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This study investigated the relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in selected tasks. Using the 99 UniServ Directors of the Michigan Education Association, the objective of the study was to provide additional criteria that could be used to assist organizational leaders in assignment of staff to areas of specialization. The selected task areas were (a) negotiations, (b) arbitration, (c) writing, (d) political action, (e) public relations, (f) member counseling, (g) leadership training, and (h) organizing.

Leadership style was defined using the two dimensional nature of leadership postulated by Fleishman (1957), Blake and Mouton (1964), Reddin (1980), Hersey and Blanchard (1974), and Fiedler (1967). These dimensions were concern for consideration and structure.

The instruments used to collect the data were the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and a self-assessment instrument. The LOQ was used to determine leadership style and the self-assessment instrument was used to determine perceived performance in the task areas. These questionnaires were mailed to the 99 directors with a response rate of 62.6%. The data from the LOQ were used to assign...
the respondents to one of four leadership style groups. The ranks given each task area on the self-assessment instrument were then compared across the four groups.

The hypothesis was that there exists a relationship between leadership style and the perception of the leader as to his/her ability in a specific area of specialization. It was concluded that support for this relationship was established for the tasks of (a) negotiations, (b) arbitration, (c) writing, and (d) organizing. The results of the study did not support the existence of any relationship between leadership style and (a) political action, (b) public relations, (c) member counseling, and (d) leadership training.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This section of the study will outline the organizational structure and position descriptions of UniServ Directors of the Michigan Education Association (MEA). In the statement of the problem, the current structure of the organization and the manner in which assignments are made to the UniServ Directors will be discussed. The basic problems in the area of staff specialization and the purposes of this study will be presented. The second section, need and significance of the study, will detail the importance of the study in terms of what it can provide for the MEA in future decision making. The final section will deal with the organization of the study.

Statement of the Problem

In any organization there is a need to determine the ability of individuals for specific leadership assignments. In the Michigan Education Association there are many tasks that require specific expertise. As the organization becomes larger, there is a need to determine the specific abilities of individuals in regard to areas of specialization for UniServ Directors. The current method of determining the areas of specialization for assignments of directors is by desire of the individual and intuition of the local leaders. This has led to disagreements between the local elected leader and
the UniServ Director that could only be resolved by subjective decision making. The literature suggests that the matching of leadership style to specific situational variants can provide a tool for assignment of directors to appropriate areas of specialization.

The problem, then, is that there is a need for research that establishes a relationship between the UniServ Director’s perception of his/her ability and a leadership style. If this relationship could be established, it would provide decision makers with another aspect to examine when considering areas of specialization for an individual director.

The MEA Organizational Structure

UniServ Directors are the first line leaders of the Michigan Education Association. There are 103 full-time professional field staff serving as UniServ Directors. The MEA is subdivided into three zones. Each zone is subdivided into regions and the regions are divided into coordinating councils. These coordinating councils are comprised of any number of individual district units. UniServ Directors are responsible for performing professional duties, defined later in this section, for these coordinating councils. The coordinating councils may be part of a multiple association bargaining organization, also known as regional bargaining units, organized to allow individual district units to participate in the bargaining process with other units on a unified basis.

Beginning with the local district, the MEA organizational structure is subdivided into geographical units. As stated above, the
local unit is part of an assigned coordinating council, region, zone, and finally the state. The organizational unit that is most responsible for the assignment of the duties of the UniServ Director is the coordinating council. That body is made up of representatives of the participating local association units.

UniServ Directors are assigned on the basis of member population within a zone, region, and coordinating council. The MEA allows for one UniServ Director for every 900 members. Directors are assigned to a coordinating council as either a state or local option, both of which are accountable to the MEA.

State option UniServ Directors are employed by the state organization and are responsible first to the state and then to the local coordinating council. The local option UniServ Directors are employed by the local coordinating council and are responsible first to the local council. In effect, there is no real difference between the two except that state option directors belong to the UniServ Directors' association (union within the union).

Each UniServ Director's duties are diverse in nature. Job requirements, as listed in the MEA job postings, demand expertise in a variety of areas. Although to an outsider to union activities collective bargaining appears to be the major focus of most unions, there are a number of equally important tasks. Negotiations, arbitration/grievance handling, writing skills, political action, public relations, member counseling, leadership training, and organizing are all fields of expertise that are required of the UniServ Director. Since each of these fields may be defined differently in
other organizational context, a brief description of how they are viewed by the MEA will be provided.

**Specialization Areas of UniServ Directors**

Negotiation consists of the preparation, research, use of verbal and written skills, strategy, and closing of a collective bargaining agreement. UniServ Directors are required to work with, advise, and in some cases, direct each individual's involvement in the negotiations process.

The outgrowth of the negotiations process is contract maintenance which includes arbitration/grievance processing. Arbitration is an appeal of a contractual problem to an impartial third party, usually a member of the American Arbitration Association for teacher contracts. Grievances are appeals to the administration of a given district for solution of a contractual problem. The process involved in conducting both arbitrations and grievances is similar. A case must be established based on contractual agreements, witnesses must be instructed, and the case must be presented orally, and in some cases, in written briefs. The director is the person responsible for the conducting of most arbitrations and some grievances.

Directors are expected to be versatile in writing. The talents of the director may be called upon with very short notice for preparation to communicate with media representatives or to prepare concise responses to various issues. The image of the association rests with how well the director handles the communication with
people outside of the organization.

Political action involvement is a high priority of the MEA. Each local unit, coordinating council, region, and zone becomes involved in many facets of the political action function. Coordination of the political action activities of the association is a part of the director's responsibility. Expertise is required in campaigning for endorsed candidates or working on relevant issues. Knowledge of issues and ability to communicate the union platform is essential. The directors are often responsible for working in conjunction with elected leaders on the formulation of campaign strategy.

Responding to the need to communicate the goals of the MEA to both members and the public requires skill in public relations. The UniServ Director must use this skill to enhance the image of the MEA and to communicate how the association is moving on issues and concerns.

Part of the responsibility of the UniServ Director is to meet with the individual member and discuss job related problems. This counseling requires a special skill in dealing with people with problems. Often times the problem is one of a personal nature that must be dealt with in confidence. Directors represent the union and must impart the feeling that the union is capable and ready to deal with the problem of the member.

As local districts elect new leaders it is the responsibility of the director to provide the necessary training for those individuals to perform their duties in their new positions. Directors
must be able to plan, develop, and present training activities for new leaders as well as in-service for present leaders.

In order for the organization to expand its resources, the UniServ Director must employ skill in organizing non-MEA units. This role is vital to consolidating the strength of public school employees. The MEA is organizing not only professional staff (teachers) but support personnel (secretaries, cafeteria workers, aides, and custodians) as well.

Need and Significance of Study

A problem facing the MEA and its various subdivisions is the determination of whether to assign individuals on the basis of general skills in the job areas or move to specialization in one or more areas of specialization. In the late 1970's, the MEA began to cluster local coordinating councils into multiple association bargaining organizations (MABO) for the purpose of garnering more influence and power in the negotiations process.

The Macomb County MABO, formed in 1977, was MEA-NEA Local 1. Local 1, as it was known, chose to assign staff on the basis of specialization. Three UniServ Directors were employed as local option directors, two from the previous coordinating councils that formed the basis of Local 1 and one newly hired. As more local units joined Local 1, additional directors were hired until the total number was five. The determination to assign areas of specialization was made on the basis of the director's preference as well as the intuition of the local elected leaders. There was no method of
independently determining which directors were better suited to which area of specialization.

The process of assigning UniServ Directors could be more efficient if a relationship could be established between a measurable quality of the director and his/her ability to perform certain tasks, it would provide decision makers with an additional tool to enable them to determine what areas of specialization to assign to specific individuals. There is evidence in the literature to support the concepts of leadership style measurability and situational leadership. That is, some styles of leadership are more suited to some tasks than others. This relationship will be explored in the next chapter with a review of literature on leadership style and situational leadership.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I outlines the nature of the problem to be studied. It describes the importance of the study and outlines how the study is presented.

Chapter II presents a review of selected literature and builds a framework for the research hypothesis. The theories that are presented will provide a justification for the hypothesis under study.

Chapter III presents the design and methodology of the study. The chapter includes a description of the population studied, the instrumentation, design of the research, and methods for analyzing the data.
Chapter IV presents the completed data along with an analysis and testing of the research hypothesis.

Chapter V presents the conclusions derived from the data analysis and attempts to offer recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review selected literature relative to the concept of leadership as it relates to leadership style and situational variants.

Stogdill (1974) in an extensive review of leadership research, indicated that leadership theory could be divided into six categories: (1) Great Man Theories, (2) Environmental Theories, (3) Personal-Situational Theories, (4) Interaction-Expectation Theories, (5) Humanistic Theories, and (6) Exchange Theories. This study will concentrate on the behavior of leaders, thus Interaction-Expectation Theories and Humanistic Theories of several researchers will be reviewed. The research in these areas supports the view that leaders' behavior can be analyzed in terms of consideration and initiation of structure and that leadership behavior impacts on performance. Leadership behavior will be reviewed on the basis of theory analyzing the organization, the leader, the leader-follower relationship, and situational impact. Finally, the theories under study will be related to the research hypothesis. In order to establish the basis for understanding leadership in the context of this study, one definition was used.
Definition of Leadership

Leadership has been defined by many authors and in many ways. Prior to 1945 the major attempts to determine what leadership was concentrated on leadership traits (Stogdill, 1974). These attempts did not result in any conclusive definition of leadership. D. H. Hemphill (1968) defined leadership as "the process of facilitating the solution of group problems. This process involves the control or coordination of the behavior of members of the group" (p. 6). Hersey and Blanchard (1974) added the concept of moving toward organizational goals as a dimension in their definition, "a process of influencing the activities of an individual or group in efforts toward accomplishing goals in a given situation" (p. 146). The important components in these definitions are (a) that leadership is a process, (b) that an individual influences one or more other people, and (c) that the resulting action of those individuals moves the organization toward the solution of a problem or toward a recognized goal. Therefore, the definition of leadership used in this study is the process of influencing one or more individuals' actions toward accomplishing organizational goals or toward solving organizational problems. This definition includes the importance of the leader's behavior in organizational situations.

Organizational Behavior

Some leadership theorists have concentrated on how the organizational view of behavior impacts on performance. This section will
deal specifically with three theorists representing this school of thought: Douglas McGregor, Rensis Likert, and Jerald Hage. These authors have expressed in their theories the view that an important dimension in leadership is the basic view of how and why workers deal with work. They have also proposed how organizations should be operated based on their research.

**McGregor's Theories X and Y**

McGregor (1960) proposed that the way in which supervisors viewed subordinates was an important factor in how they behaved toward workers. He determined that there were two opposite views of human nature and that an individual's perspective fell somewhere along a continuum between the two. McGregor expressed these extremes as Theories X and Y.

Theory X was based on the assumptions that the average man was lazy and would avoid work if possible. Because people disliked work, in order to get them to put forth adequate effort toward achieving organizational goals, the leader must be directive, controlling, and threatening. McGregor also stated in this theory that the average human being preferred to be directed, to avoid responsibility, and to show little ambition. These assumptions led to a management system based on reward and punishment. It was the leader's responsibility to make sure that subordinates were under control and moving toward goals that were established by the organization's management.
Theory Y assumptions were the opposite of Theory X. Man was viewed as seeking responsibility and being self-directed and self-controlled. The expenditure of effort in work was natural. Once committed to objectives, man would exercise a high degree of imagination, creativity, and ingenuity in the solution of organizational problems. McGregor also stated that the wealth of human potential lies untapped in modern industry. The management system arising from these assumptions is humanistic and aimed at providing subordinates with the opportunity to develop their individual potential. McGregor advocated this view and the strategies aimed at recognizing each employee's contribution toward the accomplishment of organizational objectives.

McGregor's view on management style was supported by Levinson (1973). He believed that motivation was an important component of the management function and could not be effective using reward-punishment as a basis for controlling subordinates. "The Jackass Fallacy" was the term Levinson applied to the carrot and stick approach to motivation. He likened the worker to a jackass when management attempted to control him/her by the use of reward or punishment. The jackass was viewed as stubborn, unmotivated, and unwilling to work. This is identical to the Theory X assumptions about people. In order to accomplish the organizational goals, Levinson stressed that group leadership, high task orientation, and assessment of views on motivation are important factors.
Likert's Four System Theory

Likert (1967) defined organization behavior in terms of one of four systems. System 1 was defined as the authoritarian end of a continuum extending from authoritarian to democratic. System 1 was exploitative and authoritarian. The system was characterized by the use of fear, punishment, threats, and occasional rewards as motivating factors. Communication was viewed as downward through the organizational hierarchy. Interaction was distrustful. Decision making and goal setting occurred only at the top of the management system. Subordinates were viewed in much the same way as in McGregor's (1960) Theory X.

Systems 2 and 3 were transitional systems along the continuum having some authoritarian characteristics but less than System 1. System 4 existed at the opposite extreme from System 1. System 4 was viewed as participative and characterized by leadership and subordinate behavior that was mutually supportive. Motivation was based on mutually established goals. The communication flow was described as multidirectional, accepted with an open mind, and accurate. The organizational system was viewed as exhibiting a high degree of confidence and trust. Decisions were made within and by the group with "linking pins," individuals sharing group membership with more than one group, playing an important role in facilitating intergroup communication and coordination.

Likert advocated the use of System 4 management and stated that the performance and satisfaction are both high in groups that have
supportive relationships, use group decision making, and set high performance goals. This relationship is best presented in Likert's paradigm wherein the integrated approach is represented by Area D, a blending of high morale and high productivity (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Likert's Paradigm]


Lippitt (1972) supported Likert's (1967) basic view on the superiority of System 4 management. In describing the need for teamwork within the organization, he outlined 10 key elements in building various suborganizations. These elements are similar to those advocated by Likert (1967) in his System 4. The 10 elements are:
1. Teamwork requires an understanding and commitment to the goals of the group.

2. Teamwork requires the maximum utilization of the different resources of individuals within the group.

3. Teamwork is achieved when flexibility, sensitivity to the needs of others, and creativity are encouraged.

4. Teamwork is most effective where participative leadership is practiced.

5. Teamwork requires a group to develop procedures to meet the particular problem or situation.

6. Teamwork is characterized by the group's ability to examine its process so as to constantly improve itself as a team.

7. Teamwork will best take place when the climate of the organization is encouraging and defense reduced.

8. Teamwork utilizes the appropriate steps and guidelines for decision-making in the solution of a problem.

9. Teamwork requires trust and openness in communication and relationships.

10. Teamwork is achieved when group members have a strong sense of belonging to the group. (pp. 100-101)

**Hage's Axiomatic Theory**

Hage (1965) proposed that organizations could be described by analyzing eight variables, four organizational means and four organizational ends. These formal characteristics defined how the organization operated. The variables were interdependent and formed a closed system when viewed with the accompanying corollaries.

The structural means variables were centralization, formalization, stratification, and complexity. Centralization is the degree
to which decisions are made at the top of the organization. Formalization is the reliance on standardized rules and regulations. Stratification is the status differential between hierarchy levels. Complexity is the degree of specialization of tasks. The functional aspects, or organizational ends, are production, efficiency, adaptiveness, and job satisfaction. Production is defined as the amount of work output. Efficiency is the cost per unit of output. The ability to respond to change is adaptiveness and job satisfaction is related to employee morale.

Hage determined that these factors are interrelated and form a closed system. As one factor is increased or decreased, there is a corresponding change in another factor. The degree to which the organization is concerned with production is its mechanistic dimension. A high mechanistic organization is characterized by high centralization, formalization, stratification, production, and efficiency, low complexity, adaptiveness, and job satisfaction. The organic dimension, or degree to which the organization is concerned with the human element, is characterized by the opposite of the mechanistic dimension.

Hage (1965) stated:

The theory provides a basis for making an improvement in organizational performance. If greater efficiency is desired, the theory suggests increasing the formalization of rules; if greater job satisfaction is desired, the theory suggests decreasing the stratification of rewards. (p. 319)
Summary of Organizational Behavior

McGregor (1960), Likert (1967), and Hage (1965) have determined that the organizational behavior will impact on the performance of subordinates. McGregor (1960) expressed a view that management style depended on how one viewed human nature. Likert (1967) viewed the style of the organization as being an important determinant of performance and satisfaction. Hage (1965) proposed that the organization could be analyzed by looking at eight variables and that change could be made by adjusting the degree to which each variable was manifest. It is believed that the style of the organization will have some bearing on the style exhibited by leaders within the organization. The next section of this review will concentrate on some theorists that stress leader behavior as an important consideration in explaining leadership.

Leadership Behavior

The behavior of individuals within any organization is a key element in how the organization works as a whole. A description of the organizational behavior deals with the overall climate and environmental impact on workers. This section will deal with the theories of Robert Blake and Jane Mouton, J. W. Reddin, Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, and Fred Fiedler. These theories form the basis of the initiation of structure and consideration dimensions in regards to leadership of individuals. A review of the Ohio State Studies is needed as a background for understanding the theories
based on initiating structure and consideration.

Ohio State Studies

Stogdill (1974) reported that the initial studies on leadership style were conducted at Ohio State University under the direction of Shartle in 1945. Extensive research in the area of leadership style led to the conclusion that initiating structure and consideration were key factors in leadership style (Halpin & Winer, 1957; J. K. Hemphill, 1949). Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) researchers found that the subscale scores of initiation of structure and consideration measured two distinct patterns of behavior (Stogdill, 1974). Fleishman (1969) wrote:

Consideration (C). Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. (p. 1)

Structure (S). Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. (p. 1)

The initiation of structure and consideration dimensions were used to describe different leadership styles by other authors including four to be described in this section. The LBDQ used in the Ohio State Studies measured subordinate responses to determine leadership behavior. Fleishman (1957) developed the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) as a means of determining style based on the leader's responses to questions. The LOQ was used in this study to determine leadership style.
Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid Theory

Blake and Mouton (1964) advocated an understanding of leadership in terms of task (initiation of structure) and relationship (consideration) orientations of the leader. The authors have constructed a Managerial Grid (see Figure 2) identifying five divisions of leadership behavior based on the factors of task and relationship.

The horizontal axis on the grid indicates concern for the task. The vertical axis indicates concern for people or relationships. The interrelationship of these dimensions defines the basic leadership style of an individual. The grid is divided into nine units on each of the axes. As the score on either the task or relationship dimension rises, the area of the grid changes. The lower left section is called the 1/1 section. This represents a style viewed as avoidance of both task and relationship. The leader using this style offers little to the subordinate in terms of either direction or support. The 1/9 section denotes a leadership style concentrating on providing a climate conducive to meeting people needs. A leader using this style would feel that task or organizational needs would follow once people needs are met. The 9/1 leadership section indicates a task orientation. This authoritarian type leader would expect obedience from followers and would provide continual direction. The 5/5 leader is democratic. This leader would attempt to solve problems by seeking the middle ground or compromise. This leader would be concerned about meeting both the needs of the task...
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9/9 Management
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Figure 2
The Managerial Grid
and the people, but would do so in a manner not likely to meet either needs. The 9/9 leader is team management oriented. This leadership style fits the Likert (1967) System 4 style. The 9/9 leader balances the needs of the organization and the needs of individuals with team decision making and commitment of group members.

Blake and Mouton (1964) stated that the 9/9 leadership style will produce both better performance and satisfaction at higher levels than the other leadership styles. They do, however, recognize the need for the use of other styles depending on the situational factors (Blake & Mouton, 1978).

Gordon (1977) found that conflict resolution styles fell into similar categories as those proposed by Blake and Mouton (1964). He stated that the ideal manner in which to handle conflict situations was through the use of "win-win" resolution styles. These styles emphasize both the needs of the individual and the needs of the opponent. This is similar to the needs of task and relationship. Levin (1979) listed styles of negotiating and conflict resolution on a conflict grid patterned after the Management Grid. The styles proposed by Levin were (a) failure [1/1], (b) dominating [9/1], (c) dominating [1/9], (d) compromise [5/5], and (e) mutual gain [9/9]. Levin concluded that the most preferable style for settlement of conflict was mutual gain. This type of settlement of conflict is characterized by a lack of any party losing or winning. It is mutual problem solving. Nierenberg (1968) agreed with Levin stating that where there is a heavy winner, there must be a heavy loser waiting for the tables to turn.
Cummins (1971), in a study using the LOQ to determine the interaction of structure and consideration, found that consideration-structure interaction affected quality but not productivity. Brown and Dalton (1980) found that successful business managers "would exhibit high Initiating Structure and (high) Consideration when working with principals and supervisors in the school organization" (p. 212). This supports the findings of Blake and Mouton (1964) in that the 9/9 style is superior to the other styles of leadership.

Reddin's 3-D Theory of Leadership

Reddin's (1980) work is another example of the consideration and task dimensions of leadership. To the dimensions used by Blake and Mouton (1964), Reddin (1980) added the dimension of effectiveness. Reddin fits into the contingency management classification because of his belief in the effect of situational factors on leadership effectiveness. He listed five situational factors that determine effectiveness: (1) style demands of the job, (2) style demands of the superior, (3) corporate philosophy, (4) style demands of the subordinate, and (5) expectations and style of the subordinate.

Using the task orientation dimension as the horizontal axis of his model and the relationship dimension as the vertical axis, Reddin categorized four latent styles of leadership (see Figure 3). In addition to the four latent styles, he proposed four effective and four ineffective styles for a total of 12 style variations.

Figure 3

3-D Leadership Theory
Hersey and Blanchard's Life Cycle Theory

Hersey and Blanchard (1974) presented a theory based on both Blake and Mouton's (1964) and Reddin's (1980) works. The Life Cycle Theory attempts to define the curvilinear relationship between initiating structure and consideration behavior and the maturity of subordinates.

The theory suggests that as subordinates mature in the situational aspects of their jobs, the leader should alter his/her style, moving from low consideration, low task for immature subordinates through high consideration, low task to high consideration, high task and finally to low consideration, high task for the mature subordinate. This movement is controlled by the rate of maturity of the follower (see Figure 4).

Weed, Mitchell, and Moffitt (1976), in their study of leadership style and subordinate personality, found that high consideration leadership fits with low dogmatism subordinates. High structured leadership was appropriate with high dogmatism subordinates. Dogmatism was the degree that an individual believed in and held on to an opinion or method of action. High structure and high consideration were viewed by all subordinates as the most favorable style, but performance indicators showed differing results for different leadership styles depending on the subordinate orientation.
### Effective Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 1</th>
<th>Quadrant 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUADRANT 1</td>
<td>QUADRANT 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task and High relationship</td>
<td>High task and High relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 3</th>
<th>Quadrant 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUADRANT 3</td>
<td>QUADRANT 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High relationship and Low task</td>
<td>Low task and Low relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** P. Hersey & K. Blanchard, *So you want to know your leadership style?* Training and Development Journal, 1974, 28(2), p. 28.

**Figure 4**

Life Cycle Leadership Theory
Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership

Fiedler (1967) stated that the group's performance is contingent upon the appropriate matching of leadership style and the degree of favorableness of the group situation for the leader. This theory proposed that group performance could be improved either by modifying the leader's style or by modifying the group task situation.

Using the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale, Fiedler assessed leadership style and related it to leadership effectiveness. The LPC required the respondent to indicate or rate the person with whom he/she worked least effectively. This rating scale consisted of a series of adjectives describing the least preferred co-worker (Wexley & Yukl, 1977). According to Fiedler (1967), the score on the LPC related to the degree of task or relationship orientation of the leader. The high LPC leader is oriented to relationships and the low LPC leader is oriented toward the task.

Fiedler found that the favorableness of the situation could be determined by studying the leader-member relations, the task structure, and the positional power of the leader. The results of the study allowed the creation of eight divisions that could be ranked according to the favorableness of the situation for the leader. Fiedler constructed eight octants and described the three variables within each octant.

Octant I was the most favorable situation for the leader and Octant VIII was the least favorable. Octant I was characterized by
good member relations, structured task, and strong positional power. This is easily understood as a favorable situation since each variable is in the leader's favor. Octant II is similar to Octant I with the positional power as weak. Octant III has good relationships with low task structure and strong positional power. Octant IV is similar to Octant II with weak positional power.

Octants V through VIII are characterized as having only moderate to poor member relations. Octants V and VI have structured tasks with power being strong in V and weak in VI. Octants VII and VIII have unstructured tasks with VII having strong positional power and VIII having weak. Octant VIII is the least favorable situation since none of the variables are in the leader's favor.

The results of Fiedler's (1967) study indicate that relationship oriented leaders do well in situations that are only moderately favorable. Task oriented leaders do well in situations that are very favorable or very unfavorable.

Graen, Orris, and Alvares (1971) attempted to replicate Fiedler's (1967) work. Their study was experimentally designed to determine if there was a relationship between leadership style, situational determinants, and performance. The findings indicated that no real relationship could be found between the variables and that the LPC score had no construct validity. Rice and Chemers (1973) found, on the other hand, in a laboratory experiment using 18 four-man teams, that although emergent leadership could not be predicted using the LPC, leadership effectiveness could be predicted.
A number of authors studying the situational aspects of leadership effectiveness have determined that style and effectiveness are related to situational factors (Cammalleri, Henduck, Pittman, Blout, & Prather, 1973; Goodstadt & Kipnis, 1970; Rosenbaum & Rosenbaum, 1971; Walter, Caldwell, & Marshall, 1980). Barrow (1976) indicated that the behavior of the subordinate may be the key factor in how the leader will behave. When subordinates are motivated and task oriented, the leader uses more democratic style. When the subordinates are less task oriented, the leader uses more authoritarian style.

Summary of Leadership Behavior

Beginning with the Ohio State Studies, leadership style was viewed as consisting of two key factors, initiating structure and consideration. Blake and Mouton (1964) found that leadership style could be analyzed and placed on a Managerial Grid indicating the predominant leadership style. This style was related to the performance of the leader. Reddin (1980) proposed that effectiveness was also a key factor, along with task and relationship, and added the third dimension. This created a possible 12 styles, four latent, four effective, and four ineffective.

Hersey and Blanchard (1974) indicated that the proper leadership style was dependent on the maturity of the follower. As the subordinate matured in a given task situation, the leader was to adopt a more mature leadership style.
Fiedler (1967) proposed that the situational favorableness determined the most effective style. In high or low favorableness situations, a high task orientation is necessary. In moderate favorableness situations, a democratic, or more relationship orientation is more effective.

**Relationship Between Literature and Study**

Leadership behavior is defined by this review of the literature as consisting of two key factors, initiating structure and consideration. Style is the interaction of the two.

The contention that different leadership styles are more effective with some tasks than with others is supported by this review. The tasks of the UniServ Director can be subdivided into tasks demanding structure orientation, tasks demanding consideration orientation, and tasks demanding both structure and consideration orientation.

Tasks requiring a high degree of initiating structure are writing and arbitration. Writing is an individual activity aimed at communicating to others through a specific medium. This skill is high task oriented and low people oriented by virtue of what is required of the individual. Arbitration and other legal procedures, unlike writing, are performed in an environment that includes the human element. It is the director's task to minimize the impact of the variations possible from the human element. The goal is to convince a third party that a specific position is correct. Blake and Mouton (1964) specified the aspect of minimizing the effect of the
human element as being part of the 9/1 management style. The review of literature suggests that individuals oriented toward production or task would do well in high task situations (Fiedler, 1967; Reddin, 1980).

The member counseling task of the UniServ Director is concerned with relationship or people orientation. The task element is secondary to the human element. The director involved in member counseling must be oriented toward the 1/9 management style (Blake & Mouton, 1964). McGregor (1960), Likert (1967), and Hage (1965) supported the human orientation of this task and agreed on its importance to the organization. Reddin (1980) stated that the "developer" is the effective orientation toward the human element as contrasted with other styles.

Gordon (1977), Levin (1979), and Nierenberg (1968) agreed that effective negotiations require a combination of task and relationship orientations to be effective. Blake and Mouton (1964) labeled this style 9/9 management. The director tasks that involve this high task and relationship orientation are negotiating, political action, unit organizing, training, and public relations. These tasks are similar in nature in that there is a high degree of importance attached to goal attainment and the reliance on people to achieve the goals. Likert's (1967) System 4 management theory stated that a successful organization involving people to achieve goals requires supportive relationships, group decision making, and high performance goals.
It is expected that directors that are highly task oriented would do well in writing and arbitration areas. Those directors that are relationship oriented would excel in the area of counseling. Negotiations, political action, unit organizing, leadership training, and public relations would require individuals that have a combination of high task and relationship orientations.

The hypothesis is that there is a relationship between the leadership style of a leader and the perception of that leader as to his/her ability in a specific area of specialization. This relationship is supported by this review of the literature. The study will concentrate on the establishment of a relationship between leadership style and the specific tasks of the UniServ Director. The establishment of this specific relationship will aid the management of the MEA in making staff assignments. The methodology and design of the research will be presented in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains the research design and methodology used in this study. The first section presents the population under study. The second section describes the two research instruments used to obtain data from the population. The next section is the design and procedure methodology. The final section deals with the manner in which the data is analyzed.

Population

The population under study was the 99 UniServ Directors employed by the Michigan Education Association. These directors are responsible for providing services to the teacher members of the MEA on a one director assigned to work with 900 members basis. The directors are assigned to a coordinating council and are directed by that council to perform specific duties. The entire population was sampled which provided data relevant to the MEA.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in the data collection phase of the study: the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and a self-assessment instrument designed to gather perceptions on an individual's evaluation of his/her ability in areas of specialization.
The Leader Opinion Questionnaire

The first, the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (see Appendix B), was used to obtain two scores. The first score was a consideration score, the second a structure score. The purpose of these scores is to ascertain the leadership style of the individual based on a consideration and structure interaction. In the review of the literature a foundation was presented for leadership style defined by the relationship of these dimensions. The instrument was developed by Fleishman (1957) based on the Ohio State Studies on leadership. Gibb (cited in Buros, 1972), in a review of the instrument stated:

Despite difficulties and as yet incomplete information, the LOQ is a well-made instrument. Its author's claims for it are cautious and modest and they rest upon research which he is ready to expose to users. It is an instrument with definite potential in training and training evaluation, and by its use in a variety of situations and organizations there may be some prospect of elaborating the complex, contingent, and often curvilinear relationships which exist between the basic dimensions of Consideration and Structure and measures of leadership effectiveness. (p. 1531)

Doppelt (cited in Buros, 1965) reported reliability estimates for the structure scale of .79 and .88 computed by split-half method. The split-half reliability scores for the consideration scale were between .62 and .89. Test-retest reliability scores for the structure scale were .74 and .67 and for the consideration scale, .80 and .77. On validity, Doppelt stated that the author feels that the factor analysis and item selection procedures support the construct validity of the instrument. He also supported the author's statement that further validity studies be carried out in particular
organizations.

Kirchner (cited in Buros, 1965), elaborating on validity, commented:

There is good evidence that consideration scores, for example, correlate with successful ratings of supervisory performance in a variety of different activities. It appears, therefore, that this questionnaire has some validity in determining leadership style or supervisory behavior. (p. 1372)

He concluded by stating that the instrument has been developed through careful research and appears to be reliable and valid with reasonably good norms. His final analysis on the use of the questionnaire was, "It seems well suited for research activities and training activities, although it is probably not the best thing to use as an evaluative instrument of supervisory performance" (p. 1372).

The Self-Assessment Instrument

The second instrument (see Appendix C) used was a rating scale based on the performance tasks from the job postings for the position of UniServ Director of the MEA. This instrument required the respondent to rank order the tasks starting with the one that he/she perceived as being his/her strongest ability area and proceeding through the list to the area of weakest ability. The purpose of this instrument was to ascertain the perception of performance ability in the task areas.

The validity of this instrument was based upon two factors. The first factor was the accuracy of the task descriptions and
whether they reflected the skills required of the UniServ Director. A panel consisting of three MEA local unit presidents reviewed the instrument and indicated no need for change. The panel found that the tasks were reflective of required skills and that the descriptions were adequate for determining what was meant by each task. In addition, the skill areas were taken directly from the job descriptions used by the MEA in posting vacancies in UniServ positions.

The second factor was whether an individual's perception of performance is accurate. An assumption was made that the directors as a group were psychologically healthy based on the success of individuals achieving leadership positions. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1962) stated that effective behavior is based on reality. The Association proposed that "adequate people must have an accurate, realistic understanding of themselves and the world in which they live" (p. 119). It was accepted that the UniServ Directors as a group are effective. Therefore, it was assumed that their perceptions were accurate and reality based. Since anonymity was assured, there was no reason known to distort responses on the survey. Backstrom and Hursh (1963) indicated that self-perception questions are a valid measure of a "person's reporting of 'facts' he knows about himself and others" (p. 72).

Design and Procedure

The commitment of the MEA was obtained by this researcher meeting with the Eastern Zone Director of the MEA. The purpose and use of the data were explained and the initial permission to send the
A survey to each UniServ Director was obtained. The Eastern Zone Director discussed the research with the other two Michigan Zone Directors.

The survey was mailed to each UniServ Director by first class mail. Included within the survey packet was a cover letter (see Appendix A), explaining the research and purpose; the two questionnaires; and an addressed, stamped envelope.

Anonymity was maintained by coding the return envelope so that this researcher could determine who had responded and then by separating the envelope from the enclosed questionnaires so that there could be no determination of how an individual responded. In order for each respondent to learn of his/her individual results and how it compared to the group, an option to include a self-chosen five digit code on the survey was given. Data were supplied to the MEA using the codes placed on the questionnaires by the respondents.

Within 3 weeks of the original mailing, 54 of the 99 questionnaires had been returned. Forty-five follow-up packets were mailed to those directors not responding to the first mailing. A follow-up letter (see Appendix D) was included in this packet. Eight additional questionnaires were received within the next 2 weeks. The remaining directors' offices were contacted by phone, urging completion of the questionnaire. This resulted in no further returns. A total of 62 questionnaires of the 99 that were mailed were returned.
Data Analysis

The LOQ produced a consideration and a structure score for each respondent. The mean of the population was established for both of the scores. A grid was constructed based on the consideration and structure scores using the means as the midpoint on each axis. Four categories were determined by construction of the grid: (1) low consideration and low structure, (2) high consideration and low structure, (3) high consideration and high structure, and (4) low consideration and high structure. Directors were classified on the basis of their consideration and structure scores and placed in one of four leadership style subgroups.

The self-assessment instrument produced a rank ordering of selected tasks by each respondent. Four groups were established based on leadership style as indicated by the LOQ. The frequency of ranks for each task was compiled. A median was determined and the percentages of ranks above and below the median were computed for each task.

The theoretical hypothesis, as stated in the first and second chapters is the following: There is a relationship between the leadership style of a leader and the perception of that leader as to his/her ability in a specific area of specialization. Leadership style is operationally defined by the quadrant location on the consideration/structure grid. The individual perception of ability in specific areas of specialization is operationally defined as the rank order placement of the tasks specified in the self-assessment
The Extension of the Median Test (Siegel, 1956) was used to determine if the differences in response to the tasks were due to a relationship to leadership style or to random fluctuation. The test is a comparison of the proportion of assigned ranks above or below the median to the expected proportions if there were no differences among the four subgroups. The null hypothesis is that there is no difference in the proportion of assigned task ranks above or below the median between the four subgroups.

The Extension of the Median Test used the chi square distribution for a degrees of freedom (df) of k-1 where k is the number of independent groups. For this study there are four groups so the df = 3. An alpha level of .10 was chosen for determination of acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of this study. This research is aimed at attempting to establish if a relationship exists between the leadership style of an individual and the perception of performance in selected task areas. The topics covered in this chapter are the general characteristics of the population under study, the national norms of the LOQ instrument compared with the research findings, construction of leadership style subgroups, the analysis of task rankings of the respondents, and the test of the research hypothesis.

General Characteristics of the Population

The population consisted of the 99 Michigan Education Association UniServ Directors. These directors are responsible for the day-to-day functioning of the association on a local level. Of the 99 questionnaires mailed to the directors, 62 were returned. A demographic analysis of the respondents indicated a fairly equal distribution of response from throughout the state (see Table 1).

An informal survey of four directors and one zone director indicated the two possible reasons for nonresponse. The first reason was a concern that the information could be used by the MEA management as an evaluation tool or means for reducing UniServ staff. The second questionnaire, self-assessment, required the directors
to rank order their perceived ability on selected tasks. Despite construction of the study to assure anonymity, some directors feared management's use of the data.

Table 1
Demographic Distribution of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of directors in the zone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of directors responding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of response</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second concern was produced by the then current hearings before the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). The bargaining agent for the state option staff was seeking to incorporate the local option staff into one unified group. This move was being resisted by the local option staff. Because of this legal process, some directors chose not to respond to a questionnaire dealing with the UniServ program, fearing some use in the NLRB hearings.

With a response rate of 62.6%, the findings of the study are somewhat limited in the application to other organizations. The external validity would be in question. This researcher believes, however, that the limitations are not sufficient to cause great concern to the application of the conclusions within this organization.
Because the demographic response rate was even throughout the three zones, there is little problem with applying the results to the MEA.

General Findings of the Study

The findings of the study presented in this section are divided into a discussion of the LOQ results, which involves information on why group means were used rather than the national norms, and the research study results, leadership style, task ranking, and a test of the hypothesis by statistical analysis.

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire Results

National norms for various groups are reported by Fleishman (1969). For general supervisory personnel, the national mean for the consideration score is 53 and national mean for the structure score is 50. For educational supervisors the mean consideration score is 62 and a mean of 42 for the structure score.

The mean consideration score for the population under study was found to be 55.7 (estimated standard error of the mean was .73). Compared with the national mean consideration score of 53 for general supervisory personnel, this group produced a mean 2.7 points different. However, when compared to the educational supervisors' consideration mean of 62, this group scored considerably lower. This may be due in part to the directors working in a different situation than the typical educational administrator.

Findings for the mean structure score was the reverse for that of consideration. A mean of 43.9 (estimated standard error of the
mean was .85) was found for the research population compared to the general supervisory personnel mean of 50 and the educational supervisor mean of 42. The research population mean was much closer to that of the educational supervisor than that of the general supervisory personnel.

Leadership Style

Leadership style, based on consideration and structure scores, is used to determine the four subgroups (see Figure 5). Since this researcher is interested in determining a relationship between the leadership style of a specific population and perceived ability in selected task areas, the means derived from the LOQ for this population were used to determine the four groups. Unlike the Managerial Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1964), the LOQ does not in itself report a leadership style. Rather, it produces consideration and structure scores which can be used to classify individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Consideration</th>
<th>High Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HC/LS)</td>
<td>(HC/HS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Consideration</th>
<th>Low Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LC/LS)</td>
<td>(LC/HS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5
Leadership Style Subgroups
Use of the derived means from the sample used in this study for the consideration and structure scores produced four groups (see Table 2). The low consideration/low structure (LC/LS) group had consideration scores less than 55.7 and structure scores less than 43.9. Consideration scores higher than 55.7 with structure scores less than 43.9 formed the high consideration/low structure (HC/LS) group. The group with high consideration and structure scores (HC/HS) was formed by consideration scores above 55.7 coupled with structure scores higher than 43.9. The remaining group, low consideration/high structure (LC/HS) included scores for consideration lower than 55.7 with structure scores higher than 43.9.

Table 2
Leadership Style Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Number of directors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 62 respondents, 16 were placed in the LC/LS subgroup, 14 were placed in the HC/LS subgroup, 15 were placed in the HC/HS subgroup, and the remaining 17 were placed in the LC/HS subgroup.
Self-Assessment Results

The self-assessment instrument required the respondents to rank order how they perceived their individual performance in selected task areas (see Appendix E). Negotiations (N), arbitration (A), writing skills (W), political action (P), public relations (PR), member counseling (M), leadership training (L), and organizing (O) were defined in the questionnaire. These task areas were chosen on the basis of their inclusion in the MEA job description for UniServ Directors. The results are discussed in terms of individual tasks related to the total group of respondents. For the purpose of discussion, the ranks of 1, 2, and 3 are considered high ranks. The ranks of 4, 5, and 6 are considered to be average, or midrange. The low ranks are considered to be 7 and 8. These are arbitrary cutoff points for discussion purposes only. How the individual groups responded to the rankings will be discussed under the hypothesis testing, although the breakdown by ranks are presented by group in this section.

It should be remembered when analyzing the results of the ranking that the questionnaire was constructed to force a choice of ranking. The directors responded to the ranking of their perception of ability on each task compared with the others. A low ranking does not mean a lack of ability in the given task area, just that when compared to the other tasks, that task is lower. Any reference to high ability and low ability in this section must be viewed in this context.
Negotiations. Negotiations was defined for use on the ques­tionnaire as the process of setting objectives, developing proposals, and planning strategies for accomplishing goals when bargaining. The directors ranked their ability on this task very high with 87% of the respondents ranking this task as a 1, 2, or 3 (see Table 3).

Table 3

Frequency of Rank Order of Negotiations Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arbitration. Also ranked very high was the ability in the area of arbitration and legal processing; 80.7% of the directors ranked their skill in this area in one of the top three ranks (see Table 4). Arbitration included the entire process of investigating, planning, and presenting a case before a third party.

Writing skills. Writing skills included all manner of preparation of written material for the MEA. Only 33.9% of the respondents ranked their ability on this task as 1, 2, or 3 (see Table 5).
### Table 4
Frequency of Rank Order of Arbitration Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 6</th>
<th>Rank 7</th>
<th>Rank 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
Frequency of Rank Order of Writing Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 6</th>
<th>Rank 7</th>
<th>Rank 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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bulk of the directors, 62.9%, ranked their ability in writing skills in the midrange, giving ranks of 4, 5, or 6.

**Political action.** Political action, one of the top priorities of the MEA, received low ability ranks by 37.1% of the responding directors (see Table 6). These directors ranked their ability in political action as a 7 or an 8. Political action includes the screening and endorsing process as well as the organization, planning, and directing the MEA effort in a given campaign.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 6</th>
<th>Rank 7</th>
<th>Rank 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public relations.** Public relations, defined as organizing and implementing internal and external communications, ability was ranked by the directors as low; 45.2% of the respondents ranked their ability on this task in the lowest two ranks (see Table 7). Only five directors ranked their ability in this area as 1 or 2.
Table 7
Frequency of Rank Order of Public Relations Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member counseling. Working with individual members of the association on work related problems involves counseling. The directors ranked their ability in this area as high with 58.1% of them giving the task ability a rank of 1, 2, or 3 (see Table 8). Only one respondent gave a rank in the lowest two ranks.

Leadership training. Of their ability in leadership training, 48.4% of the directors gave ranks in the midrange with 35.5% giving ranks in the lowest two ranks (see Table 9). Leadership training involves assessing local member needs and developing needed training programs to meet those needs.

Organizing. The identification of non-MEA units with an interest in affiliating with the MEA and then planning a strategy for winning a representation election is involved in organizing. An
Table 8
Frequency of Rank Order of Member Counseling Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Frequency of Rank Order of Leadership Training Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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overwhelming majority, 74.2%, of the respondents ranked their ability in this area in one of the two lowest ranks (see Table 10).

Table 10
Frequency of Rank Order of Organizing Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 3 3 5 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 3 2 9 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2 4 9 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 5 9 10 36 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0 1.6 0 1.6 8.1 14.5 16.1 58.1 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This identification of the total group rank is useful in determining how the population rank orders their ability in the selected task areas. The purpose of the research, however, was to determine if the different leadership style groups perceived their ability differently than other groups. Again, it is cautioned that an interpretation of high and low ability is only a comparison between the selected tasks and not an indication of performance in those areas. The differences between the groups, if any, are explored in the next section.
Test of the Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was to determine if there existed a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in selected task areas. Leadership style was operationally defined as the interaction of the consideration and structure scores on the LOQ developed by Fleishman (1957). Perceived performance in selected tasks was equated to how individual directors ranked, by ability, the tasks. It must be remembered that the rank ordering does not reflect on high or low ability, but rather a comparison of ability among the eight tasks.

In order to test the hypothesis, the Extension of the Median Test was used. This tested the probability that the four subgroups were drawn from the same population. If no relationship existed between the variables, the probability would be high that the groups were drawn from the same population in respect to leadership style. If there was a relationship, the probability would be low that the subgroups were drawn from the same leadership style population. Each of the task areas were tested individually to determine if some, if not all, of the ability ranking was related to leadership style.

The critical value statistic drawn from a chi square distribution table is 6.25 for a df of 3. If the test statistic is larger than 6.25, the probability that a Type I error is made by rejecting the null hypothesis is less than .10. If the test statistic is less than 6.25, the null hypothesis is retained which means that the
Negotiations. Using the Extension of the Median Test, it was determined that the hypothesis could be supported (see Table 11). There appears to be a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance based on the ranks given to the ability in negotiations. The LC/HS subgroup responses resulted in a higher percentage of above-the-median ranks. However, the remaining group percentages of above-the-median responses were similar with the HC/HS subgroup, giving a slightly higher percentage than the remaining two groups. The lowest above-the-median percentages were given by the LC/LS and HC/LS subgroups.

Table 11
Leadership Style and Negotiations Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 7.42.

χ²cv = 6.25 for df = 3.

alpha = .10; p less than .10.

^Frequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.
Arbitration. The hypothesis was also supported by the Extension of the Median Test in relation to the ability ranking on the arbitration task (see Table 12). The sub-groups LC/LS and HC/HS gave responses resulting in higher percentages of above-the-median ranks. No ranks above the median were given in the LC/HS subgroup and only one above-the-median response was given in the HC/LS subgroup.

Table 12
Leadership Style and Arbitration Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.82. \]

\[ \chi^2_{cv} = 6.25 \text{ for } df = 3. \]

alpha = .10; p less than .10.

^aFrequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

Writing skill. Subgroup LC/HS ranked their ability in writing skill higher than expected in relation to the other three subgroups. The hypothesis that a relationship exists between leadership style
and perceived performance was supported for the task of writing using the Extension of the Median Test (see Table 13). The percentage of above-the-median ranks for the LC/LS and HC/LS subgroups were very close to the percentage of overall group responses. The above-the-median response percentage was much lower than the overall expected percentage in the HC/HS subgroup.

Table 13
Leadership Style and Writing Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.63. \]
\[ \chi^2_{cv} = 6.25 \text{ for } df = 3. \]
\[ \alpha = .10; \text{ } p \text{ less than } .10. \]

^aFrequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

Political action. There was no support for the hypothesis that a relationship existed between leadership style and perceived performance when the task of political action was analyzed. Through the use of the Extension of the Median Test the differences found
were not great enough to support the existence of the relationship (see Table 14).

Table 14
Leadership Style and Political Action Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

&ensp;

\( \chi^2 = 5.27. \)

\( \chi^2_{cv} = 6.25 \) for \( df = 3. \)

\( \text{alpha} = .10; \ p \text{ greater than .10.} \)

^a Frequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

Public relations. The percentage of above-the-median and below-the-median ranks for ability in public relations was extremely close to the expected percentage based on the total group. The Extension of the Median Test did not support acceptance of a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance when ranking ability in public relations (see Table 15). Each of the four subgroups gave ranks resulting in percentages of above-the-median responses that were very close across the groups.
Table 15
Leadership Style and Public Relations Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 1.44.

χ² cv = 6.25 for df = 3.

alpha = .10; p greater than .10.

²Frequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

Member counseling. Although differences existed between how ability was ranked in member counseling, those differences were not large enough to support acceptance of the research hypothesis. The Extension of the Median Test did not support a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in member counseling (see Table 16).
Table 16
Leadership Style and Member Counseling Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 4.72.

χ² cv = 6.25 for df = 3.

alpha = .10; p greater than .10.

^aFrequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

Leadership training. Again, in relation to the task of leadership training, the Extension of the Median Test did not support the research hypothesis (see Table 17). Subgroups HC/LS and LC/HS gave ability ranks in higher percentages above the median than expected. The remaining two subgroups gave lower than expected rankings. These differences, however, were not great enough to support the hypothesis.
### Table 17
Leadership Style and Leadership Training Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.48. \]

\[ \chi^2_{cv} = 6.25 \text{ for df } = 3. \]

\[ \alpha = .10; p \text{ greater than } .10. \]

^a Frequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

**Organizing.** A support for the hypothesis that a relationship exists between leadership style and perceived performance using ability in organizing was found using the Extension of the Median Test (see Table 18). The LC/LS subgroup gave a much higher percentage of below-the-median responses with the HC/LS subgroup giving a higher percentage of above-the-median ranks based on the expected distribution of responses. The other subgroups maintained a proportion of above- and below-the-median responses close to that of the total sample.
Table 18
Leadership Style and Organizing Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>LC/LS</th>
<th>HC/LS</th>
<th>HC/HS</th>
<th>LC/HS</th>
<th>Total$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks above the median</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ranks below the median</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequency)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total frequency</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.52.$

$\chi^2_{cv} = 6.25$ for df 3.

alpha = .10; $p$ less than .10.

$^a$Frequency totals are disproportionate due to tied ranks.

Summary

With 62 of the 99 directors responding, four subgroups were established on the basis of leadership style. Overall analysis of the task ranking by the respondents indicated that the tasks of negotiations, arbitration, and member counseling received relatively high ability ranks. Tasks in the areas of political action, public relations, and organizing were ability ranked comparatively low. The remaining task areas of writing skills and leadership training were ranked in the midrange. This ranking is a comparison of ability between the tasks and not a reflection on ability on a given
Using the Extension of the Median Test, support was established for the hypothesis that a relationship exists between leadership style and perceived performance when examining the tasks of negotiations, arbitration, writing skill, and organizing. No relationship was supported when using the ability ranking in the remaining task areas.

Chapter 5 includes the conclusions drawn from this study. Recommendations for further research are made with a consideration for possible improvements in research related to this study.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there is any means of identifying individuals for assignment in areas of specialization, based on ability in task areas. In the MEA the current method of assignment relies on intuition, both that of the UniServ Director and the local elected leader. The objective of this study was to establish a relationship between two quantifiable variables, leadership style and perceived performance. This chapter discusses the findings of the study in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter II. It also presents recommendations for future research.

Conclusions

Based on the works of Fleishman (1957), Blake and Mouton (1964), Reddin (1980), Hersey and Blanchard (1974), and Fiedler (1967), leadership style was defined in terms of the two variables of consideration and structure. Using the LOQ developed by Fleishman (1957), the responding UniServ Directors were categorized by leadership style. Selected literature in the area of leadership style indicated that individuals would vary in their performance on different tasks based on leadership style. Blake and Mouton (1964) suggested that the 9/9 and 5/5 leadership styles were predominantly the favorable overall styles for most situations. Reddin (1980)
differentiated the basic leadership styles into more effective, latent, and less effective styles creating not four but 12 styles. Hersey and Blanchard (1974) suggested a need to consider the maturity of the follower in determining the effective leadership style needed in a given situation. Finally, Fiedler (1967) was concerned with a matching of leadership style and situational favorableness.

The research hypothesis was that there is a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in selected task areas. In order to determine if performance in any of the selected tasks were related to leadership style, each task was analyzed separately to determine the existence of the hypothesized relationship. Therefore, the conclusions are also discussed for each individual task.

The conclusions drawn from the results of this study are applicable to the organization studied. Because of the response rate of 62.6%, the external validity is somewhat questionable. This researcher is confident that the even distribution of response from the three zones assures that any conclusions can be applied to the statewide organization.

**Negotiations**

It was determined that a relationship existed between leadership style and perceived ability in the negotiations task. The LC/HS subgroup gave a higher than expected ranking with the HC/HS subgroup giving ranks close to expectations. These results are consistent with what the literature leads one to believe. Gordon
(1977), Levin (1980), and Nierenberg (1968) agreed that effective negotiations require a combination of high concern for consideration and structure. This study indicates that high structure leadership is an aspect important to the degree of ability in negotiations. The findings that the LC/HS subgroup ranked this task higher than expected may be due in part to the influence of maturity of the follower as suggested by Hersey and Blanchard (1974). With highly mature individuals participating in the process, Hersey and Blanchard would expect the leader to establish more of a concern for task and be less concerned about consideration. Reddin (1980) referred to the effective low consideration/high structure leader as the "Benevolent Autocrat" and maybe that is the best description of a highly task oriented negotiator.

Arbitration

An analysis of the data for the arbitration task produced inconsistent results. Arbitration was expected to receive high ranks from directors concerned with structure. The findings indicate this task was ranked high by the HC/HS and LC/LS subgroups. If, in fact, the conclusion that arbitration is a task requiring a high structure orientation, it would be expected that the HC/HS and LC/HS subgroups would rank this task high. The literature suggests that individuals oriented toward production, or task, would do well in a high structure situation (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1967; Reddin, 1980). Consistent with this thought is the fact that the HC/HS subgroup ranked arbitration high. Some inconsistency exists that the LC/HS
subgroup did not rank this task high in ability and that the LC/LS subgroup did so. One possible explanation may be that the individuals involved in arbitrations are mostly very mature individuals needing to exhibit very little leadership on others. Hersey and Blanchard (1974) suggested that once the leader-follower relationship extends to this point, the low consideration/low structure leader is more effective.

**Writing Skill**

Based on the works of Blake and Mouton (1964), Reddin (1980), and Fiedler (1967), it was stated that the writing skill task should require a high structure leader. The findings of this study indicate that the LC/HS leader ranked ability higher in this area than the other subgroups. The hypothesis was supported that a relationship existed between leadership style and perceived performance in the writing area. The findings are consistent with the selected literature reviewed in Chapter II except that the rankings of the HC/HS subgroup were lower than expected. This may be due to the noninteraction aspect of writing in regards with other people. As stated before, writing usually requires an environment free from the distraction of other people. It was anticipated that the LC/HS subgroup would rank their ability level high in this area and the findings of the study support this view.
Political Action and Public Relations

The two tasks of political action and public relations are taken together because it was concluded on the basis of the literature and a review of the tasks that an effective leader in both of these areas would be high in consideration and structure. The findings of the study do not support the hypothesis that there exists a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in these task areas. The fact that no relationship was established does not mean that there is no relationship. Further study could well establish the existence of the relationship for these tasks as well as the others. Interestingly, this study did not establish any unexpected relationship. It would have been inconsistent with the literature if it was determined that low consideration or low structure oriented leaders excelled at these tasks. In the absence of any conflicting evidence, research in these areas could continue with the basic assumption that high consideration/high structure leadership is an attribute needed for political action and public relations.

Member Counseling

The anticipation that high consideration leaders would be most likely to rank their ability in member counseling higher than other groups was not supported by the findings. The expectation that high consideration leaders would rank member counseling ability high was supported by Hersey and Blanchard (1974). Low maturity followers
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need high consideration leaders. Individuals in need of supportive counseling are at a low level of maturity at that given point. As stated before, this does not indicate that no relationship exists, but that none was found at this time. There was no indication that the data were leaning toward any other conclusion. As expected, the LC/HS subgroup ranked this task low. The two groups with high consideration gave slightly higher rankings, but not enough for an acceptance of the hypothesized relationship.

Leadership Training

The relationship between leadership style and perceived performance was not supported by this study. The leanings of the data indicated a confusing relationship, if any. The HC/LS and LC/HS subgroups gave slightly higher ranks and the HC/HS and LC/LS subgroups gave slightly lower ranks. If the differences had been greater, the relationship supported may have been that high consideration was a favorable factor in some cases and not in others, and that high structure was favorable in some cases and not in others. More research is needed in this area before any conclusions should be drawn. The problems may be due to the vastly different possible types of training that could be offered. It is possible that with some types of training the high consideration leader is effective and in some instances the low consideration leader is effective.
Organizing

A relationship between leadership style and perceived ability in organizing was supported by the findings of this study. Based on a review of the literature, it was expected that leaders possessing a high degree of consideration and structure would rank this task higher than others. The findings do point to the HC/LS subgroup ranking this task higher than the other subgroups. The LC/LS subgroup gave much lower rankings than the other groups. This is somewhat consistent with the expectations derived from the literature review. Blake and Mouton (1964) viewed the LC/LS subgroup as the least effective leadership group in most situations. The findings would be more in line with the literature had the other two groups also ranked their ability high in this area.

Summary

This study has established some evidence to support that there does exist a relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in selected tasks. In the areas of negotiations, arbitration, writing skill, and organizing, the hypothesis was supported and the direction established by the review of literature was evidenced. Although no support for the hypothesis concerning the remaining task areas of political action, public relations, member counseling, and leadership training was established, there was also no evidence to contradict the literature regarding which leadership style groups might perceive higher ability in these task areas.
Overall, this study has added some evidence to the literature that there exists this relationship. By doing so, the MEA has been given an additional tool to assist decision makers about assignments to areas of specialization. This tool is limited to the areas supported by the study, negotiations, arbitration, writing, and organizing. Additional research is needed before any conclusions should be drawn for the remaining tasks.

Recommendations for Future Research

It is hoped that this study has formed a basis for continued research in the area of leadership and performance. The work with union leadership, especially in the field of education, is extremely limited.

Changes in the research are recommended by this researcher. It would be most helpful if performance ratings were used rather than rankings. It is viewed that this would be much more useful in determining ability in the selected tasks, adding the dimension of superior to poor performance. In order for the ratings to be of use, the superordinate's rating would have to be used rather than that of the individual being rated. The possibility of bias would be great if a self-assessment instrument were to be used.

It is also recommended that the leadership style be determined by surveying subordinates and peers, rather than the individual. This would also serve to eliminate any possible self-bias.

For the MEA, research should continue in the area of leadership style for not only the UniServ Director but the local elected
leader. The relationship between these two positions is interesting. If a determination could be made to the optimal conditions producing superior results from the unit could be made, the relationship between these leaders could be fostered in a direction to maintain high performance.

In summary, this researcher believes that the area of leadership study and performance within the MEA, or other similar organizations, is open for a variety of possible research. The need is present for more understanding of the nature of the relationship between leadership style and performance.

Summary

This study investigated the relationship between leadership style and perceived performance in selected tasks. Using the 99 UniServ Directors of the Michigan Education Association, the objective of the study was to provide additional criteria that could be used to assist organizational leaders in assignment of staff to areas of specialization. The selected task areas were (a) negotiations, (b) arbitration, (c) writing, (d) political action, (e) public relations, (f) member counseling, (g) leadership training, and (h) organizing.

Leadership style was defined using the two dimensional nature of leadership postulated by Fleishman (1957), Blake and Mouton (1964), Reddin (1980), Hersey and Blanchard (1974), and Fiedler (1967). These dimensions were concern for consideration and structure.
The instruments used to collect the data were the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and a self-assessment instrument. The LOQ was used to determine leadership style and the self-assessment instrument was used to determine perceived performance in the task areas. These questionnaires were mailed to the 99 directors with a response rate of 62.6%. The data from the LOQ were used to assign the respondents to one of four leadership style groups. The ranks given each task area on the self-assessment instrument were then compared across the four groups.

The hypothesis was that there exists a relationship between leadership style and the perception of the leader as to his/her ability in a specific area of specialization. It was concluded that support for this relationship was established for the tasks of (a) negotiations, (b) arbitration, (c) writing, and (d) organizing. The results of the study did not support the existence of any relationship between leadership style and (a) political action, (b) public relations, (c) member counseling, and (d) leadership training.
Dear Director:

I am conducting research for a doctorate under the auspices of Western Michigan University. You have been selected as part of the sample of educational leaders. All responses on the survey will be handled to assure anonymity. The surveys can be completed in fifteen minutes.

The research is attempting to find out if there exists a relationship between leadership style and ability in certain task areas. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire should be answered from the perspective of the "ideal" leader. Please answer all of the questions. The self-assessment instrument should be answered according to the way you would rank your ability in the selected tasks.

It is most important that the questionnaires be returned in the enclosed envelope, as soon as possible. If you have any questions please contact me at (313) 445-4255. If you would like to learn your individual responses to the survey and how they relate to the total research, please place any random five digit number on both questionnaires. Keep that number for future reference when the results are sent to each zone office.

The code number on the enclosed envelope will be used only to determine who has responded. The surveys will be sealed from the envelope to assure anonymity.

Sincerely,
Appendix B

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire
(Reduced to 74%)
PLEASE NOTE:

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.

These consist of pages:

75-78

 University Microfilms International
300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700
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Appendix C

Self-Assessment Instrument
SURVEY PART II

DIRECTIONS:
Please number, 1-8, the following tasks required of MEA UniServ Directors. Number the task you believe is your highest ability with the number 1, the second highest ability with a number 2, and so on. Please read the description of each task before responding.

a. Negotiations: Process of setting objectives, developing proposals, and planning strategies for accomplishing goals when bargaining with employers for wages, hours, and working conditions.

b. Arbitration/legal procedures: Investigating violations of contracts or state law and planning and presenting a case before the appropriate third party for resolution.

c. Writing skills: Preparing written material in any form to accomplish objectives set in all areas of interest of the MEA.

d. Political action: Conducting candidate and proposal screening and endorsing, developing campaign strategies, recruiting, and directing MEA members in support of endorsed candidates and/or proposals.

e. Public relations: Organizing and implementing internal member communication and external public communication that enhances perceptions of the MEA.

f. Member counseling: Working with members on an individual basis to resolve work related problems which may or may not involve the grievance procedure.

g. Leadership training: Determining areas of need for local MEA leaders and planning and presenting training programs to meet those needs.

h. Organizing: Identifying non-MEA units with an interest in becoming affiliated with the MEA. Planning a strategy for winning a representation election.

Please place this survey inside the Leader Opinion Questionnaire and return. Please remember to place your random code at the top. The results of the survey will be returned to the zone director and will be made available to you. Thank you for your cooperation.

COPY
Dear Director:

As a former SNAP negotiator for the MEA and member of the UniServ Hiring Pool in 1980-82, I realize the time demands of your job. If you would take just a few minutes to fill out the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and Task Survey, I would be very appreciative.

If you have misplaced the original survey sent early in March, I have provided a copy for your use. The surveys will be handled to assure complete anonymity. If you desire to know your personal results in comparison with the totals, place any five digit code on the survey.

Thank you for your time. I appreciate your help in this difficult time of year.

Sincerely,

David L. Myers

DLM:es
Appendix E

Frequency of Rank Ordering
by Leadership Style
### Frequency of Rank Ordering by Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Consideration</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>Writing Skill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consideration</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>Writing Skill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Skill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Frequency of Rank Ordering by Leadership Style

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Consideration</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Skill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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