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The purpose of this study was to identify the self-reported leadership style of higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to six selected demographic variables: age, sex, highest academic degree earned, years of experience in either colleges or technological institutes, marital status, and union experiences. The subjects of the study were 58 directive council members of three colleges and five technological institutes in Venezuela. Eighty-three percent of all potential subjects participated in the study. Two instruments—the LBA-II-Self (Spanish version produced by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.) and a demographic data form—were used to gather data.

The validity and reliability of the Spanish version of the LBA-II-Self was calculated; the alpha reliability coefficient obtained was .55. Parametric and nonparametric tests were used to test the hypotheses of no expected differences. The t test was formulated to test the independent variables of age and years of experience in higher education. The chi square was the statistic model applied to test the null hypotheses for the variables of sex, marital status, highest degree earned, and union experiences.
The six null hypotheses of this study were accepted \((p < .05)\). There were no significant differences between self-reported leadership styles of higher education administrators in Venezuela and six demographic variables: age, sex, highest academic degree earned, years of experience, marital status, and union experiences. In general, the findings of this study confirmed findings of previous research studies. Evidently, demographic variables seem not to be predictors of leadership styles; therefore, further studies are not recommended.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Since 1960, higher education has evolved greatly in Venezuela. Changes have occurred primarily as a consequence of several factors: (a) an accelerated process of enrollment; (b) a lack of appropriate planning regarding financial support; (c) inadequate physical settings; (d) implementing new curricula ordered by the new National Plan; and (e) new policies resulting from the demands and needs claimed by students, staff, and employees as shown by their numerous strikes. Other external factors, such as societal influences, government changes, and the increased movement to privatize public education, are being considered.

Higher education administrators are dealing with the above mentioned facts in a very direct way. Gleazer (1984) posited that differences of opinion also exist among faculty and trustees about the directions toward which institutions should move. The dynamic interaction among all members of the school organization creates the stage for the establishment of leadership.

Leadership grows by facing problems and challenges imposed by environmental factors. The variety of educational situations makes leadership function accordingly. In order to understand and solve the situational variables that are present in the management of
organizations of higher education, the style of leadership used is very important.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Venezuela has been confronting great economic difficulties. Social problems, health needs, and educational issues have not escaped financial difficulties. The economic crisis is produced mostly by the instability of a development model based on producing, exporting, and marketing oil (Oficina de Planificacion del Sector Universitario [OPSU], 1985). These realities have also generated a crisis for political, administrative, and educational leadership. Lack of credibility, managerial skills, and corruption are part of the sustained crisis. There is a need for leadership to begin to envision, to strengthen values, and to recognize the struggle of the people.

The legal structure of colleges and technological institutes of Venezuela has not allowed the development of leadership for educational administration. The politically ruled Ministry of Education appoints school administrators. The 3-year appointment of the president, vice-presidents (academic and administrative), and division chairpersons (Ministerio de Educacion, 1974) make up the institutional body called the directive council which exists in each institution. Some of these administrators are noneducators, each with his own style of leadership, and these are to be the ones responsible for the operational and functional structures of higher education!
Problem

The directive council is an academic-administrative body that makes decisions and policies to regulate and establish norms for the institutional life of each college and technological school in Venezuela. The higher education administrators who are directive council members should put into practice the policies established by the centralized Ministry of Education. Nevertheless, different decisions are being made by different directive councils. Each board should act alike in all institutes. Since the educational policies dictated by the Ministry of Education are unique, such decisions should be adhered to by the directive councils in all institutions. However, members who integrate the directive council have their own style of leadership which may have either a positive or negative impact on the institution as a whole. Faculty members, students, and the community in general are forced to deal with these style variations.

Leadership styles are important in the management of any organization. The university level draws the lines and behaviors that establish the differences among institutions. The styles of the directive councils of each Venezuelan higher education institution should be identified in order to facilitate a better understanding of the norms and policies established, and the ways they are to be used to govern and lead. Stogdill (1974) pointed out that:

It is not especially difficult to find persons who are leaders. It is quite another matter to place those persons in different situations where they will be able to function as a leader. It becomes clear that an adequate
A few research studies have been done on leadership of higher education administrators to determine the impact of leadership styles on the same population. To reinforce this, Vroom (1984) said that researchers have done few investigations in leadership in higher education institutions.

A similar situation exists in Venezuela. Such studies were found at the undergraduate level, in the private sector, and concerning secondary school administrators but not in higher education. Consequently, investigations in the higher educational levels in the area of leadership styles are not known. The interest of this research is to determine if there is a relationship between selected demographic variables and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members of Venezuelan colleges and technological institutes. The following questions can be raised from the research statement:

1. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of members of the directive council and their chronological age?

2. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of female and male members of the directive council?

3. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of members of the directive council and the higher degree they have earned?
4. Is there a significant difference between years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

5. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of the directive council members and their marital status?

6. Is there a significant difference between the degree of union participation and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

Definition of Terms

The common tendency in education is to use different terms with similar meanings. In order to avoid ambiguities, definitions of terms are presented to assure uniqueness in the written expressions of this study. The operational definitions of the variables are presented in Chapter III.

**Directive council:** the highest institutional body which exerts authority and power to make decisions, policies, and regulations of Venezuelan colleges and technological institutes.

**Higher education administrator:** one who participates with voice and vote in the decisions that are discussed and made in the directive council. The members of the directive council are: the president, two vice-presidents, division chairpersons, a student representative, and a faculty member representative.

**College and technological institutes:** places to prepare and educate professionals with a higher education degree in all those
areas required for the development of the country. These organiza-
tions use modern learning systems, new curricular orientations, and
research programs related to the regions in which they are located.
The Ministry of Education, through the National Council of Universi-
ties, provides them the basic principles of the regional develop-
ments which need attention. These institutes are supervised, con-
trolled, coordinated, and evaluated by the Director of Higher Educa-
tion of the Ministry of Education.

**Leadership style:** a consistent behavior pattern that educa-
tional administrators exhibit as perceived by others when attempting
to influence the activities of others. This study has used the
styles of leadership proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1989) in the
situational leadership approach. The four styles are selling, tell-
ing, participating, and delegating.

**Demographic variables:** concerned with the individual charac-
teristics of the administrators that relate to their personal pro-
files. The variables are: age, sex, marital status, highest degree
earned, years of experience in higher education, and union partici-
pation experiences.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-reported
leadership styles of the higher education administrators in
Venezuela as related to selected demographic variables, such as,
age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience in colleges and
technological institutes, marital status, and union experiences.
Importance of This Study

Some research studies have been done in the U.S.A. related to leadership styles and demographic variables in higher education administrators. The target populations studied in these investigations have been deans, college presidents, department heads, and chairpersons (Burne, 1985/1986;Cole, 1984; Coleman, 1987/1988; Hadley & Andrews, 1978; Jones, 1985; Ortyoyande, 1984; Schlack, 1974/1975). The findings are controversial. Literature reviews relating to research in examining higher education administrators' (directive council members) leadership style were negligible both in the U.S.A. and in Venezuela. Consequently, this study attempted to contribute data and conclusions for both educational societies for continued research.

The development of this research is considered to be important. Findings may indicate the existence of differences in leadership styles that have been used in specific situations, in another setting, and at the same administrative level, but with a different ethnic group. Specific expressions of culture are seen in organizational development. Because the Venezuelan education system is managed, administered, and regulated by the Ministry of Education, the factor of style must be taken into consideration in this study. Such research findings might result in better methods of the future decision-making processes of this governing body. Specifically, this investigation would call attention to the ways that this administrative structure has been considered up to now and how to name
its administrators. By having a better understanding of the leadership style patterns of the members of the directive councils, the college and technological communities could derive great benefit.

Assumptions

The major assumptions of this study were:

1. The members of the directive council of colleges and technological institutes of Venezuela can be characterized as high readiness (high maturity level) and self-motivated employees who require low supervision. This assumption is associated with the situational leadership model proposed by Hersey and Blanchard in 1977 and its modification in 1989. This model is followed in this study.

2. The more union participation experiences a member of the directive council has will be exhibited by a higher readiness level.

3. Experiences in laboring in colleges and technological institutes are characteristics which may influence the leadership style.

4. Participation and delegation are the leadership styles exhibited by the members of the directive council.

Limitations of the Study

This study was developed in the capital and central regions of Venezuela. The external validity would be affected since ecological generalizations cannot be accomplished in other settings. In addition, public institutions were the only type of organizations to be
considered.

Another limitation referred to the population involved in the study. The directive council is an organic structure used only in some colleges and technological institutes of Venezuela. Modifications in this legal structure have been done through the years under the approval of the Ministry of Education. This implies that the findings were also limited to those institutions with similar organizational structure.

The responses given by the participants of the sample also represented a limitation. The individuals answering the self-reported questionnaire would do so in a normative manner rather than behavioral one. This would influence the findings negatively. All the samples received the same standardized questionnaire in order to reduce delimitating factors.

Conceptual Framework

For three decades, leadership studies have been filled with situational or contingency theories. Theories such as Fiedler's (1967) leadership effectiveness, Hersey and Blanchard's (1969, 1977, 1989) life cycle, House's (1971) path-goals, and Vroom and Yetton's (1973) decision-making process were the main representatives of the theories that have endeavored to explain which leadership behaviors are the most appropriate in handling a situation when it emerges. In general, these theories assume that leader effectiveness is a function of an appropriate matching of leader behavior, situational variables, and environmental factors.
The situational leadership model developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969) was the basis of the framework of this study. This model allows for the description of the perceived leadership styles of the members of the directive council of Venezuelan colleges and technological institutes.

The situational leadership model is sustained under the interaction among the (a) task behavior a leader gives, (b) relationship behavior and socioemotional support a leader provides, and (c) level of readiness that a follower exhibits in performing specific tasks (Hersey & Blanchard, 1989). This model provides leaders with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of readiness of the follower.

The leadership styles involved in the situational leadership model are demonstrated in four quadrants and are the products of the combination of task and relationship behavior. These are (1) selling, (2) telling, (3) participating, and (4) delegating.

There is no best way to influence others' behaviors, according to the situational approach (Owens, 1987). The situation will establish the behavior to be assumed by the leader. There could be similar situations and similar behaviors. Consistent behavior appears to be an important aspect in any situation.

Many studies have been done using the situational approach. Vroom (1984) believed that leadership research conducted under this perspective does not seek to identify universal characteristics. Rather, research is directed toward discovering the situational variables that allow certain kinds of leadership behavior to become
effective. He added that delegating and participating seem to be the most appropriate styles in educational settings with a minimum range of selling and telling.

In 1987, Bennett applied the situational leadership model to the college level. His findings determined little differences between the self-reports of the president's leadership style and his perceived style as determined by others. He found that the four leadership styles are related to their definitions of task and relationship behaviors. At the same time, Jones (1985), in research involving community college administrators, found that there was no difference in the leadership styles among senior administrators.

The Hersey and Blanchard (1969) situational leadership model has been used frequently. The public and private sectors have been training managers and executives using this model. In general, the model seems to be appropriate for use in this study in which the main scenario involves Venezuelan colleges and technological institutes. In this study, some demographic variables were investigated as compared to leadership styles. The literature findings showed similarities and discrepancies in variables such as sex, age, educational background, marital status, and years of experience.


Regarding years of experience, Chacon and Rivas (1984) and Monaco (1985/1986) found this variable to be related to leadership style, while Brown (1985/1986), Cole (1984), Gilmore (1984), Jones (1985), and Khair (1984) are opposed to these findings.

Marital status and leadership style have been determined to relate to each other (Chacon & Rivas, 1984; Rebhun, 1985/1986; Schlack, 1974/1975).

The academic degree earned by an individual holding a position in any educational level has been found to relate to his or her leadership style (Burne, 1985/1986; Cheri, 1975/1976; Hadley & Andrews, 1978; Johnson, Peterson, & Kahler, 1968; Jones, 1985; Villarreal, 1984/1985). No relationship between educational background and leadership style, however, has been reported by Cimperman (1985/1986), Brown (1985/1986), Cole (1984), and Ortyoyande (1984).

No studies were detected in the area of union experiences as a variable related to leadership style in educational settings.

The literature reviewed has shown inconsistencies regarding leadership styles as they relate to demographic variables. Most of the studies have been developed in North America whose cultural context is unique. The individual differences of the participating subjects are reflected in the findings. There was a need, then, for
further investigation in another cultural setting that may contribute to clarity some of the contradictions and inconsistencies found.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-reported leadership style of the higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to selected demographic variables, such as age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience in colleges and technological institutes, marital status, and union experiences. This chapter is presented in three sections. The first is a review of situational leadership theories; the second, an overview of leadership styles; and the third is a description of findings in demographic variables regarding leadership styles.

Review of Situational Leadership Theories

The situational approaches are concerned with examining the characteristics of the group in which the leader operates and the situation with which the group must deal. These approaches hold that leadership can be more appropriately explained in terms of the interaction between the leader and other variables presented in the work setting.

The reliable prediction of the effects of leadership styles on organizational outcomes has filled the development of the modern situational theories (Chemers, 1984).
Fiedler's Contingency Approach

Fiedler's (1967) contingency model postulates that the effectiveness of the group is contingent upon the relationship between leadership styles and the degree to which the group situation enables the leader to exert influence. Of all situational models of leadership, Fiedler's is undoubtedly the most thoroughly researched (Vroom, 1984). This contingency model attempts to reconcile the personal trait approach with ideas of different requirements.

Fiedler's (1967) approach centered on personality as measured by the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) scale, which he found to be related to group performance. A low LPC leader, who assigns largely negative attributes to the least preferred co-worker, is seen as primarily task motivated, whereas a high LPC leader is seen as relationship motivated.

The work of Fiedler (1967, 1971b) and Fiedler and Chemers (1974) initiated the era of the situational or contingency study. Fiedler hypothesized in his work that group productivity was dependent on the match of leadership orientation (task versus relationship orientation) and situational favorableness (a mix of personal trait, group, and situational variables). In this research, Fiedler operationalized leadership orientation in terms of high and low scores on his LPC scale. Situational favorableness was determined in terms of eight categories indicated by high and low scores on three dimensions: (1) degree of task structure, (2) amount of power, and (3) quality of interpersonal relationship.
Fiedler (1967) found that task-oriented leadership was related to effectiveness in moderately favorable situations. He developed a scale of situational control based on the features of the situation. These were (a) leader-member relations, (b) task structure, and (c) position power. The research findings indicated that neither style is effective in all situations.

The contingency model has been the subject of considerable controversy. Many arguments have been raised over the meaning of the LPC scale, the appropriateness of situational variables, and the general predictive validity of the theory (Chemers, 1984).

Immegart (1988) said that Fiedler's work served to establish the value of the contingency approach for the study of leadership. At the same time, Yago (1982) posited that Fiedler clearly questioned the notion that there is one best way to lead, and he took the first important direct step toward the study of leadership in terms of situational dependencies. His research has developed two measures of leadership styles, the LPC scale and the closely related Assumed Similarity Opposites (ASO) scores, and has also introduced the concept of situational favorableness. His theory postulates that leadership style is determined by the needs the individual seeks to satisfy in the role of leadership. In increasingly less favorable leadership situations, there is found a corresponding increase of threat to the leaders' gratification.
House's Path-Goal Theory

House's (1971) path-goal theory is concerned with the influences of specific leader behavior on subordinate motivation and satisfaction, rather than the more general issues of decision making and performance (Chemers, 1984). The path-goal researchers have studied the influences of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ, Yukl, 1989) categories of considerate and structuring behavior. The theory predicts that leader-structuring behavior will have more positive effects on subordinate psychological status when the subordinate's task is unclear and unstructured. Structure, provided by the leader, helps to clarify the path to the goal for the subordinate. Consideration is concerned with neither participative decision styles nor decision making. Such an approach will have more positive influences when subordinates have a boring or distasteful job to perform.

The path-goal (PG) theory, promulgated first by Evans (1970) and later by House (1971), is predicated by some basic ideas about the determinants of individual choice behavior often called expectancy theory (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1964). The basic idea is that the performance of subordinates is under the control of choices made by them concerning the amount and kind of influence that they expect on their jobs.

Vroom (1984) stated that the PG theory is perhaps more suggestive than definitive in its implications for leader behaviors. The PG theory has served more to guide research in identifying important
situational variables for use in future research. On the other hand, its "looseness," and the absence of readily available measures or indicators of the needed awareness for leader interventions, make it less useful as a guide to practice by leaders.

The initial version of the PG theory contained only two leadership behaviors: supportive leadership and instrumental or directive leadership. A revised version by House and Mitchell (1974) added two more behaviors, participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership.

Yukl (1989) cited that the PG theory provides a conceptual framework to guide researchers in identifying potential situational variables. The proponents of the theory intended it to be only a tentative explanation of the motivational effects of leadership behavior and they did not attempt to include all of the variables that may be relevant. When the followers are performing relatively unstructured tasks, the PG theory proposes that a leadership style high on task behavior and low relationship behavior will be most effective.

Vroom and Yetton's Normative Model

The Vroom-Yetton Normative (VYN) model (Vroom & Yetton, 1973) is based on the leader behavior in the decision-making process. The decision is measured in terms of quality and acceptance regarding the effect on the subordinates.

The effect of participation in decision quality depends upon the distribution of important information and problem-solving
expertise between the leader and subordinates. The VYN model assumes that participation will result in good quality decisions.

The procedures for decisions in the model involve two variables of autocratic decision (AI, AII), two variables of consultative decision (CI, CII), and one variety of joint decision making by leader and subordinates as a group (CIII).

The model establishes that the decision procedures are effective depending on:

1. The amount of relevant information possessed by leaders and subordinates.
2. The likelihood that subordinates will accept an autocratic decision.
3. The likelihood that subordinates will cooperate if allowed to participate.
4. The amount of disagreement among the subordinates with respect to their preferred alternative.
5. The extent to which the decision problem is unstructured and uniqueness creative problem solving. (Owens, 1987, p. 145)

In 1988, the model was revised. Vroom and Yago (1988) included criteria hierarchically classified and a single procedure by applying the criteria.

In the VYN (Vroom & Yetton, 1973) model, a yes or no answer is required for the situational questions (Yukl, 1989). This model is supported and respected by such researchers as Hersey and Blanchard (1989). The model is seen by Immegart (1988) as a "diagnostic tool" for managers or designated leaders "to be used in specific situations in order to determine the appropriate degree of participation in decision making activity" (p. 265).
Bass, Valenzi, Farrow, and Solomon (1975) identified five decision-making styles similar to Vroom and Yetton's (1973) styles. They concluded that the effects of decision styles on group performance and subordinate satisfaction depend on the situation.

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Model

The situational leadership approach, originally called life cycle theory of leadership, then situational leadership theory, and lately situational leadership model is based on an interaction among (a) the task behavior, (b) the relationship behavior, and (c) the readiness level that the follower exhibits in performing specific tasks (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1977, 1982, 1989).

The situational model springs as a result of the University of Michigan and the Ohio State University studies reported by Halpin (1966), Blake and Mouton's managerial grid (1964), and Reddin's (1967) 3-D effectiveness model. This model attempts to explain effective leadership. The combination of an effective style of leadership and the readiness level of the follower is the essence of the leadership understanding of the situation.

The components of this model are defined as follows:

1. Task behavior is "the extent to which the leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities of an individual or group. These behaviors include telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who is to do it" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1989, p. 172).
2. Relationship behavior is "the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi-way communication. The behaviors include listening, facilitating and supportive behavior" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1989, p. 172).

3. Readiness level is referred to as "the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish specific tasks. People tend to be at different levels of readiness on the task they are being asked to do" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1989, p. 175).

Four levels of readiness of the follower are identified: (1) R1, unable and unwilling; (2) R2, unable but willing; (3) R3, able but unwilling; and (4) R4, able and willing. The level of readiness determines the optimal level of leadership behavior detected through the four styles called: telling, selling, participating, and delegating.

Different positions regarding this model have been adopted by investigators in the area of leadership. Yukl (1989) recognized that the model presents some deficiencies; but the model has provided positive contributions, such as flexible and adaptative leadership behavior, leadership awareness of building skills and confidence in subordinates, and "the recognition that the leader behavior can be exhibited in a more or less skillful fashion" (p. 108). Also, Vroom (1984) stated that the model is useful in leader training rather than in selection and job engineering.
Leadership Style

The major emphasis during both the trait and behavior eras of the study of leadership has been to identify the best style of leadership. However, leadership researchers were unable to dictate a prescriptive and unique style as being the best (Chemers, 1984). Style, according to Immegart (1988), refers to a consistent behavior pattern exhibited by a leader in a leadership situation when attempting to influence the activities of others. The individual's disposition as perceived by others in specific situations has induced the conceptualization and differentiation of individual styles.

Leaders show style variability. The most effective or successful leaders demonstrate different styles in different situations (Bass et al., 1975).

Boles and Davenport (1983) posited that leadership style and authenticity are the essence of the process of leading. The influence of the style greatly depends on the quality of the leader-follower relationship in a given situation (Hollander, 1978). Literature states two clearly defined sides in the study of the effect of leader style: first, a leader exhibits different styles; and second, style is dependent upon the situation.

Leadership Style Under Behavioral Approach

The behavioral approach implies that the leadership style exhibited by a leader is a combination of task-oriented behavior and
people-oriented behavior (Halpin, 1969; Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1960; Owens, 1987; Reddin, 1970). The styles of leadership described by researchers have combined the concern for people and their relation to the task performance. Such an example may be found in Blake and Mouton (1964). Their introduction of the managerial grid theory identified the varying styles managers might use in dealing with people and the situations in which they find themselves. In the model a 9,9 pattern of leadership is indicated to yield optimum results in most organizations.

Reddin's (1967) own line of inquiry identified leadership styles and grouped them according to their level of effectiveness measured in terms of task and relationship oriented behavior. Four leadership styles were indicated: (1) separated, (2) related, (3) integrated, and (4) dedicated. Reddin agreed that different situations require different styles.

Halpin (1969) delineated two significant styles of leadership: initiating structure and consideration. Three different styles of leadership behavior were also traced at the University of Michigan: (1) task-oriented behavior, (2) relation-oriented behavior, and (3) participative leadership (Likert, 1967). Barnard (1966) used the term effectiveness to mean task accomplishment and efficiency as satisfaction describing leadership style.

Further, studies in the behavioral approach also have described the importance of the congruence between leadership behavior and organizational expectations. Getzels and Guba (1957) identified three styles of leadership: (1) nomothetic, (2) ideographic, and
(3) transactional, also called by Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968) as normative, personal, and transactional styles. The first two represent the opposite poles on a continuum. The nomothetic leader seeks employees who will submit to unthinking compliance with impersonal rule and formal organizational roles. The ideographic leader delegates authority and stresses the meeting over the accomplishment of organizational objectives. The transactional leader tries to balance employees' personal needs with organizational objectives, usually by finding areas of compatibility. This leader must adopt one of the other two styles depending upon the circumstances.

In sum, the behavioral approach of leadership has strongly reaffirmed the situational manner of the phenomenon (Immegart, 1988). The tendency of the different studies about leader style has indicated the reciprocal interaction of three elements that contribute to delineate the variability of the leader behavior. They are (1) task orientation, (2) people orientation, and (3) circumstances surrounding the behavior exhibited.

Leadership Style Under Situational Approach

Fiedler (1967) initiated the era of the situational studies. In his study, Fiedler hypothesized that group productivity was dependent on the match of leadership orientation and the situational favorableness. Leadership orientation was operationalized in terms of high or low scores on his LPC scale. Situational favorableness was determined by eight categories which indicated by how high or
low on three dimensions: (1) degree of task structure, (2) amount of power, and (3) quality of interpersonal relationships. Fiedler found that task-oriented leadership is related to effectiveness in situations of high and low favorability and that relationship-oriented leadership is related to effectiveness in moderately favorable situations. His work confirms that leader style is situational in nature and posits leadership effectiveness as being situational in nature as well.

Vroom and Yetton (1973), in their normative contingency theory, resumed the decision analysis model. The normative contingency theory focuses on decision-making activities. The leader analyzes the problem and chooses from five styles. Logical bases are given for using different styles for maximum effectiveness under specific circumstances. In other words, the leader has the ability to vary his or her style to fit the situation.

House (1971) proposed the path-goal (PG) theory in which a leadership style high on task behavior and low on relationship behavior is the most effective. Four leadership styles are identified in the PG theory: (1) supportive leadership, (2) directive leadership, (3) participative leadership, and (4) achievement-oriented leadership. House involved two categories of situational variables: the personal characteristics of subordinates and the environment in which they must deal.

The situational model of leadership by Hersey and Blanchard (1982, 1989) proposes four basic behavior styles of leadership in terms of task behavior and relationship behavior. The styles are
(1) telling, high task and low relationship; (2) selling, high task and high relationship; (3) participating, high relationship and low task; and (4) delegating, low relationship and low task. A person's leadership style, according to Hersey and Blanchard, involves some combination of task behavior and relationship behavior.

The situational model expresses that the effectiveness of leaders depends on how their leadership style interrelates to the situation in which they operate. The style of a leader is reinforced over a period of time. The use of a specific style requires specific elements in the situation given. The situational leadership appears to confirm that there is no best way to lead and that the leadership style used depends on the characteristics of the situation.

Demographic Variables in Leadership Studies

Sex

Sex is a commonly used variable in many research studies (Bass, 1982). Differences in leadership styles between females and males have been identified in all types of organizations and management functions. Some researchers have found some relationship between sex and leadership style. Bartley (1987/1988), for instance, with a sample of 29 instructors and 79 students, using the instrument called LBDQ-XII found that sex had some influences on leadership style. Heischmidt (1984/1985) studied 401 junior and senior college students enrolled in general service business courses at Southern
Illinois University at Carbondale. His study reported that sex appeared to be a possible predictor of consideration leadership style as assessed by the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) instrument.

Al-Shakhis (1984/1985) was among 312 school administrators in Saudi Arabia who concluded that sex does have an influence on leadership style. Research by Monaco (1985/1986), with a sample of 22 principals and 329 teachers, found a significant relationship between principals' leadership style as measured by the LPC scale and sex. Also, Hersey and Blanchard (1977) using the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) determined that women reported themselves to be slightly higher in consideration, while men reported themselves higher in task rather than relation orientation.

Among 100 high school professionals, Carpeno (1976) detected no differences due to sex on the LOQ instrument. Brown (1985/1986), with a sample of 151 principals and using the LEAD-Self instrument, determined that no relationship existed between leadership style and sex. In a study by Cimperman (1985/1986), with a sample of 320 male and 115 female administrators in the Wisconsin vocational, technical, and adult education system, using the LEAD-Self instrument, detected that male and female administrators perceived their own behavior as leaders in the same manner, the selling style.

Jones (1985), investigating 150 males and 150 females who were selected by random sampling from a population of 2,360 community and junior colleges in the U.S.A., found no differences in management style as attributable to sex. In 1976, McGregor said the model of a
successful manager in the U.S.A. culture is a masculine one. Cultural forces, he added, have not only shaped the existence and acceptance of masculine superiority in management and administration, but has reinforced it as well. The same situation could be happening in Venezuela. Sex distinctions in leadership are a function of role expectation styles and situational variables (Hollander, 1978). Expectations from subordinates do not change with the sex of the leader. The situation is more likely to stimulate behavioral changes in the subordinates. Changes in the society are approaching a more acceptable stance in its view of women in leadership positions. The differentiation between the sexes tends to be apparent but not substantiated. This study, then, intends to investigate sex as a variable and its relationship to leadership style.

Age

The findings in research related to age and its relationship to leadership have shown some contradictory evidence. Jones (1985) found that among 300 community and junior college administrators that differences in leadership styles were identified as a function of the age of administrators. Monaco (1985/1986), with a sample of 22 principals and 329 teachers, detected that principals' leadership styles were related to their ages. The older principals scored higher on the LPC scale indicating a tendency to be more human relation oriented than their younger counterparts. Also, using the LBDQ questionnaire, Burne (1985/1986) determined that among 85 subjects, the age of the director of cooperative education was the most
important personal characteristic predictor of the cooperative education director's LBDQ score. Coleman (1987/1988), with a sample of 18 college presidents of the City University of New York, reported that there was a significant relationship between the leadership style and the age of the president.

Cheri (1975/1976), among 88 community educators randomly selected from Colorado, Florida, and Michigan, who responded to Reddin's Educational Administrative Style Diagnosis Test (EASDT), concluded that community educators predominantly use the executive and benevolent autocratic styles. He also noticed that community educators use distinctive styles according to age.

Contrary to these findings, Khair (1984), using the (LBDQ-XII) instrument with a sample of 300 secondary school teachers and 30 secondary school principals in Kuwait, ascertained that the principal's age had no effect on his or her leadership behavior. Roberts (1985/1986), with a sample of 31 principals and 186 teachers using LEAD-Self and LEAD-Others, also determined that there was no significant difference between age and leadership styles. Using the LEAD-Self instrument with a sample of 151 principals, Brown (1985/1986) reported that with a .05 level of significance with 10 degrees of freedom there was not enough evidence to show a significant relationship between leadership style and age.

The age variable, though amply studied, has produced no consistent findings to make it a reliable research factor. In a different cultural context, it would be interesting to explore whether such a relationship exists. Therefore, in this study, age of the
Venezuelan higher education administrators will be used for such purpose.

Experiences

The study of leadership style has been traced through significant variables. Years of experience in the workplace is one such variable. Research has shown that its relationship to leadership style has come from different educational levels. For example, Roberts (1985/1986), with a sample of 31 principals and 186 teachers from public high schools using the LEAD-Self and LEAD-Others, found no significant differences at .05 level of significance between leadership style and the length of service as school administrators. Khair (1984), in examining a sample of 300 secondary school teachers and 30 secondary principals in Kuwait, using the LBDQ-XII scale, reported that years of administrative experience of the principal also had no effect on his or her leadership behavior.

In Michigan, Gilmore (1984), using the Management Inventory instrument, studied all school business officials employed in K-12 public schools. Findings indicated no relationship between leadership style and experience. Jones's (1985) findings, that surveyed 300 community/junior college administrators with the LEAD-Self questionnaire, showed that no differences exist in leadership styles as a function of experience in higher education.

In research carried out in black colleges, Cole (1984), with a sample of 54 subjects, determined that years of experience did not affect the perception of leadership style among black college
presidents.

Monaco (1985/1986), in studying 85 principals, measured their leadership style by the LPC scale and found significant differences regarding the years of administrative experience in the school system. However, Brown (1985/1986), with a sample of 151 principals, found no relationship existed between leadership style and the length of service.

In Venezuela, Chacon and Rivas (1984) studied different demographic variables in a sample of 201 principals. They reported that experience may affect the principal's leadership style in relation to leader consideration.

The purpose of exploring years of experience in a different culture would confirm the actual findings that the leadership style is not related to it. Most studies reviewed except for two indicated that experience as a demographic variable is not related to leadership style.

**Marital Status**

Individuals in leadership positions are expected to possess particular characteristics. One of these is referred to as the civil legal status (marital status). Not many researches have developed in the area of leadership style and its relation to marital status. Studies by Chacon and Rivas (1984), among 201 junior high school Venezuelan principals, reported a relationship between the intermediate leadership style and the marital status. Rebhun (1985/1986), in his research on the impact of administrative
leadership style, other organizational variables, and stress on the absenteeism of elementary school teachers, found that a significant difference did exist between leadership scores and marital status.

In a sample of 150 women drawn from the 1973-74 membership list of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors with the following characteristics: 51% unmarried, 9.1% divorced, and 40% married, Schlack (1974/1975) showed a substantial relationship between marital status and leadership styles. Vaughan (1989) indicated that 87% of the deans of instruction at college level were married, whereas 92% of the current presidents were also married; only 1% were divorced, 6% of the deans were divorced; 2% of the presidents were unmarried, and 6% of the deans were unmarried. The need to be married for the sake of image may be stronger among the presidents than the deans. Ortyoyande (1984), with a sample of 18 chairpersons and 108 faculty randomly selected from four universities in Michigan, found that marital status showed no significant correlation with leadership behavior.

Perhaps the real importance of this variable lies in expanding the knowledge of leadership style and in getting at more complex interactions of variables for a domain that has been empirically shown to be difficult.

**Highest Degree Earned**

The literature reviewed indicated evidence of some relationship between leadership style and the highest educational degree earned by an individual. Johnson’s et al. (1968) study of 496 first-line...
foremen in a company from 1940 to 1961 indicated that there is a relationship between education and leadership and that the years of schooling increased from 10.8 to 11.2 during the same period.

Ortyoyande (1984), with a research population of 18 chairpersons and 108 randomly selected faculty members from four universities in Michigan using a demographic questionnaire and the LBDQ, reported no significant relationship between leader behavior and educational background. The statistical results of the LEAD-Self questionnaire given by Brown (1985/1986) to 151 principals of secondary schools of the United States showed that no relationship existed between leadership style and the principal's level of training and graduate or undergraduate major.

Burne (1985/1986) found support from among 85 subjects that the academic degree of the director of cooperative education was the most important predictor of the cooperative education director's LBDQ score.

Cheri (1975/1976), with a sample of 88 community educators randomly selected from Colorado, Florida, and Michigan using Reddin's (EASDT) questionnaire, reported that community educators with master's degrees or above were significantly higher developed. On the other side, Cimperman (1985/1986), using the LEAD-Self questionnaire with a sample of 320 male and 115 female administrators in the Wisconsin vocational, technical, and adult education systems, determined no differences between leadership style exhibited by male or female administrators and the highest degree earned. Jones (1985), in an earlier study, indicated that leadership style is a
function of educational background. Hadley and Andrews (1978), using a sample of nine administrators at Los Angeles Southwest College, contended that the seven holding doctoral degrees and the two with master's degrees all showed authoritarian style. As mentioned before, Cole (1984), in his study with 54 black college presidents, found that the level of instruction did not affect their perceived leadership style.

From the literature review the findings have shown some disparities. In spite of these differing conclusions, this study included the relationship to reconfirm whether or not such a relationship exists in a different cultural setting.

**Union Experience**

Union affiliation and experience manifested by faculty has not been examined. The faculty participation and involvement in academic unions, and its influence in leadership styles, represents a relevant point in this study. Such a variable is included since Venezuelan university and college academic life is highly influenced by the organized unions. In Venezuela, the participation in union organizations is mandatory. Faculty members are regularly part of the executive committee of the unions. In many cases, higher education administrators are appointed due to their involvement and influences in the unions.
Summary

The situational approaches of leadership have filled the literature. Four situational models have tried to explain the characteristics of the group in which the leader operates and the situation with which the group must deal. The models are: (1) Fiedler's (1967) contingency approach, (2) House's (1971) path-goal theory, (3) Vroom and Yetton's (1973) normative model, and (4) Hersey and Blanchard's (1982, 1989) situational leadership model. The framework of this study is represented by the situational leadership model based on an interaction among (a) the task behavior, (b) the relationship behavior, and (c) the readiness level that the follower exhibits in performing tasks. Four styles of leadership are identified in this model: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. Numerous research studies have shown the inconsistencies and agreements regarding the relationship between demographic factors: age, sex, highest degree earned, union experience, marital status, and years of experiences in higher education and leadership styles.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-reported leadership style of the higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to selected demographic variables such as age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience in either colleges or technological institutes, marital status, and union experiences. In the previous chapter some of the literature relevant to leadership theories, leadership style, the situational leadership model by Hersey and Blanchard (1989), and demographic variables were reviewed. In this chapter a detailed description of the study and the methods and procedures used to test the hypotheses are discussed. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the (a) research questions, (b) sample, (c) research setting, (d) operational variables, (e) procedures of data collection, and (f) data analysis.

Research Questions

The main research question of this study to be investigated was as follows:

To what extent is there a positive and significant relationship between demographic variables (age, sex, marital status, highest degree earned, years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes, and union participation experiences) and
leadership style as measured by Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBA-II-Self) developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1989).

The following research questions were derived from the research statement:

1. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of members of the directive council and their chronological age?

2. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of female members as compared to male members of the directive council?

3. Is there a significant difference between the self-reported leadership styles of members of the directive council and the differing academic degrees that they have earned?

4. Is there a significant difference between years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

5. Is there a significant difference between the marital status of a member of the directive council and self-reported leadership style?

6. Is there a significant difference between the degree of the union participation experiences of the directive council members and the self-reported leadership styles?

Sample

The population of this study was defined as higher education administrators and members of the directive council of colleges and
technological institutes in Venezuela. The directive council consists of the president, the vice-presidents (academic and administrative), and division chairpersons. Three criteria were used to select the directive councils: (1) their members represent the institutional body that makes decisions about all academic and administrative aspects of the institutional life, (2) they consist of individuals who have been appointed by the Ministry of Education to govern these higher education institutions, and (3) each of the selected members of the directive council should have academic and administrative personnel under his or her supervision.

The members of the directive council are appointed by the Ministry of Education for a 3-year term. The requirements to be nominated as a part of the directive council are: (a) Venezuelan citizenship, (b) to be a faculty member of the institution, (c) to hold an academic rank of aggregated or above, (d) to possess tenure, and (e) to be appointed by the Minister of Education.

Two members of the directive council were excluded. The faculty representative and the student representative did not fit the second and third criteria used for the sample selection purposes.

The entire population of the directive councils of the colleges and technological institutes in Venezuela located in the capital and central regions of the country was used. Since the study took the target population, randomization is not necessary. A target population, according to Borg and Gall (1983), is formed by all members of the population to be studied. The involvement of the population
allowed the generalization of the findings to be more accurate and precise. The larger the sample, the smaller the standard of error (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985). The population of the study consisted of 58 members of the directive councils of three public colleges and five public technological institutes. Female and male individuals were part of the membership of the directive councils and ages ranged from 30 to 70 years old. Those tenured faculty have worked for years in the colleges and technological institutes. In general, members of the directive council have had some degree of union participation. They exhibit different marital statuses and degrees. Table 1 shows the number of directive council members by institution participating in this study.

Table 1

Number of Administrators by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Setting

The study was conducted at the colleges and technological institutions located in the capital and central geographical regions of Venezuela. The capital region is formed by Distrito Federal (Caracas, capital city) and Miranda state (Los Teques, capital city). The central region groups Aragua state (Maracay, capital city), Carabobo state (Valencia, capital city), and Yaracuy state (San Felipe, capital city).

Four institutions are located in the capital region. They are: Instituto Tecnologico Region Capital, Colegio Universitario Los Teques, Colegio Universitario Francisco de Miranda, and Colegio Universitario de Caracas. The central region contains the other four institutions. These are: Instituto Tecnologico La Victoria, Instituto Tecnologico de Valencia, Instituto Tecnologico Puerto Cabello, and the Instituto Tecnologico de Yaracuy.

The selection of colleges and technological institutes of the central and capital region of Venezuela was based on the fact that they: (a) were public institutions depending academically and administratively on the Ministry of Education, (b) were located in cities whose population density is over 1,000,000 inhabitants, (c) were accredited institutions which have been operating for more than 10 years, and (d) functioned under the same organizational structure.

A Venezuelan college is a three-year public institution whose mission is to form and train human resources based on a general
curriculum and multidisciplinary areas. The curriculum majors are mainly administrative and related careers.

A technological institute is a two- and three-year public institution created to prepare individuals in the basic and applied aspects of science and technology. The curriculum emphasizes those careers considered as priority areas required for the development of the country and according to the National Planning.

Table 2 shows the description and location of the institutions which were part of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Caracas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Caracas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>Technologic</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>Technologic</td>
<td>Aragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>Technologic</td>
<td>Carabobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>Technologic</td>
<td>Carabobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>Technologic</td>
<td>Yaracuy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capital and central regions have the highest population density in the country. Due to the decentralization of the capital city, Caracas, the surrounding states have captured the work force...
and, of course, the industrial development. The metropolitan area of Caracas and Los Teques contain the three colleges. The technological institutes are placed in industrial states (Aragua, Carabobo, and Yaracuy). (See Table 2.)

Operational Variables

**Independent Variables**

The demographic variables were considered the independent variables of this study. The variables involved were: age, sex, marital status, years of experience working in colleges and/or technological institutes, highest degree earned, and union participation experiences.

**Age:** the age of the member of the directive council, the population of this study. The age ranges were from 30 to 70 years.

**Sex:** categorized by female and male individuals who were members of the directive council of colleges and technological institutes.

**Marital status:** relates to the members of the directive council who were married, single, divorced, or widowed.

**Years of experience working in colleges and technological institutes:** number of years a member of the directive council has been working in colleges and/or technological institutes. Years of experience ranged between 4 and 23 years.

**Highest degree earned:** the professional degree earned or being earned by a member of the directive council. The degrees considered...
in the study were: bachelor, master, specialist, and doctorate.

Union participation experiences: a variable which aspires to collect information on the participation and involvement a member of the directive council has had in national and institutional unions which describe or categorize professors of higher education. In this variable the following categories were identified: (a) member of the national union directive board, (b) member of the institutional union directive board, (c) regular membership with active participation and involvement, and (d) regular membership without participation.

A demographic questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed to collect information in three areas:

1. Personal characteristics of the members of the directive council, which include age, sex, and marital status.

2. Professional characteristics of the members of the directive council, which involve years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes and highest degree earned.

3. Nonprofessional activities of the members of the directive council as indicated by their involvement and participation in national and institutional unions, which group higher education faculty.

The questionnaire was constructed based partly on items suggested by the literature reviewed. This instrument was totally adapted to the needs of the study.

The demographic instrument was translated into the Spanish language. Items were evaluated by two faculty members, a doctoral
student, and six members of the directive council of one of the
colleges and one of the technological institutes participating in
the research. They reviewed the instrument in a 2-day period. A
page was attached to the instrument indicating the importance, quan-
tity, length, sentence structure, reading level, and wording of the
items. The majority of the validity panel found similarities in the
characteristics mentioned. All items were categorized as very im-
portant. Regarding quantity, three panel members suggested to add
two items. The suggestion was not accepted since the items selected
were supported by the literature reviewed. In addition, three mem-
ers represented only 33% of the panel. The rule adopted, then, was
that in order to change, modify, or eliminate an item, it should be
referred by more than 50% of the panel of experts.

The items were neither reconstructed nor eliminated. The mem-
ers who participated in the evaluation of the instrument agreed
with the grammar construction of the items. The length and wording
were found appropriate. The content of the items was considered as
essential and important for the purpose of the demographic variables
studied. The experts in the validity of the items concurred in that
demographic items selected confirmed content validity.

Dependent Variable

Leadership styles, as self-reported, represented the dependent
variable of this study. For the purpose of this research, Hersey
and Blanchard's (1989) situational leadership model and their Leader
Behavior Analysis II (LBA-II-Self) instrument was used (Appendix B).
Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., authorized the use of the instrument for this study (Appendix C).

The selection of this instrument happened to be after the revision and analysis of two other instruments. In the analysis the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) was reviewed. The LBQ has been used in several studies with the purpose of seeking information about the perception of subordinates regarding leader behavior (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973). The LBQ was developed at Ohio State University and provides 12 subscales. Its reliability developed a conservative .70 to .87 for Consideration and .70 to .80 for Initiating Structure. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) developed by Fleishman and Hunt (1973) was also reviewed. Many estimates of reliability and validity are given from a variety of sources derived from an exhaustive consideration of the instrument. Gruenfield and Weisenberg (1966) who found a significant correlation of .40 between LOQ Consideration and Structure, suggests that under certain conditions common factors may affect both scores.

**Description of the Instrument**

The LBA-II-Self measures the leadership style of an individual administrator. The instrument consists of 20 typical job relations that involve a leader and one or more staff members. Following each situation are four possible actions that a leader may take.

The LBA-II-Self score comprises an interval scale. The style flexibility score can range from 0 to 30. The highest score that may be obtained is 30, and an individual scoring 30 in all 20
situations would indicate a highly adaptable leadership style. The style effectiveness score ranges from 20 to 80. A score closer to 80 suggests high style effectiveness.

Validity and Reliability of the LBA-II-Self Instrument

The LBA-II-Self instrument, produced by the Blanchard Training and Development Inc., was used in its Spanish version. This instrument has not been standardized; therefore, a pilot test was necessary in order to obtain its validity and reliability. The pilot testing was carried out in June 1990 once the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University approved the implementation of the research (Appendix D).

Pilot Study

The pilot study was carried out in two colleges located in Caracas from June 24 to July 5. The Universidad Experimental Libertador and the Politecnical Institute were the centers selected for the field testing. The content validity of the test was assessed by a panel of experts consisting of two presidents of colleges, an educational administrator professor, and a Spanish grammar professor. The panel corrected for sentence structure, content, and wording. Very few corrections were made. Item 20, for instance, read "una de sus . . ." It should read "uno de sus . . ." The modification of some words of Items 3, 5, and 18 were suggested. The panel members agreed that the content of the instrument and the item construction were relevant for the purpose of the study. There
were no changes suggested in this sense. In general, the Spanish version of the LBA-II-Self was considered to be adequate. They concluded that the translation of the English version of the instrument into a Spanish version was accurate. The experts did note a concern that the time necessary to answer the questionnaire was relatively long due to the item length.

Regarding the reliability of the instrument, 100 individuals participated in this process. The characteristics of the subjects participating in the pilot testing were very similar to those forming the sample representation. In effect, the criteria of selection established involved individuals who: (a) were currently school administrators, (b) had 3 years as school administrators, and (c) had at least one year as a school administrator in any educational level in the past.

The sample obtained consisted of 75 school administrators (principals, supervisors, and superintendents) who were attending graduate courses at the Universidad Pedagogica Libertador in Caracas and 25 faculty members who had held administrative positions at both the Politecnical Institute and Pedagogical University.

Pilot Procedures

A previous meeting with faculty members at the Universidad Pedagogica Libertador was held. The purpose of the meeting was to get their permission to use their graduate classes to administer the test. They agreed to it and a schedule was drawn. The researcher discussed the protocol to be followed in addressing the sample.
participants. Similar instructions were given in all classrooms regard­
ing purpose of the instrument, timeline, importance of the study, and specific directions of the questionnaire. Each faculty
(N = 5) was responsible for giving the questionnaire. The imple­
mentation of the pilot testing in this institution was developed
without obstacles.

Regarding the sample of 25 faculty members collected at the
Politechnical Institute, a list was obtained from the personnel
office to identify individuals who either were administrators or
were holding an administrative position. Two faculty members helped
in the process of administering the questionnaires and insuring the
return of them.

Results of Pilot Testing

The computer program Statistical Package for the Social
Sciences (SPSSx, Norusis, 1988) was used to calculate the reliabil­
ity coefficient. The alpha model computing Cronbach's alpha and the
standardized item alpha were used to estimate the reliability co­
efficient. The Cronbach's alpha is a general form of the KR-20
formula that can be used with items not scoring dichotomously. The
LBA-II-Self is not dichotomously scored. In this case, the alpha
model is the most appropriate (Borg & Gall, 1983) and had been used
to establish the reliability for the LBA-II-Self (Zigarmi & Edeburn,
1990).

The alpha reliability coefficient obtained for the instrument
was 0.559 and the standardized item alpha was 0.553. Zigarmi and
Edeburn (1990) reported that the internal consistency for the LBA-II-Self (English version) have ranged from a low 0.43 to a high 0.60. As it is seen, the consistency of the Spanish version is only 0.04 different from the highest reliability coefficient found in the English version of LBA-II-Self. The conclusion was made that the Spanish version had reliability coefficients comparable to the English version.

Data Collection

Permission to conduct the study at three colleges and five technological Venezuelan institutes was granted by the Director of Higher Education in the Ministry of Education. Also, the executive board of the faculty union organization called Federacion de Asociaciones de Profesores de Institutos y Colegios Universitarios (FAPICUV) wrote a support letter (Appendix E) to the presidents of the colleges and institutes participating in the study. Both letters were attached to the questionnaires at the moment of collecting the data. A cover letter describing the nature of the study and assuring the confidentiality of the information given was also included in the package (Appendix F).

The directive council members were required to complete the questionnaires and return them in an enclosed envelope to the researcher in person. The researcher traveled to each college and technological institute with planned visits in order to ensure the response rate. The calendar and schedule followed by the researcher in the process of data collection is shown in Table 3.
As shown in Table 3, all data were collected in a time period of 7.5 days. Five states located in the central region of the country were visited for this purpose. Most of the institutes are located in capital cities, except I.U.T. Puerto Cabello and I.U.T. La Victoria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>Caracas</td>
<td>7/02/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>Caracas</td>
<td>7/03/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>7/04/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>7/06/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>Aragua</td>
<td>7/09/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>Carabobo</td>
<td>7/10/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>Carabobo</td>
<td>7/11/90</td>
<td>1.0 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>Yaracuy</td>
<td>7/12/90</td>
<td>0.5 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-eight respondents were obtained from an estimated population of 58 directive council members. This sample of respondents was 83% of the total sample. The breakdown of the respondents is as shown in Table 4.

The percentage of respondents (83%) represented a reasonable expectation for a questionnaire returned. Response rates may range between 50% and 90% (Ary et al., 1985; Kerlinger, 1986). In this case, the response rate obtained was judged to be representative of
the total population examined. Only 17% of the population of 58 did not answer the questionnaire. Since fewer than 20% of the subjects failed to respond, this situation was not critical (Borg & Gall, 1983).

Table 4
Summary of Percentage of Respondents by Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Directive council members (N = 58)</th>
<th>Respond. (N = 48)</th>
<th>% R (T = 83%)</th>
<th>% NR (T = 17%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = Respondent. NR = No respondent.

Data Analysis

In the analysis, the demographic data of the members of the directive council were grouped by institutions. The responses were analysed to determine any significant influence on participants' leadership style (dependent variable). The descriptive statistic of
the demographic variables is expressed in tables containing frequency distribution of the sample, sample size, percentage, mean, and standard deviations.

The member score obtained on the LBA-II-Self survey instrument determined a specific style of the leader. A style was identified for each individual.

Based on the review of the literature, significant differences were not expected; therefore, the six hypotheses studied were stated in the null form:

1. There is no significant difference between the directive council member's age and self-reported leadership style.

2. There is no significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of female members as compared to male members of the directive council.

3. There is no significant difference between the differing academic degrees earned by the directive council members and the self-reported leadership style.

4. There is no significant difference between the directive council member's years of experience in higher education and the self-reported leadership style.

5. There is no significant difference between the marital status of directive council members and self-reported leadership style.

6. There is no significant difference between the degree of union experience of directive council members and the self-reported leadership style.
The statistical approaches used to test the hypotheses mentioned were t-test for independent means for Hypotheses 1 and 4 and the nonparametric statistical model of chi square to test Hypotheses 2, 3, 5, and 6.

In using the inferential model of t-test in Hypotheses 1 and 4, the following criteria were met:

1. All observations were independent.
2. A normal distribution of scores was assumed since the research is using the entire population. In addition, the size of the group is greater than 20 individuals.
3. Homogeneity of variance was also assumed since each group has approximately the same number of members as the directive council.

An alpha level of .05 was set for the rejection of the null hypotheses.

The chi square and the t-test and all calculations were computed by using the statistical package SPSSx (Norusis, 1988). The Computer Center facilities located at Western Michigan University were used for this purpose.

Summary

Chapter III includes a description of methods and procedures used in the study and consists of six sections. The main research statement and six research questions derived from it are stated in the first section. The second section dealt with the population and sample description. In the third section, the research setting was
examined in terms of location of the colleges and technological institutes, the selection criteria for institutions, and the characteristics of each institute. The fourth section dealt with the operational variables. Here, the independent variables (age, sex, marital status, years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes, highest degree earned, and union participation) and the dependent variable, leadership styles are self-reported. The description of the instrument and its validity and reliability were part of this section. In addition, the pilot test results were presented. The fifth section referred to data collection procedures; and finally, the sixth section showed the analysis of the data in which the research hypotheses to be tested and its statistical approaches were explained.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-reported leadership style of higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to selected demographic variables such as age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience in either colleges or technological institutes, marital status, and union experiences. In Chapter III, methods and procedures used to test the six hypotheses were discussed. The research questions were derived from the research statement which sought to determine the extent of the relationship between demographic variables (age, sex, marital status, highest degree earned, years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes, and union participation experiences) and the leadership style (measured by the Leader Behavior Analysis II instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard, 1990).

The design of the study involved the participation of 58 directive council members of Venezuelan colleges and technological institutes. Eighty-three percent (n = 48) of the population of subjects participated. The validity and reliability of the Spanish version of the LBA-II-Self instrument was calculated. Standard conditions for administration and scoring were used and the alpha reliability coefficient obtained was .55. The LBA-II-Self questionnaire was filled out by administrators of eight institutions.
In this research study, the independent variables were the demographic variables of sex, age, highest degree earned, years of experience, marital status, and union experience. The dependent variable was leadership style as measured by the LBA-II-Self (Spanish version produced by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.).

The data were analyzed by using parametric and nonparametric tests. The t test was used for testing the independent variables of age and years of experience in higher education. The chi square was the statistical model applied to test the null hypotheses including the variables of sex, marital status, union experiences, and highest degree earned.

Based on the review of the literature, significant differences were not expected; therefore, the six hypotheses studied were stated in the null form:

1. There is no significant difference between the directive council member's age and self-reported leadership style.

2. There is no significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of female members as compared to male members of directive council.

3. There is no significant difference between the differing academic degrees earned by the directive council members and the self-reported leadership style.

4. There is no significant difference between the directive council member's years of experience in higher education and the self-reported leadership style.

5. There is no significant difference between the marital
status of directive council members and self-reported leadership style.

6. There is no significant difference between the degree of union experience of directive council members and self-reported leadership style.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The directive council members' demographics were studied. The results are reported by variable. In Table 5 the variable sex is described.

Table 5

Distribution of Respondents by Sex and Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
There were 28 (58.3%) males and 20 (41.7%) females among the 48 subjects. There were female members of directive councils in all colleges and institutes, but I.U.T. Puerto Cabello. Here, all members were male. There were more females than males in I.U.T.R. Capital and C.U. Francisco de Miranda.

The data in Table 6 show that all subjects were or had been married. At the time of this survey, 39 (83%) were married and 9 (17%) were divorced.

Table 6
Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status and Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data on highest degree earned (B = bachelor, M = master, and D = doctor) distribution by institution (Table 7) show that there were higher numbers of members holding a master's degree (44%). Thirty-three percent of the directive council members held a bachelor degree; only 23% had earned a doctoral degree.

Table 7

Distribution of Respondents by Highest Degree Earned and Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B %</th>
<th>M %</th>
<th>D %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on union experience distribution (1 = member of the national union directive board, 2 = member of the institutional union directive board, 3 = regular membership with active
participation and involvement, and 4 = regular membership without participation) are described in Table 8. Forty-six percent of the directive council members belonged to the union but did not actively participate in the union. Twenty-seven percent were involved in union activities, and an additional 27% had participated in institutional union boards.

Table 8

Distribution of Respondents by Union Experiences and Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and standard deviations obtained regarding the variable age by institution are shown in Table 9. The highest mean age
(\(\bar{X} = 46.60\)) was in the C.U. Caracas. The institution with the lowest mean age (\(\bar{X} = 37.60\)) was I.U.T. La Victoria. The mean age for the population of 48 directive council members was \(\bar{X} = 42.50\) (SD = 7.28). The I.U.T. Puerto Cabello Directive Council members' ages represented the most homogeneous age group (SD = 2.16). The I.U.T.R. Capital Directive Council was the most heterogeneous group in age (SD = 12.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44.57</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.60</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39.66</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Distribution of Respondents by Age and Institution

The data on years of experience in higher education colleges and/or technological institutes are shown in Table 10. The total population of 48 directive council members had a mean years of experience (\(\bar{X}\)) equal to 12.27, and a standard deviation (SD) equal to
4.00. The directive council members who had more years of experience in higher education are those of the C.U. Los Teques ($\bar{X} = 12.55$). Also, this group is the more homogeneous ($\text{SD} = 2.24$).

Regarding the group with lowest years of experience in higher education among the various institutes, the directive council members of I.U.T. La Victoria presented a $\bar{X} = 9.40$, $\text{SD} = 2.70$. The I.U.T.R. Capital with the highest number of directive council members ($n = 11$) is the most heterogeneous group in terms of years of experience in higher education institutions ($\text{SD} = 5.50$).

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are four leadership styles detected by the LBA-II-Self instrument (Table 11). The styles assessed are S1 (telling), S2 (selling), S3 (participating), and S4 (delegating). The styles of selling (S2) and participating (S3) were the only styles identified for the directive council members of colleges and technological institutes of Venezuela, as summarized in Table 11.

Table 11
Self-Reported Primary Style of Administrators by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a total population of 48 directive council members, 62.5% self-reported a participatory leadership style (S3), and 37.5% self-reported S2, selling style. No other primary leadership styles were detected in the sample.
All groups of the directive council members indicated a secondary self-reported style of leadership. Secondary styles detected by the instrument (LBA-II-Self) for all administrators surveyed are reported in Table 12.

Forty percent of directive council members' self-reported secondary styles was selling (S2) whose behavior is high directive and high supportive. The delegating style (S4), low support and low directive, was shown by 35% of total groups. All institutes, but two (C.U. Caracas and I.U.T. Victoria), indicated the directive council members' secondary leadership style as participating. The telling style (S1) was detected in members of the C.U. Francisco Miranda and I.U.T. La Victoria. In addition, the data presented in Table 12 show that all four self-reported secondary styles were found in the sample studied.

An earlier presentation of grouped data (see Tables 11 and 12) compared the self-reported primary and secondary leadership styles of the directive council members of eight colleges and technological Venezuelan institutes. These data also show that the directive council members perceived themselves to be more S2 (selling) and S3 (participating) in their primary leadership styles. In Table 13, the data collected for self-reported primary and secondary leadership styles of the directive council members are reported.

Self-reported primary leadership styles were used for data analysis in this study. Only two leadership styles, selling (S2) and participating (S3), were reported as primary styles by the 48
Table 12

Self-Reported Secondary Style of Administrators by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Caracas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Francisco Miranda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U. Los Teques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T.R. Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. La Victoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Valencia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Puerto Cabello</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.U.T. Yaracuy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Summary of Self-Reported Primary and Secondary Leadership Styles of Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling (S1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling (S2)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating (S3)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating (S4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

subjects. There were no examples of telling (S1) and delegating (S4) as primary styles.

Data Analysis and Findings

Research Question 1

Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of members of the directive council members and their chronological age?

Hypothesis 1

There were no significant differences between the directive council member's age and the self-reported leadership style (p < .05).

In order to test this hypothesis, the sample of 48 directive...
council members was surveyed by using the LBA-II-Self instrument. The findings of the $t$ test for independent means are presented in Table 14. In this table the means, standard deviations, and the $t$-test findings for the variable age are described in terms of the leadership styles found, selling (S2) and participating (S3).

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations, and $t$-Test Results for the Variable Age by Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Selling ($n = 18$)</th>
<th>Participating ($n = 30$)</th>
<th>One-tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$  SD</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$  SD</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>43.5  8.6</td>
<td>41.9  6.4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

Table 14 presents the findings of the $t$ test to see whether mean difference between ages of individuals who had either selling (S2) or participating (S3) leadership style is zero. The findings showed that directive council members who have selling (S2) leadership style rated higher mean age scores than those who had participating (S3) style. The $t$-test critical value ($tcv$) from the table of $t$ values is equal to 2.021. The observed $t$ value is 0.73 at alpha level of significance .05. The $t$ observed value is smaller than the $tcv$ and, therefore, is not statistically significant. This means that the observed differences between the two groups could
easily have happened by chance. Consequently, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the mean age scores for both groups cannot be rejected at .05 level of significance.

Research Question 2

Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership styles of female members as compared to male members of the directive council?

Hypothesis 2

There were no significant differences in the self-reported leadership styles of female members as compared to male members of the directive councils ($p < .05$).

The nonparametric chi-square test was used to determine whether or not there were differences among the proportions of female and male directive council members who had either selling ($S_2$) or participating ($S_3$) leadership styles. The percentages of leadership style ($S_2$ and $S_3$) by sex are reported in Table 15.

The chi square obtained was 0.27654 with $df = 1$ ($p = .5989$). A chi-square value of 3.841 is needed for significance at the .05 alpha level. But the calculated chi-square value of 0.27654 is smaller than this table value and is, therefore, not significant. The null hypothesis of no differences is not rejected at the .05 alpha level.
Table 15
Percentages of Leadership Style by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selling (n = 18)</td>
<td>Participating (n = 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

Research Question 3

Is there a significant difference between the self-reported leadership styles of members of the directive council and the differing academic degrees that they have earned?

Hypothesis 3

There was no significant difference between the differing academic degrees earned by the directive council members and the self-reported leadership style (p < .05).

The findings of the chi square of these data are presented in Table 16.

With 2 degrees of freedom, a chi-square value of 5.991 or greater is required for significance at the .05 level. However, the obtained chi-square value is smaller than the critical value and,
Table 16

Percentages of Leadership Styles by Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree earned</th>
<th>Selling (n = 18)</th>
<th>Participating (n = 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

therefore, is not statistically significant. Although the percentages of persons with master's degrees (38.9 and 46.7) were higher for both selling and participating styles, this could be due to chance. The null hypothesis of no differences was accepted.

Research Question 4

Is there a significant difference between the years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

Hypothesis 4

There were no significant differences between the directive council member's years of experience in higher education and the
self-reported leadership style ($p < .05$).

As noted in Table 17, the differences were not statistically significant at $p < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no differences was accepted.

Table 17

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-Test Results for the Years of Experience in Higher Education and Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Selling (n = 18)</th>
<th>Participating (n = 30)</th>
<th>One-tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$ 4.1</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$ 3.8</td>
<td>df 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>$t = 1.44$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The mean scores of directive council members' years of experience in higher education institutions who had selling leadership style is greater than those who had participating leadership style ($13.33 < 11.63$). In terms of the standard deviations, the selling (S2) style group showed a standard deviation of 4 and the participating style group showed a standard deviation of 3.8. This value may be an indicator that years of experience in higher education of those with participating leadership style are more homogeneous than the S2 group. The $t$ observed value was equal to 1.44 and the $t$
critical value obtained from the $t$ table was 2.021. With 46 degrees of freedom, the $t$ observed value is smaller than the $t$ critical value; and therefore, the null hypothesis of no differences is not rejected at .05 level of significance ($p = .0785$).

**Research Question 5**

Is there a significant difference between the marital status of a member of the directive council and self-reported leadership style?

**Hypothesis 5**

There were no significant differences between the marital status and self-reported leadership style ($p < .05$).

The findings of the differences between the two variables are shown in Table 18.

**Table 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Selling ($n = 18$)</th>
<th>Participating ($n = 30$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$p < .05$. 
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The chi square for one degree of freedom, a chi-square value of 3.841 is not significant at the .05 level of significance. The chi-square calculated value was 2.728, which is smaller than the table value, meaning that if differences between categories occurred, it was only due to chance. The null hypothesis was not rejected at .05 alpha level.

**Research Question 6**

Is there a significant difference between the degree of union participation experiences and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

**Hypothesis 6**

There was no significant difference between the degree of the union experience of directive council members and the self-reported leadership style \( p < .05 \).

Findings of the chi-square analysis of union experiences and self-reported leadership styles is shown in Table 19.

The category, member of the national union board, was not reported in the sample surveyed. The other categories (member of the institutional union directive board, regular membership with active participation and involvement, and regular membership without participation as part of the variable union experiences) are examined in Table 19. The chi-square table indicated that with one degree of freedom the chi-square value of 3.841 or greater was required for significance at .05 level. The chi-square calculated (2.72842) is smaller than that value and, therefore, was not statistically
Table 19
Percentage of Leadership Style by Union Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union experience</th>
<th>Selling (n = 18)</th>
<th>Participating (n = 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the institutional union directive board</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular membership with active participation and involvement</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular membership without participation</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

significant. The null hypothesis, consequently, was not rejected at .05 alpha level.

Summary

The chi square and the t test were used to test the six research hypotheses. The findings of this study showed that the research hypotheses were not sustained; instead, the null hypotheses were accepted. No differences were found between leadership styles of higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to the selected demographic variables studied. In Chapter V, a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research are presented.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-reported leadership style of higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to selected demographic variables such as age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience in either colleges or technological institutes, marital status, and union experiences. A review of the literature was conducted related to situational leadership theories (Hersey & Blanchard, 1989) and the six demographic variables regarding leadership styles. No clear directions were identified from a review of related literature. Some research studies reported significant relationships between leadership styles and demographic variables; others found no significant relationships. Research hypotheses were formulated expecting no significant differences. In Chapter III, methods and procedures used to test the six hypotheses were discussed. The research questions were derived from the research statement which sought to determine the extent of the relationship between demographic variables (age, sex, marital status, highest degree earned, years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes, and union participation experiences) and the leadership style (measured by the Leader Behavior Analysis II instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard, 1990).
The design of the study involved the participation of 58 directive council members of Venezuelan colleges and technological institutes. Eighty-three percent of the population of subjects participated. The validity and reliability of the Spanish version of the LBA-II-Self instrument was calculated. Standard conditions for administration and scoring were used and the alpha reliability coefficient obtained was .55. The LBA-II-Self questionnaire was completed by administrators of eight institutions.

In this research study, the independent variables were the demographic variables of sex, age, highest degree earned, years of experience, marital status, and union experiences. The dependent variable was leadership style as measured by the LBA-II-Self (Spanish version produced by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.).

The data were analyzed by using parametric and nonparametric tests. The t-test was used for testing the independent variable of age and years of experience in higher education. The chi square was the statistical model applied to test the null hypotheses including the variables of sex, marital status, union experiences, and highest degree earned.

The following research questions were studied:

1. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of members of the directive council members and their chronological age?

2. Is there a significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of female members as compared to male members of the directive council?
3. Is there a significant difference between the self-reported leadership styles of members of the directive council and the differing academic degrees that they have earned?

4. Is there a significant difference between years of experience working in either colleges or technological institutes and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

5. Is there a significant difference between the marital status of a member of the directive council and self-reported leadership style?

6. Is there a significant difference between the degree of union participation experiences and the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members?

In Chapter IV the following six hypotheses, stated in null form, were tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the directive council member's age and self-reported leadership style.

2. There is no significant difference in the self-reported leadership style of female members as compared to male members of directive council.

3. There is no significant difference between the differing academic degrees earned by the directive council members and the self-reported leadership style.

4. There is no significant difference between the directive council member's years of experience in higher education and the self-reported leadership style.
5. There is no significant difference between the marital status of directive council members and self-reported leadership style.

6. There is no significant difference between the degree of union experience of directive council members and self-reported leadership style.

Discussion

All six null hypotheses were accepted. There were no significant differences between self-reported leadership styles of higher education administrators in Venezuela as related to selected demographic variables such as age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience, marital status, and union experiences.

The research finding of no significant differences between age and leadership styles confirms earlier findings reported by Brown (1985/1986), Khair (1984), and Roberts (1985/1986).

No significant relationship was found between sex and self-reported leadership styles. Earlier research studies which reported similar findings are those of Brown (1985/1986), Cimperman (1985/1986), Carpeno (1976), and Jones (1985).

The research finding of no significant differences between the differing degrees earned by the directive council members and their self-reported leadership style confirms earlier findings reported by Cimperman (1985/1986), Cole (1984), Brown (1985/1986), and Hadley and Andrews (1978).

There were no significant differences between the directive council member's years of experience in higher education and

No significant relationship was found between marital status and self-reported leadership styles. Previous research studies of these variables, however, have found marital status and leadership styles to be positively related (Chacon & Rivas, 1984; Rehburn, 1985/1986; Schlack, 1974/1975). The findings of this study contradict the findings of the earlier studies, but the meaning of this is unclear.

The union experiences were not significantly different from the self-reported leadership styles of the directive council members. Forty-six percent of the directive council members belong to the union but do not actively participate in it. Of course, administrators and unionism may be incompatible situations.

Four assumptions were made in Chapter I. Selling (S2) and participating (S3) styles were reported as primary leadership styles by 48 subjects. Therefore, Assumption 4 referring to the leadership styles of participating and delegating as the styles exhibited by the members of the directive council was partially inferred.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Most findings of this study were consistent with findings of previous research studies (the finding on marital status, however, was not consistent with other findings reported by the literature). There were no differences between leadership styles and demographic
variables such as age, sex, highest degree earned, years of experience, marital status, and union experiences. The findings of previous investigations and the findings of this study have provided adequate evidence that demographic variables are not meaningful predictors of leadership styles. Replications of this study or similar research studies are not recommended.
Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire
CUESTIONARIO
DATOS BIOGRAFICOS

INSTRUCCIONES
El cuestionario requiere la información siguiente:

Nombre de la institución
Datos biográficos

POR FAVOR
1. Responda todas las partes del cuestionario.
2. Responda todas las preguntas en el espacio indicado.
3. Este cuestionario es totalmente anónimo.
CUESTIONARIO
DATOS BIOGRAFICOS

1.- Nombre de la Institución

2.- Indique su edad: ________ años

3.- Indique su sexo:
   ( ) masculino
   ( ) femenino

4.- Indique su estado civil:
   ( ) soltero
   ( ) casado
   ( ) divorciado
   ( ) viudo

5.- Señale los años de servicio en Colegios y/o Institutos Universitarios: ________ años

6.- Señale el título educativo más alto alcanzado hasta el presente:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Título</th>
<th>Especialidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) Licenciatura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Maestría</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Doctorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Otro (s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.- Indíquen el tipo de experiencia en sindicatos y/o asociaciones de profesores:

( ) miembro de la junta directiva nacional

( ) miembro de la junta directiva en la institución.

( ) miembro regular con activa participación

( ) miembro regular sin participación contínua.
Appendix B

Leader Behavior Analysis II
Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.
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Permission to Use LBA-II-Self Instrument
May 21, 1990

Julian Sarafin
1940 Howard Street, Apt. 306
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Dear Julian:

It was a pleasure speaking with you by telephone this week, and I'm very interested in the research that you are undertaking. As we discussed, I am enclosing a bibliography of dissertations that have been completed using the LBA instrument, as well as the Alpha coefficient data. Under separate cover, we are shipping to you 90 copies of the LBAII Self in Spanish translation. We are happy to grant you permission to use our instruments in your research under the following conditions.

1. Any dissertations, papers, etc., written from this theoretical framework and using this instrument give citations and references as to where the instrument can be obtained.

2. That you do not sell or make economic gain from selling the instruments for popular consumption, and that any copies used of the instrument be marked clearly "for research only."

3. That BTD receive a full bound copy of any dissertation or monograph written concerning this research.

4. That BTD be able to pass on your research to other people who might be doing similar research.

Should you have any questions or need additional help, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Drea Zigarmi
Corporate Development

Enclosures:
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Approval Letter From Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: June 15, 1990
To: Julian Sarafin
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "The Relationship Between the Self-reported Leadership Styles of Higher Education Administrators in Venezuela as Related to Selected Demographic Variables", has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: E. Kelley, Educational Leadership

HSIRB Project Number 90-05-17

Approval Termination June 15, 1991
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Letters of Support
Quien suscribe, Director General Sectorial de Educación Superior, por medio de la presente hace constar que el LIC. JULIAN SERAFIN, Cédula de identidad Nº 5.614.545, Profesor del Instituto Universitario Politécnico "Luis Caballero Mejías", está realizando un trabajo de investigación doctoral, sobre "Las relaciones de los modelos de administración de la educación y las variables dentro del régimen democrático en Venezuela", para lo cual tendrá que visitar varios Institutos y Colegios Universitarios.

En consecuencia, se estima a las autoridades de dichas Instituciones, prestarle toda la colaboración necesaria al Profesor Serafín, a los fines de que logre los objetivos propuestos en dicha investigación.

Caracas, veintiseis de junio de mil novecientos noventa.

[Signature]

Giovanni Nani

GN: E0:1ps.
26-6-90.
CARACAS, 27 de Junio de 1990

Ciudadano: 
Prof. EMIGDIO PINO 
Director del COLEGIO UNIVERSITARIO DE CARACAS 
Su Despacho.

Apreciado Colega, el Portador de la presente Profesor JULIAN SERAFIN, es estudiante de doctorado y requiere aplicar dos cuestionarios a los Miembros del Consejo Directivo de la dicha Institución, cuya finalidad es identificar el estilo de Liderazgo de Administradores de Educación Superior que laboran en los Institutos y Colegios universitarios de Venezuela y su relación con diferentes variables demográfica seleccionada para tal fin.

Solicito su asistencia y ayuda en este esfuerzo como participante seleccionado en la investigación.

Mucho sabré agradecer su ayuda en este Proyecto.

Atentamente,

Lic. Lic. GONZALO GÓMEZ
Presidente 
FAPICUV

LRGA/6p.
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Cover Letter
Caracas, Julio 1990

Apreciado Colega:

El propósito fundamental de la disertación es identificar el estilo de liderazgo de administradores de educación superior que laboran en los Institutos y Colegios Universitarios de Venezuela y su relación con diferentes variables demográficas seleccionadas para tal fin.

Como candidato a obtener el título de Doctor en Educación en la Universidad de Western Michigan, localizada en la ciudad de Kalamazoo, Michigan, de los Estados Unidos, trabajo actualmente en mi tesis doctoral.

Solicito su asistencia y ayuda en este esfuerzo como participante seleccionado en la investigación.

En los materiales entregados, usted encontrará dos cuestionarios, los cuales deben permanecer absolutamente anónimos: (1) Datos Demográficos, y (2) Análisis del Comportamiento del Leader-Para uno mismo (ACL-II).

Las instrucciones para completar los instrumentos son las siguientes:

(1) Complete los cuestionarios incluidos en el sobre.

(2) Guarde los cuestionarios dentro del sobre cerrado.

(3) Los cuestionarios deben ser llenados durante la reunión del Consejo Directivo el día de Julio, 1990. Una vez completado el cuestionario deje el sobre cerrado con la secretaría del director del Instituto.

En la misma fecha, pasare personalmente recolectando los cuestionarios por la oficina antes mencionada.

Mucho sabré agradecer su ayuda en este proyecto. Cualquier información acerca de la investigación, me puede contactar al teléfono: (02) 573-87-25.

Una vez más gracias.

Julián Serafín
Candidato a Doctor
Western Michigan University.
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