the religious and cultural institutions. This presented little problem, however, due to the low number of responses to these items in general. Also of interest is the finding that, of all the specific institutional contact items, the political and economic institutions were overwhelmingly higher than any other. This extreme emphasis upon political and economic contacts may be interpreted as an instance where organizational maintenance has displaced the goals of information promulgation and popular support.

Examining the three indicators of membership type revealed a range of medians from 1 through 3 (see Table 1). In that the lower scores reflected a more inclusive (as opposed to exclusive) membership type, these scores pointed out that most organizations had a tendency towards inclusive requirements. As with leadership style, this may be traced to the instrument, the population, or both. The interquartile range scores for indicators of this variable ranged from .5 through 3.4, which (again as with leadership) pointed to a low degree of discrimination between extreme categories.

Turning next to the variable of value orientation, the median value was 2.0, which pointed towards most organizations exhibiting a societal focus (see Table 1). The interquartile range score for this indicator was 1.43 which indicates (consistent with the preceding two variables) a rather low degree of discrimination between a member and societal focus.
To end this section on a note of speculation one further point should be made. With regards to the statistics presented above, it may have been the case that either the population under study was composed of leaders exhibiting a mobilizing style of leadership, or that the instrument did not discriminate well between leaders exhibiting mobilizing versus articulating leadership styles. In the first case the results would be accurate in terms of the high median values of leadership indicators as well as the high interquartile range scores. In the second case, the instrument would be seen as having some effect on statistical outcomes and therefore results may be obscured. To help remedy this situation the next section deals with bivariate analysis of leadership and the other two variables.

**Bivariate Analysis**

In this section the propositions discussed throughout this thesis were empirically tested. To this end the techniques of tau-b and percentage table analysis were applied to the data set at hand in order to test propositions 1 and 2 respectively.

Early in this thesis the question was asked: "To what degree was leader behavior determined by attention to dual environments, as reflected by internal and external influences?" To help answer this question two propositions were offered:

**Proposition 1:** "An exclusive organization is almost certain to have a leadership which focuses on mobilizing membership for tasks, while the inclusive organization is readier to accept an articulating leadership style."
Proposition 2: "The M0 (Movement organization) oriented to individual change is likely to have a leadership focused on mobilizing sentiments, not articulating with the larger society. Organizations oriented to changing the larger society are more likely to require both styles of leadership, depending on the stage of their struggle" (Zald & Ash, 1966).

Discussion initially focuses upon an examination of Proposition 1 which looked at the relationship between the variables of leadership style and membership type. At this point the reader is referred to Table 2 for a listing of all tau-b coefficient measures of association between the indicators of these variables. As will be recalled, the decision rules allow consideration of only those comparisons where there was a minimum of 30 observations. As was previously discussed this prevented consideration of those leadership style indicators in which respondents indicated the specific number of contacts with societal institutions. The remaining indicators, on all variables, were sufficiently large so as to enable the comparisons of interest to be made, attention is directed toward these.

Thorough scrutiny of Table 2 revealed that of those comparisons where 30 or more observations were used only two membership type indicators were found to produce acceptable tau-b coefficients (\( \geq .25 \)). These indicators were "percent of organization budget contributed by members" and "openness of membership requirements." Examining first the member contribution indicator, of 15 possible comparisons with the leadership style indicators, only three were at least .25 (20%). These comparisons utilized the leadership style...
Table 2
Tau-b Coefficients Between Indicators of Leadership Style and Membership Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Openness of Requirements</th>
<th>Member Responsibility</th>
<th>% of Member Funding</th>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Leadership Style Indicators Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uniqueness of doctrines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doctrines/clear cut alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calling to position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commitment to movement ideology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frequency of member contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education of members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frequency of compromise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Goal consistency/other environmental organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Institutional contact index-categorical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>Total specified contacts**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Political contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Type</td>
<td>Openness of Requirements</td>
<td>Member Responsibility</td>
<td>% of Member Funding</td>
<td>Indicator No.</td>
<td>Leadership Style Indicators Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified political contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Religious contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified religious contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Specified economic contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Specified cultural contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Specified educational contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ( ) represents population size (N)

** 24 observations equal 0
indicators of "frequency of member contact" (.34), "importance of member education" (.31), and "communication direction" (.33).

Moving on to the second membership type indicator of "openness of membership requirements," of fifteen possible comparisons only one (6.7%) met the established criteria. This comparison utilized the leadership style indicator of "goal consistency with other environmental organizations" and revealed a tau-b of .39. Thus of 45 possible comparisons only four were found to be supportive of Proposition 1. This leads to the conclusion that there exists little evidence to support Proposition 1. An alternative explanation may be possible where only some dimension(s) of the two variables were addressed through the selected indicators. Although acknowledgement of this notion tended to partially support Proposition 1, overwhelming evidence to the contrary ruled out this conclusion.

Attention now turned to the testing of Proposition 2. As will be recalled a minimum of eight observations per cell was deemed as necessary for a comparison to be considered valid. Table 3 lists all these valid comparisons in percentaged form and includes the cell frequencies as well as the size of the group being considered. Upon examination it was noted that only seven of fifteen comparisons conformed to the preestablished decision rule, regarding minimum cell size, and thus provided a valid test. Of these seven comparisons, none provided support for the proposition. Indeed, in no case was the percentage of those mobilizers responding in a non-societal manner greater than those responding in a societal manner, let alone a 10% difference existing between the categories in the
Table 3
Percentage Distribution of Mobilizing Leaders with Societal and Nonsocietal Value Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Nonsocietal</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.86% (19)*</td>
<td>32.14% (9)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.70% (23)</td>
<td>30.30% (10)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65.52% (19)</td>
<td>34.48% (10)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65.63% (21)</td>
<td>34.38% (11)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67.65% (23)</td>
<td>32.35% (11)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>59.40% (19)</td>
<td>40.60% (13)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.60% (14)</td>
<td>36.40% (8)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ( ) = cell frequencies

predicted direction. Thus there can be little doubt that the data did not support Proposition 2.

In closing this section on the bivariate analysis of the propositions, a few summary statements are in order. This section, in that it provided an actual testing of the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions, may be considered the most vital portion of this thesis. Unfortunately it also held the greatest potential for disappointment in case it is found that either the propositions could not be tested or were not supported. Through the reworking of Proposition 2 the first obstacle was avoided, but the second could not be. This is so because neither proposition was supported through analysis. The only consolation is that this is the lot of empiricism in the social sciences—to examine ideas for accuracy and report findings in an unbiased manner. To this end the preceding
section was useful for it investigated proposed relationships and found little or no support for them. In this way the number of alternatives for explaining leader behavior has been reduced, thus the potential exists for not only increased understanding of leadership through discovery of what it is not, but also provided an increased sense of direction for those planning future research in this area.

Conditional Relationships

It has been concluded, on the basis of bivariate (primary) analysis, that the data provided no support for the propositions under study. There may have existed a situation, however, where variables, other than those of interest, acted in a spurious or intervening manner on the relationship and thereby confounded results of statistical manipulations. In order to deal with this situation conditions under which a relationship may or may not hold up were examined, and their effects controlled for. Two issues were addressed before this procedure was implemented: (1) what types of variables may be used for control purposes, and (2) what effect does the propositional format have on variables selected for control purposes? These issues are the focus of the following paragraphs.

Justification for the selection of specific variables for control purposes pointed toward one of three general areas. The first of these areas was that of methodological concerns where effects of study design characteristics were examined. Regarding
the present study, the design characteristics of interest were the number of mailings and the leadership status of respondents. The second type of variable that should be considered for control purposes was that which may be broadly described as demographic. In this area population characteristics were examined regarding their effect on the primary relationship. In the case of the present study two populations were defined as being pertinent to the selection of demographic variables. These populations were the group of organizations that comprise the data set and the group of leaders of these organizations. In the present study three variables of this type were selected: (1) the length of time the organization had been established, (2) the number of organizational members (size), and (3) the length of time the leader had held his/her present position (office tenure). Of these, the first two addressed the population of organizations and the last addressed that of the leaders. The final type of variable considered for controlling purposes was that which is theory based. In this area variables are selected on the basis of conditions imposed on the primary relationship by the same theory used to substantiate the primary relationship. In that the theoretical underpinnings of the present study imposed no such conditions, this type of controlling variable was not addressed.

Concerning the two methodologically based control variables, the possible effects of the number of mailings was first examined. Three mailings took place in order to achieve as high of a response
rate as possible due to a rather small population size. It may have been the case that leaders returning questionnaires after repeated mailings were motivated to do so for reasons different than those returning them after one or two mailings, and their responses may have been influenced accordingly. In that the decision rules did not allow consideration of comparison consisting of less than 30 observations, the only controlling manipulation possible was that which considered those observations returned in response to the first and second mailings—excluding the third. Along this line the tau-b coefficients, used to test Proposition 1, were recomputed. This resulted in no additional information being revealed. Indeed, the minimum of 30 observations was not even achieved for the four comparisons found to be supportive at the primary level.

The second proposition, regarding the value orientation indicator of "goal direction" and the indicators of leadership style, was also reexamined controlling for the mailing returned. In the primary comparisons, 7 of 15 were found to have acceptable cell sizes. After controlling for the mailing variable this number was reduced to 5. Consistent with results obtained regarding the primary relationships, in none of the 5 acceptable comparisons was the percentage of mobilizers greater for those with a non-societal orientation than for those with a societal value orientation.
The second methodologically based control variable was that of the executive or leader status of respondents. As previously mentioned, there was some question regarding the official leadership position of several respondents. To this end a letter was sent to those individuals in question requesting additional information regarding their official position. From this a determination was made regarding whether a respondent occupied a leadership position or not. Additionally, nonrespondents were classified in the same manner as those who may not have been leaders, thereby erring in the direction of exclusion. In order to test Proposition 1 while controlling this variable tau-b coefficients were recomputed considering only those respondents whose leadership status was not in question. As with the previous methodologically based variable no additional comparisons were found to be substantial within the context of the decision rules. Differing from the previous control variable was the finding that most comparisons having the required minimum of 30 observations in the primary relationships were found to still fit this criteria (except "goal consistency with other environmental organizations" - N = 28). With regards to those comparisons found acceptable, this controlling procedure revealed only slightly different coefficient values, although all tau-b values were still well above the .25 minimum. Examination of the effect of this variable on Proposition 2 revealed similar results. Of those 15 comparisons made at the primary level, 7 were found to have suitable cell size. Controlling for this variable reduced this number by two to five. As with the previous controlling
variable, in no comparison was the percentage of mobilizers with a non-societal greater than those with a societal value orientation, let alone a 10% difference.

Thus the primary comparisons used to test the propositions were reexamined in an effort to account for two specific design characteristics--mailing returned and respondents leader status. It was found that by controlling for these variables no additional (acceptable) relationships were discovered. On the other hand, it was found that the relationships discovered held up for the most part in spite of these controlling procedures, thus lending partial support to the existence of relationships found to exist at the primary level.

The next type of control considered was from the demographic area. The first of these was the length of time an organization has been in existence. To this end the questionnaire requested information on how many years the organization had been established. Consideration of the minimum number of observations as well as the idea of 1970 marking the popularization of the environmental movement (Earth Day), lead to the decision to consider only those organizations which had been in existence for eight or more years. In order to examine the effects of this variable on Proposition 1, the tau-b coefficients were recomputed using only those observations where the organization had been established for more than seven years.
One additional comparison was discovered to fit the decision rules. This comparison used the leadership style indicator of "communication direction" and the membership type indicator of "openness of membership requirements" and resulted in the coefficient value increasing from -.14 to .25 (n = 32). Other comparisons remained unchanged.

The comparisons involved in the testing of Proposition 2 were also examined while controlling for the demographic variable "length of establishment." Contrasting with the seven valid comparisons made at the primary level, controlling revealed only six that were valid (n = 30). Consistent with findings at the primary level there were no instances where the percentage of mobilizers with nonsocietal value orientations were greater than those with societal.

The second demographic variable to be controlled for was that of size (number of members). It was arbitrarily decided that there may have been differences between those organizations having 100 or more members and those with fewer (which may have more closely resembled a small group than an organization). In that the number of organizations with 100 or more members was less than 30, this precluded the testing of Proposition 1. Regarding Proposition 2, of seven valid comparisons at the primary level, only two met the cell size criteria when organizational size was controlled for. In neither of these two cases was the percentage of mobilizers with nonsocietal value orientations greater than
those with societal.

The organizationally based demographic control variables examined above revealed no additional information regarding the validity of the propositions. Therefore the conclusions reached at the primary level were not affected by their consideration and the determination of nonsupport was warranted.

The final demographic control variable concerned the population of leaders and addressed the leaders' office tenure. Within the instrument respondents were asked how long they had occupied the position they now hold. This was considered because it was felt that a leader who had occupied his/her position for a short period of time may have perceived environmental effects in a manner different from those with somewhat longer office tenure. To this end only those respondents who had office tenure of one year or more were considered for control purposes. To test Proposition 1 tau-b coefficients were recomputed between indicators of the variables leadership style and membership type. The results of this procedure revealed that only two comparisons fulfilled the 30 observation minimum, both of which were found satisfactory at the primary level. Thus, no additional support was evident. In terms of the magnitude of these two comparisons there were some differences, however. The tau-b coefficient between the leadership indicator "frequency of member contact" and the membership indicator "percent of member funding" decreased from .34 to .27. Additionally the tau-b coefficient between this membership type indicator and "communication
direction" increased from .33 to .43. Thus the validity of those two relationships existing at the primary level was supported.

The effect of office tenure was also examined in terms of testing Proposition 2. As had been the pattern, only two comparisons were found to have adequate cell size within the context of the decision rules. In neither of these comparisons was the percentage of mobilizers with nonsocietal value orientations greater than those with societal. Thus no further information was revealed.

In this section the possibility of influences, other than those addressed by the propositions, having an effect on results obtained at the primary level was examined. Study design and demographic variables were considered significant and their effects were controlled for. Consistent with conclusions reached at the primary level, this section has shown there exists little support for the propositions, thus the previous conclusions remained unchanged.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The previous chapter concluded that this study provided no support for the two propositions under consideration. A more comprehensive statement would take the form of: There is no evidence to support the idea that the internal and external environment of the organization, as represented by the environmental avenues of membership type and value orientation, to some degree interact with the style of leadership in social movement organizations. This is not to say that there are no alternative explanations possible, but rather that the above is the most likely given the data at hand. Two alternative explanations, one centering on methodology, the other on the environmental movement, are possible and are presented below.

The first alternative centers on the methodological aspects surrounding measurement of the leadership variable. Although efforts were made to avoid attitudinal indicators, examination of Table 1 leaves one with the impression that this did not result in a totally behavioral set of measures. Indeed, many of those not found to be useful could be said to be vague and colored by leader perception to the point of inaccuracy. This being the case the argument could
be made that the three leadership indicators, which are sufficiently related to the two indicators of membership type, provide support for Proposition 1 on the basis of quality and not quantity of indicators. This is one possible alternative explanation.

The second possible alternative explanation for the findings centers on a characteristic of the environmental movement itself and addresses Proposition 2. This proposition focuses upon the value orientation of the movement organization as an avenue through which environmental constraints may be operative. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, very few organizations have a member focused value orientation. Although this was countered through substantial restructuring of the operationalized proposition, this statistically based manipulation did not represent the full extent of the situation. The actual impact lies in the finding that only two leaders expressed the idea that they had an internal focus of change—thereby leading one to question the applicability of this concept to the population under study. The environmental movement has undergone the process of institutionalization at a rate much more rapid than other social movements (Albrecht, 1976), and therefore leaders may identify with areas external to the environmental movement organization per se. A second reason for an overwhelming focus on society may be traced to the urgency with which environmental problems are identified. Environmental dogma revolves around both exhaustion of nonrenewable resources and irreparable damage to natural areas. In light of the perceived urgency of these situations, it is likely
that environmental organizations desire exposure on a wider basis than the organizational membership provides. This also leads to an external (societal) focus. Following from the above two points (rapid institutionalization and urgency) a third explanation for an overwhelmingly societal focus centers upon the idea that many environmental organizations are involved with technical programs (air and water pollution, climate and geographic studies, etc.) A focus such as this would preclude a member based focus while turning to the promulgation of knowledge aimed at depicting the nature of environmental problems. Thus, considering the above points it does not seem too surprising, that Proposition 1 received little support and Proposition 2 received none.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research**

This section combines two traditionally separate areas in an attempt to not only list problems that have been encountered but also to examine ways which they could be avoided. The first limitation is the obviously low number of observations which prevented extensive investigation of conditional relationships. This may be seen as traceable to the source of the population in that the authors of the Encyclopedia of Associations may not have had access to all environmental groups, through their traditional channels, and therefore the organizations examined may represent a truncated form of the population of interest. In that there is nothing inaccurate about this listing, except its possibly incomplete nature,
one way to rectify this problem of a low number of observations would be to use this listing as a base and include, within the instrument, the list and a request for respondents to note other environmental organizations not yet identified. This procedure is known as "snowball sampling."

The next three limitations center on the concept of leadership. As alluded to above, leader perception may have had an effect upon the leaders' assessment of their organization as well as their own behavior. This is one area where this study may be open to criticism and should be seriously considered in any replication. Two alternatives are available which would help to rectify this situation: (1) researchers may familiarize themselves with the psychological literature on perception, choose the most appropriate orientation, and control for leader response in ways that would allow for isolation of its effects, or (2) employ more empirically based measures such as direct observation, interviewing, and content analysis of organizational documents. In that the second alternative appears most plausible, its use is recommended, although the first may also prove useful.

A second limitation regarding the concept of leadership is the idea of multiple leadership. The effect of this limitation on the present study is simply not known but considering the size of these organizations (median number of members = 390, see Appendix 1) an assumption of a single leader may be justified. In the case where one may not be able or willing to make this assumption, network
analysis of a smaller number of organizations may prove useful.

The final limitation centering on leadership looks at the importance of leadership. This has been an area long ignored, perhaps due to its strong tie to the elusive concept of efficiency. Indeed, Pfeffer (1977) is the only author who has addressed this problem directly and he presents only two pieces of evidence, both dealing with high level administrative efficiency. These studies both conclude that change in leadership has very little effect (Lieberson & O'Connor, 1972; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). On the other hand, Selznick (1957) claims it does matter, especially when exercised at a crucial point in an appropriate manner. Although this is a limitation on this study it also is a limitation on all leadership studies and its impact should be viewed in this light. If future research wishes to avoid this limitation additional research should be undertaken in the footsteps of Lieberson and O'Connor as well as Salancik and Pfeffer, although careful consideration as to the type of organization may address this issue and warrant the assumption of importance.

The next limitation centers on the idea of movement perspective. From the turn of the century through the fifties the environmental movement was seen as essentially conservation oriented. From this early orientation developed two more refined positions. Through a focus on environmental quality, many organizations have promoted wise use of nonrenewable resources as well as such concerns as pollution levels. Another focus of the contemporary environmental
is the goal of maintaining all nondeveloped areas in their natural state, an aesthetic orientation. It may be the case that these differences in perspective may account for differences in leadership style due to differences in external influences. To overcome this limitation a quota based snowball sample could be employed in order to obtain sufficient numbers of responses to allow consideration of differences in perspective. A base list similar to that discussed earlier would also be helpful.

Another limitation of this study is its narrow focus upon a special type of organization, that being the social movement organization. This focus may tend to inhibit generalization to other organizations and leaders. However, there is a positive side to this limitation in that it may not be justifiable to view social movement organizations as simply organizations. This is noted with respect to their close connection with the social movement. In this sense a narrow focus is not only justified but necessary to investigate the organizations of social movements.

A further limitation of this study is the incomplete nature of Proposition 2. As will be recalled this proposition includes a time reference when predicting leadership in organizations with a societal value orientation. Although this was accounted for in the present study, further theoretical development may be called for in order to evaluate the importance of this time consideration as it runs counter to the general focus of the research question.
The final limitation to be discussed is the obvious situation of few prior tests of the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions. Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1976) were identified as providing the only prior test of these propositions. The only remedy available is to simply encourage more research directed at the testing of these propositions.

Implications

A unique feature of the present study is that it focuses upon two areas (organizations and social movements) that traditionally have been vaguely defined and consist of disparate fields. The study of organizations has traditionally been the realm of sociology, management, psychology, and general business. Social movements have been dominated by social psychology, voluntary associations, and collective behavior. The complexity of the subject may help explain the social movements field while application in the business/industry area may explain the situation in the study of organizations. If it accomplishes nothing else this study is valuable in that it represents an attempt to unite these two areas and focus them on a common problem--the effects of environments on leadership.

From a theory building perspective, the present study is significant in two ways. First, Thompson's (1967) idea on the environment of organizations was found not applicable to leadership. Second, social movement leadership was examined in terms of its context and found to be no more useful than its examination in terms of even more vague concepts (i.e., legitimacy and efficiency) than style.
A final point surrounding the significance of this study is one that has been previously mentioned. This is the idea that, irregardless of other considerations, two of the Zald and Ash (1966) propositions were tested in a scientific manner. Why they have been virtually ignored in research settings for over a decade is not known but perhaps when applied to the organizations of other social movements these propositions may be found useful.
Appendix 1

Percentaged Questionnaire Responses

Name of Organization: ________________________________

Address of Organization: ________________________________

Number of members: Median = 390 [34]

Date of establishment (not including name changes): Length: median = 9 yrs [40]

Name and title of officer filling out this questionnaire: ________________________________

How long have you been a member of this organization? Median = 6½ yrs. (78 mos.) [38]

How long have you held an official position in this organization? median = 5 yrs. (64 mos.) [38]

How long have you held the position you now hold? median = 4 yrs [39]

The following are a series of questions followed by a set of possible responses. Please choose that response most appropriate to you or your organization, and indicate that choice by placing a check mark in the space provided.

1. As compared to other organizations not involved in the environmental movement, the doctrines of this organization are unique.
   
   42.1 Strongly Agree 7.9 Disagree
   36.9 Agree 2.6 Strongly Disagree [38]
   10.5 Uncertain

2. The doctrines of this organization provide clear cut alternatives to non-environmentally sound practices.

   52.6 Strongly Agree 5.3 Disagree
   36.8 Agree 0 Strongly Disagree
   5.4 Uncertain

3. My decision to take the position I now hold in this organization was based on a "calling" of sorts.

   40.5 Strongly Agree 10.8 Disagree
   40.5 Agree 2.7 Strongly Disagree
   Uncertain

4. My decision to enter the environmental movement was based upon a commitment to a political ideology which views the environmental movement as an instrument to be used to achieve a safe and secure environment.

   35.1 Strongly Agree 10.8 Disagree
   32.4 Agree 13.5 Strongly Disagree
   8.1 Uncertain

( ) = frequency  [ ] = N
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5. How many times in the last six months have you had contact with members of your organization?

- 64.1% Very Often
- 23.1% Often
- 10.3% Sometimes
- 2.6% Almost Never
- 0% Never

6. Concern for the education of members, relative to environmental issues, is an important focus of our organization.

- 63.2% Strongly Agree
- 29.0% Agree
- 2.6% Uncertain
- 2.6% Disagree
- 2.6% Strongly Disagree

7. In order to further the goals of our organization(s), I have, as its representative, often compromised with other groups that expounded positions at odds with our own.

- 2.6% Very Often
- 2.6% Often
- 44.7% Sometimes
- 23.7% Almost Never
- 26.3% Never

8. How often in the last year has your organization been in contact with groups or individuals representative of the political community, such as congressmen, lobbying groups, special committees, etc.?

- 35.9% Very Frequently
- 25.6% Frequently
- 7.5% Sometimes
- 12.8% Very Seldom
- 7.7% Seldom

If possible, please specify the number of contacts: median = 37.5

9. How often in the last year has your organization been in contact with groups or individuals representative of the religious community, such as clergymen, local, state, or national church councils, etc.?

- 2.5% Very Frequently
- 5.0% Frequently
- 7.5% Sometimes
- 32.5% Seldom
- 52.5% Very Seldom

If possible, please specify the number of contacts: median = 1.0

10. How often in the last year has your organization been in contact with groups or individuals representative of the economic community, such as banking institutions, governmental funding agencies, philanthropic associations, etc.?

- 12.5% Very Frequently
- 37.5% Frequently
- 22.5% Sometimes
- 10.0% Seldom
- 17.5% Very Seldom

If possible, please specify the number of contacts: median = 10
11. How often in the last year has your organization been in contact with groups or individuals representative of the cultural community, such as historical preservation associations, art societies, classical music associations, etc?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If possible, please specify the number of contacts: median = 3 [7]

12. How often in the last year has your organization been in contact with groups or individuals representative of the educational community, such as school administrators, local boards of education, university administrators, etc?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If possible, please specify the number of contacts: median = 5.25 [8]

13. Concerning your organization's communication effort (e.g. newsletters, publications, press releases, etc.) which of the following best describes its direction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost totally with members</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More with members than non-members</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both members and non-members equally</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More with non-members than members</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost totally with non-members</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The membership requirements of my organization could best be described as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open to all</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to most</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to some</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to few</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to very few</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Overall, how much responsibility do members feel towards the achievement of organizational goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great responsibility</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much responsibility</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some responsibility</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little responsibility</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little responsibility</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please indicate the percentage of this organization's annual funding that is contributed by the membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% or less</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 40%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% to 60%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% to 100%</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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17. The goals of my organization may be best seen as being directed at changing society in general rather than changing individual members.

42.1 Strongly Agree 2.6 Disagree
23.7 Agree 2.6 Strongly Disagree
29.0 Both equally

18. Please indicate the degree to which the goals of your organization are consistent with other environmental quality organizations.

36.8 Highly consistent 10.5 Different
21.0 Consistent 5.3 Very Different
26.3 Similar
### Appendix 2

**Listing of Indicators Along With Their Numeric Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Question No. in Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uniqueness of organizational doctrines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clear cut nature of alternatives to nonenvironmental mentally sound practices provided by organizational doctrines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leader &quot;called&quot; to present position</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leader commitment to movement ideology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frequency of leader-member contact</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Importance of member education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frequency of leader compromise</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication direction</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consistency of goals with other environmental quality organizations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Institutional contact indec---categorical responses</td>
<td>Sum of 8, 9, 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Frequency of political contacts---categorical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Frequency of religious contacts---categorical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Frequency of economic contacts---categorical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Frequency of cultural contacts---categorical</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Indicator Number</td>
<td>Indicator Description</td>
<td>Question No. in Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Frequency of educational contacts--categorical</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Style</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Openness of membership requirements</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Member responsibility toward organizational goal achievement</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Percent of member funding</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Orientation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Goal direction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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