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This study examined the leadership styles exhibited by Michigan school superintendents in relation to school district size, birth order, family size, marital status, time served as a teacher before becoming a superintendent, and time served as a superintendent. The subject population consisted of 530 superintendents from which 363 were selected at random. A questionnaire was sent to the random sample with a 65% return. The questionnaire utilized the LBDQ FORM-XII to ascertain the self-perceived leadership styles of these superintendents. The aforementioned other sociological factors were determined by question. No support was found for the existence of any of the relationships mentioned above. On the basis of some trends found in the analysis of the data there was some speculation about a tendency to be a high relations oriented leader if one had first been a teacher for 7 or more years.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Administration is complex. Administrators need both personal
talent and the ability to create an atmosphere in which people
flourish. Their effectiveness depends on the people with whom they
deal and on the type of community surrounding them. Assessment of
administrative success is also complex. When can administrators be
considered successful? When they hold their job? When they just
keep things going? When they make significant changes? How does
the community and organization influence the administrative situa­
tion?

To study the administrative process, the school situation was
selected. By studying this specific situation in detail, it was
hoped to uncover principles that applied to all administrative set­
tings. Thus, this study is about schools and their leaders. School
administrators are key elements in the question of quality education
(Schutz, 1977). While teachers are certainly the pivotal figures in
the educational process, good administrators tend to encourage, en­
hance, and help release teachers' potential. In any organization,
the person at the top sets the tone. When the school leader is
frightened, uncertain, domineering, incompetent, or irresponsible,
the teachers and the school reflect these traits. Educational up­
grading requires the improvement of school administration.
Modern concepts of leadership cover a broad range of behavioral patterns. Leadership is one of an administrator's most critical functions and is one of the most highly valued functions in human society. Leaders may act in a variety of ways and still be considered as leaders.

Leadership does not consist of a combination of abstract personal qualities, but is a result of complex interaction between the leader and his group members in an organizational system. Morphet et al. (1964) state that "a person performs leadership acts when he (1) helps a group to define tasks, goals and purposes, (2) helps a group to achieve its tasks, goals and purposes, and (3) helps to maintain the group by assisting in providing for group and individual needs" (p. 127). The method the individual uses in performance of those acts and the extent to which he performs them will determine his effectiveness as a leader. The leadership function is based upon the authority that individuals acquire upon assuming positions of responsibility. This authority cannot be fully utilized unless the person occupying the leadership position exercises, to the fullest extent possible, the leadership function.

To be an effective leader the administrator must examine the role he/she is to play and develop a consistent philosophy of leadership. Stoops and Johnson (1967) indicate that the administrator will tend to select that style of leadership which best supports his perception of leadership. For this reason he/she must be able to
evaluate himself/herself as an educational leader and determine the style of leadership in which he/she can be most effective. Failure to do so will limit his ability to improve his influence as an administrator and as an educational leader (Bowman, 1972).

The analysis of leader behavior, what leaders actually do, has proven to be the most rewarding research approach to the understanding of leadership. Numerous studies have dealt with the analysis of leader behavior and leadership styles, and these studies have ranged from communication behaviors, subordinate perceptions of leadership behaviors, relationships between teacher morale and teacher-perceived leader behavior, to relationships between observed and perceived principal leadership behaviors.

Through the Ohio State Leadership Studies, Halpin (1956) found that leader behavior consisted of four dimensions: Consideration, Structure, Production Emphasis, and Sensitivity. Consideration and Structure were the most important, as confirmed by a number of subsequent studies (Halpin & Winer, 1957; Shartle, 1956; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Halpin and Winer (1957) said that a low Consideration score is indicative of an autocratic leadership style, whereas a low Structure score would indicate that the leader is likely to be relatively inactive in directing his work group toward goal attainment.

Many studies indicated that a person does not become a leader by possession of a combination of personality traits. Myers (1954) examined over two hundred studies of leadership that had been made within the 50 years prior to 1954 and concluded that the research indicated that the personal characteristics of leaders differed.
according to the situation and leaders tended to remain leaders only in situations of similar activity; no single characteristic was possessed by all leaders. This finding confirmed the study of Stogdill (1948) in that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits. Therefore, leadership depends upon other variables in addition to the combination of individual personality traits.

In the 1960's a new concept of studying leadership styles emerged. Tannebaum (1961) proposed that a new approach to the study of leadership styles should be considered. Tannebaum also indicated that certain forces within the situation are factors in determining the leadership style. These factors are type of organization, group effectiveness, the nature or complexity of the task, and the amount of time available to make a decision or take action. Shetty (1970) supported this proposal and termed this a situational approach, in which the situation or environment should be considered as the relevant variable in analyzing leadership styles.

The leadership style of an individual evolves through interaction among the four above-mentioned forces which influence his/her behavior. These forces, interacting simultaneously, shape the individual's leadership pattern. The administrator, at every level, must react to the pressures and demands of his/her environment and understand those forces within himself/herself, the individuals and the groups he/she is dealing with, and the forces existing in the organization in order to adjust his/her leadership style accordingly (Wilson, 1965).
Does an individual's leadership behavior differ from situation to situation? Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) indicated that theoretically, individuals might adjust their actual behavior to suit the particular situation. Leadership acts are essential to goal achievement and the situational variables determine what may be the most effective leadership style. Bell (1954) supported this by proposing a situational theory which states that social situations determine the nature and quality of leadership. The theory states, in essence, that leadership which succeeds in one situation will not necessarily do so in another. Gibb (1954) discussed this theory in relation to leadership traits and concluded that, given a stable set of leadership traits, the traits would have to bend to meet differences in situations.

Reviewing the research related to the area of leadership concerning situations and environments, one concludes that situation and environments are next to impossible to change. Therefore, under these conditions, it becomes possible to change more easily, rather than the situational and environmental factors, the leadership style of the administrator. Is it really possible to change one's own leadership style? Can a leader really adapt his/her style of leadership to mesh with certain situations and environments? These points of curiosity lead to this and perhaps a later study.

Initially, in this study, what are the leadership styles exhibited by superintendents in the state of Michigan in their current environments, and do these styles vary as may be influenced by certain situations? Secondly, an area for further study, what happens
to leadership style when the same leader is forced through employment change into another, differing environment? Is it really possible to change one's own leadership style?

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between leadership styles of chief school administrators and some common factors in socialization and employment environment conditions. Attention was focused upon the leadership styles as described through the application of the LBDQ-XII (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, revised form XII, Stogdill, 1963). Socialization factors were described in terms of birth order, family size, marital status, time spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent, and length of time a superintendent has served in that capacity. Employment environment conditions were described in terms of the student enrollment of a district. A student enrollment of 0-1,499 was considered a small school district. A student enrollment of 1,500-2,999 was considered a medium school district. A student enrollment of 3,000 and up was considered a large school district. This method of categorization by certain sizes of enrollment places all superintendents in Michigan into approximately three equal groups.

Need for the Study

This study needed to be done for theory and practice. To improve and add to the vast store of knowledge concerning leadership,
studies need to be done that will expand and will add to the theory of leadership. Practical studies need to be accomplished too. Aspiring leaders need practical help in becoming the very best leaders they can possibly become. This study concerning leadership styles exhibited in certain environments and situations can provide practical help for new leaders. Certain socialization factors were examined in this study. This was done to aid those aspiring leaders and help them examine their social background for certain similar traits useful in their future leader positions. One can do nothing except to note his/her birth order or family size. But marital status, time spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent, and length of time a superintendent has served in that capacity are social factors a future leader can control. This study can then provide a few factors against which future leaders can test themselves.

The results of this study would be of interest to three different audiences. The first audience would be a community interested in selecting a new superintendent. After a school board has determined the community's need concerning a new superintendent (example: high relations, high task leadership style), then through skillful interview techniques the school board could select the most correct leader for the position. The second audience for this study would be persons aspiring to become leaders. It would be of interest to them to ascertain their own leadership style and then using that knowledge about themselves they could select or interview for positions in situations and environments that would be a good match for
their particular leadership style. The third audience interested in this study would be administrators currently occupying positions of leadership. It would be of interest to them to note the style of leadership being exhibited by other administrators in similar situations to their own situation and also compare their style of leadership to the aforementioned leadership style.

Hypotheses to be Tested

In the interest of clarity and so that the reader may better understand the direction of this study, the hypotheses as suggested by the Chapter II review of the literature are presented here:

1. The larger the school district the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership.

2. The larger the school district the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership.

3. A superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

4. A superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high task oriented rather than low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

5. The larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented will be his/her style of leadership.
6. The larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented will be his/her style of leadership.

7. A superintendent who is married will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership.

8. A superintendent who is married will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership.

9. A superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership.

10. A superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership.

11. A superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high relations oriented rather than a low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

12. A superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high task oriented rather than a low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

Organization

The report of this study is organized in the following manner:

Chapter I presents an introduction, background, a statement of the purpose, need for the study, hypotheses to be tested, an
organization statement, and a summary.

Chapter II provides a review of the literature dealing with the topic and the rationale or bases for the hypotheses of the study.

Chapter III describes the methodology of the study. This involved the selection of the LBDQ as the instrument for the determination of the leadership style. Included also in this section are the inferential techniques utilized to test the hypotheses.

Chapter IV is a presentation and interpretation of data involved in specific regard to the hypotheses, as well as a description of other factors uncovered by the study.

Chapter V presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

Summary

Chapter I begins with an introduction and continues with a section on background of leadership. The statement of purpose suggests a relationship between certain leadership styles and other situational and environment conditions. The need for the study indicates that this study is important for both leadership theory and practice. For clarity the research hypotheses are listed in this early chapter. There are six of them stating relationships between the leadership styles of low and high relations orientation and certain situations and environment conditions. Another six research hypotheses state relationships between the leadership styles of low and high task orientation and certain situations and environment conditions. These are followed by an organization statement and a summary.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Leadership is very highly valued in human society. For this reason vast amounts of research have been conducted and numerous books have been written concerning leadership and leaders. It would, therefore, be unwarranted to even attempt to cover all the research conducted pertaining to leadership. The review of literature presented in this chapter is limited to the more important research on leadership as it may pertain to educational administration and the school superintendent. With the exception of a few sources from the 1930's and 1940's, the great majority are from 1950 on to the present. For organizational purposes, this chapter is divided into several sections. The first section presents the two main approaches to the study of leadership. The second section involves discussion of some of the theories of leadership. The third section analyzes some of the more important research conducted concerning leadership styles relating to the hypotheses of this study. The final section summarizes the important research findings pertaining to the leadership styles of educational administrators, especially school superintendents.
At the beginning of the 20th century leaders were generally regarded as superior individuals who, as a result of inheritance or social status, became possessed with qualities and abilities that differentiated them from individuals in general. The early focus was upon sets of personality traits or characteristics which were supposed to differentiate leaders from followers. This approach tended to treat personality characteristics in an atomistic fashion, suggesting that each trait acted singly to determine leadership effects. The assumption behind this approach was that successful leadership behavior was a function of the unique personality structure of an individual.

Bird (1940) studied a long list of traits which were taken from investigations conducted prior to 1940. Only 5% of the traits which were supposed to distinguish leaders were common to four or more studies. Jenkins (1947) confirmed Bird's study, finding that, although leaders show some superiority over followers in at least one of a wide variety of abilities characterizing leaders, leadership and leader behavior is specific to the situation under investigation. Stogdill (1948) in examining leadership studies conducted prior to 1948 agreed with Bird (1940) and Jenkins (1947), finding that the average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average members of his group in the following respects:
intelligence, scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibilities, activity and social participation, and socioeconomic status. Gouldner (1950) reviewed the literature in leadership and concluded: "At this time there is no reliable evidence concerning the existence of universal leadership traits" (p. 34).

All four researchers essentially agreed in the relationship of personality traits to leadership in that personality traits alone will not explain leadership. Most of the personality traits, with the exception of intelligence, that were found to be associated with leadership could be classified as competencies, rather than traits. These competencies could be attained through effective learning experiences.

The modern trait approach to the study of leadership views the leader as having certain attributes which influence his behavior. These traits or attributes are found in successful leaders and it would appear that they interact to generate personality dynamics advantageous to the individual seeking the responsibilities. These traits, however, could be found in different combinations, depending upon the situational circumstances.

Stogdill (1974) compared the studies conducted dealing with leadership traits prior to 1948 with those studies conducted from 1948-1970. He concluded that different strata of leaders and followers can be described in terms of the extent to which they exhibit some of the characteristics. He also indicated that leader characteristics, considered singly, hold little predictive significance. Strong evidence indicates that different leadership skills and
traits are required in different situations (Fiedler, 1970; Mann, 1959).

There are several traits listed by Ross (1966) as desirable in leaders, but he does not claim universal support for their desirability:

1. Empathy: The effective leader can successfully identify with the group because he can see as they see.

2. Member of the group: The leader must have identification with the group and must be a member of the group, albeit a unique one.

3. Consideration: Consideration suggests that the leader recognizes the need and knows what to do. He is not necessarily warm and sympathetic.

4. Surgency: Elected leaders need prominence, pleasantness, and positive attitude to maintain the leader role.

5. Emotional stability: Leaders need to be able to move in good and bad times with poise and serenity. Individual personality patterns tend to create disharmony and ambivalence in groups. (p. 56)

Doll (1972) in analyzing a number of trait studies agreed with Ross's findings and listed essentially the same traits as being significant or desirable in leaders, although he gave the traits different names.

A problem with the traits approach is that the traits are not necessarily universal. Traits included in one's list might prove to be important in some situations. The degree of significance assigned to a given list may vary from situation to situation (Guetzkow, 1951).

Pierce and Merrill (1957) reviewed research on traits and attributes and concluded:
Traits and attributes which may be considered as bearing positive relationships to leader behavior are popularity, originality, adaptability, judgement, ambition, persistence, emotional stability, social and economic status, and communicative skills. The highest correlations with leader behavior were found to be popularity, originality and judgement.

Traits that are considered to be of some significance, but not on the basis of statistical treatment, are insight, initiative, and cooperation.

Traits and attributes that may be considered to be positively related to leader behavior, but with low statistical correlation, are disposition, responsibility, integrity, self-confidence, social activity and mobility, social skills, physical characteristics and fluency of speech.

Conflicting findings were reported with respect to the relationship of leader behavior to dominance and extroversion and introversion.

A successful leader should possess at least several of the traits in some combination. (p. 331)

Several studies were undertaken to examine the relationship between the personal traits of the school administrator and the perceptions of his effectiveness or success on the job. Wiles and Grobman (1955) in studying working patterns of school administrators found no relationship between personality factors and their on-the-job behavior. This finding was supported by Alpren (1954), Farrar (1956), and Henderson (1954).

Personality traits, however, do bear some relationship to the effectiveness or success of an individual in a leadership position. Personality traits alone cannot explain leader effectiveness, and no given set of personality traits or personal attributes can be claimed as being common to all leaders. As numerous researchers pointed out, the personal values held by a successful leader in one
situation may not be effective for success in another different situation. These conclusions were supported by Fiedler (1971) in that he found that situational factors and personality attributes interact in determining leadership effectiveness.

**Group Approaches to Leadership**

The second approach to leadership is the group approach. This approach is founded on the premise that the individual acquires leadership status through the interactions of the group in which he participates and demonstrates his ability to aid the group in the completion of its tasks. In short, leadership is a quality of group activity and involves the contribution an individual makes in a group situation. The focus of the group approach is on leader behavior in a social system rather than on leader traits.

According to Halpin (1957) group leadership consists of two fundamental group functions: group achievement and group maintenance. He describes these functions as follows:

1. Group achievement: measured in respect to how well the group accomplishes the group task.

2. Group maintenance: measured by the extent to which the group remains intact as a group; gauged in respect or "morale," "cooperation" among group members in working with one another and other indices of job satisfaction. (p. 169)

Doll (1972) postulated that groups are concerned with two kinds of problems: those concerned with getting tasks performed according to the objectives of the group; and those associated with keeping the work of the group proceeding harmoniously and happy. According
to Doll (1972), "Leaders are to put their faith in methods which
will help their groups solve the two kinds of problems" (p. 16).
Barlund's (1962) viewpoint indicated that leaders should have spe-
cial competence in group management functions and in helping perform
tasks which belong to the group.

A great number of studies were made of leadership and the rela-
tion of leadership to the group. Myers (1957) made an extensive
analysis of many of these studies and proposed the following gener-
alizations supported by two or more studies:

1. Leadership is a product of interaction, not
status or position.

2. Leadership cannot be structured in advance.
The uniqueness of each combination of persons, of vary-
ing interactional patterns and of varying forces within
and without impinging upon the group will bring forth
different leaders.

3. A leader in one situation will not automatically
be a leader in another situation.

4. Leadership does not result from a status posi-
tion, but rather how a person behaves in an organization.

5. Whether a person is a leader in a group depends
upon the group's perception of him.

6. Most groups have more than one person occupying
the leadership role.

7. The way a leader perceives his role determines
his action.

8. Leadership fosters positive sentiments toward
the group activity and persons in the group.

9. Leadership may be democratic or autocratic, but
never laissez-faire.

10. Leadership protects the critical group norms.
11. Leadership is authority rendered to some who are perceived by others as the proper persons to carry out the particular leadership role of the group.

12. Program development that involves only persons of a single (specific) position is not as comprehensive or lasting as that which involves people of various positions in the organization. (pp. 4-9)

The group approach involves the analysis of leadership in group interaction situations rather than individual personality traits. Berelson and Steiner (1964) made an extensive survey of the scientific findings in the behavioral sciences and formulated a number of propositions relating to leadership in small groups and formal organizations. Three of the most pertinent of the propositions are:

1. In general the "style" of the leader is determined more by the expectations of the group membership and the requirements of the situation than by the personal traits of the leader himself. (p. 342)

2. In a small group, authoritarian leadership is less effective than democratic leadership in holding the group together and getting its work done. (p. 342)

3. The leader's style of leadership tends to be influenced by the style in which he is led. (p. 376)

The researchers also pointed out that the holders of intermediate positions in the organizational hierarchy are under pressure from their superiors for productivity and under pressure from the subordinates for human consideration, and "this cross pressure is the source of actual or potential conflict in their behavior" (Berelson & Steiner, 1964, p. 376).

Brain (1972), in summarizing research findings concerning group leadership and the nature of leadership, stated four basic principles about the nature of leadership:
1. Leadership is a function of the group.

2. Leadership is that quality of the group that determines its effectiveness in establishing and achieving group goals.

3. Many people contribute to effective leadership.

4. The extent to which people contribute to leadership is determined by the way the members of a group perceive an individual and use his contributions. (p. 7)

Further light was thrown on group characteristics by the studies of Hemphill (1949). He identified 15 measures of group dimensions and studied leadership in relation to those dimensions. Hemphill (1949) found that only two of the group dimensions had a significant positive correlation with leadership behavior: viscosity (the feeling of togetherness of the group); and hedonic tone (the degree of satisfaction group members obtain from group membership). The correlations were .52 for viscosity and .51 for hedonic tone.

One of the major contributions of research involving the group approach was the identification of two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior: consideration and structure. These two dimensions of leader behavior are similar to the two dimensions of group activity. The identification of consideration and structure dimensions provided researchers with a new means of analyzing leadership: the study of patterns of styles of leadership.

Foremost among instruments developed in the studies was the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire developed originally by Hemphill and Coons (1957) and adapted in its most recent version by Stogdill (1963). The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) measures the two dimensions of leader behavior:
initiating structure and consideration. Stogdill's LBDQ (Form XII) was also found by Brown (1967) to yield two major factors which he referred to as "system" orientation and "person" orientation. Brown (1967) indicated that these two dimensions of leader behavior were highly similar to the two major dimensions previously identified by scholars, including Halpin's (1957) two dimensions. Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) in analysis of the dimensions of leader behavior concluded: "The Halpin dimensions are representative of the various categorizations and are useful concepts to use in an abbreviated treatment of leader behavior. They are probably the most widely known among educational administrators" (p. 201).

Initiating structure behavior "refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure" (Halpin, 1958, p. 4). Consideration behavior "refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff" (Halpin, 1958, p. 4).

The most important point about initiating structure and consideration behaviors is that they are not arranged on one continuum. They are two separate dimensions which may range from low to high in any individual (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). See Figure 1.

Another development in the group approach to the study of leadership has been the emphasis on the relations of the situational factors to leader behavior. This approach contends that different
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Quadrant 1 = Low Consideration (-C) and High Structure (+S)
Quadrant 2 = High Consideration (+C) and High Structure (+S)
Quadrant 3 = Low Consideration (-C) and Low Structure (-S)
Quadrant 4 = High Consideration (+C) and Low Structure (-S)

Figure 1

Leadership Styles Concerning the Two Dimensions of Leadership Style Known as Consideration and Structure
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leadership behaviors are required in different situations in order to achieve effectiveness.

Tannebaum and Massarik (1961), in studying leadership as a function of managerial activity, suggested that there are three types of forces which influence a leader in shaping his leadership style: forces within the leader himself, forces in his subordinates, and forces in the general situation.

1. Forces within the leader himself include:
   a. his value system, that is, the extent to which he thinks individuals should share in the decisions which affect them.
   b. his confidence in his subordinates.
   c. his own leadership inclination, that is, under what circumstances he feels more comfortable.
   d. his feelings of security in certain situations.

2. Forces within subordinates include:
   a. their need for independence.
   b. their tolerance for ambiguity.
   c. their interest in a problem and its importance.
   d. their degree of identification with the organization's goals.
   e. their knowledge and experience.
   f. their expectations that they should share in decision-making.

3. Forces within the situation include:
   a. the type of organization, including its culture, size of working units, geographical distribution and the degree of inter- and intra-organizational interaction required to attain goals.
b. group effectiveness.
c. the nature and complexity of the task.
d. the amount of time to make a decision or take action. (p. 24)

Models for Analyzing Leadership Styles

One model of leadership style was developed from the research dealing with the consideration and structure dimensions of leadership behavior as developed by Halpin and Winer (1957) and modified by Goldman (1966). These two dimensions, according to Goldman (1966), are a "useful way of viewing leadership behavior when organized into a quadrant scheme" (p. 85).

According to this scheme or model, as it is referred to in this discussion, a superintendent's leadership style may reflect any one of the following combinations as shown in Figure 1. For example, a person with high consideration and high structure would have a leadership style that places him/her in Quadrant 2, while a person with low consideration and low structure would have a leadership style that places him/her in Quadrant 3. Other possible combinations would be low consideration and high structure (Quadrant 1) or low structure and high consideration (Quadrant 4). These four leadership styles may be determined on basis of structure and consideration scores on the LBDQ.

Another form of leadership style is suggested by Getzels and Cuba's social systems theory (Getzels & Cuba, 1957). Moser (1957) and Guba and Bidwell (1957), in using this theory as a referent,
derived three styles of leadership:

1. Nomothetic: The leader emphasizes the demands of the organization—expectations for role occupants, rules, regulations.

2. Idiographic: The leader emphasizes the need of the individual for being treated in a considerate manner, autonomy.

3. Transactional: The leader attempts to negotiate a course between the two extremes, at times engaging in nomothetic behavior and at other times engaging in idiographic behavior. (Moser, 1957, p. 2)

While the nomothetic style is not necessarily synonymous with initiating structure behavior, there is some definitional similarity (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). In the same sense there are similarities between idiographic leadership style and consideration behavior. Transactional leadership style, in its best form, seems to be a manifestation of the behavior of a leader who has considerable capacity for both initiating structure and consideration (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973).

Fiedler (1967) proposed a Contingency Model with which to analyze leadership behavior. Leaders are classified as task oriented or interpersonal relationship oriented on the basis of the way they describe the person with whom they least liked to work. Fiedler called this the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC). The contingency variables are empirically derived situational determinants of effectiveness of leadership style in achieving group tasks (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). According to Fiedler (1967) the Contingency Model combines the psychological (personality attributes) and sociological (group behavior analysis) approaches to the study of leadership.
The emphasis in this model is not directly based on behavior, rather it is based on the favorability of the situation to task oriented or interpersonal leaders.

Under the Contingency Model, groups are classified into types according to their status in three dimensions: (1) the degree of structure involved in the task, (2) the amount of power given to the leader, and (3) the quality of interpersonal relationships between leader and other members (Fiedler, 1966). Fiedler reasoned that these three variables have a common element. They constitute favorability of the situation to the leader. The most favorable situation would be one in which the task is structured, the leader has high position power, and leader-member relations are good.

Eight situations for leadership can be identified, based upon the combining of each of the three situational dimensions. Four situations, being either very favorable or very unfavorable for exercising leadership and influence, require task-oriented styles. Four moderately favorable situations require relationship-oriented styles.

1. Task-oriented authoritarian leadership styles are more effective in group situations of:
   a. good leader-member relations, structured tasks, and strong leader position power.
   b. good leader-member relations, structured tasks, and weak leader position power.
   c. good leader-member relations, unstructured tasks, and strong leader position power.
   d. moderately poor leader-member relations, unstructured tasks, and weak leader position power.
2. Relationship-oriented, participatory leadership styles are more effective in group situations of:

a. good leader-member relations, unstructured tasks, and weak position power.

b. moderately poor leader-member relations, structured tasks, and strong leader position power.

c. moderately poor leader-member relations, structured tasks, and weak leader position power.

d. moderately poor leader-member relations, unstructured tasks, and strong leader position power. (Fiedler, 1967, p. 146)

One of the questions arising out of examination of the Contingency Model is whether the leader can behave flexibly enough to cope with varied situations, or whether it is necessary to either replace the leader as the situation changes or to modify the situation to fit the leader's capabilities or behavior. There is disagreement over this issue as noted by Fiedler (1967), Hill (1969), and Tannebaum and Schmidt (1958).

Tannebaum and Schmidt (1958) suggested that a leader is capable of exhibiting a wide range of behaviors. They stated:

The successful leader is one who is able to behave appropriately in light of these perceptions. If direction is in order, he is able to direct; if considerable participative freedom is called for, he is able to provide such freedom. . . . Thus, the successful manager of men can be primarily characterized neither as a strong leader or as a permissive one. Rather, he is one who maintains a high batting average in accurately assessing the forces that determine what his most appropriate behavior at any given time should be and in actually being able to behave accordingly. (p. 301)

Fiedler (1967) feels that a leader is not capable of varying his behavior to a large degree. He stated: "Fitting the man to the leadership job by selection and training has not been spectacularly..."
successful. It is surely easier to change almost anything in the job situation than a man's personality and his leadership style" (p. 115).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) proposed another model of analyzing leader behavior, called a Normative Model, based on the following assumption:

1. The Normative Model should be constructed in such a way as to be of potential value to leaders in determining which leadership methods they should use in each of the various situations they encounter in carrying out their formal leadership roles. Consequently, it should be operational in that the behaviors required of the leaders should be specified unambiguously.

2. There are a number of discrete social processes by which organizational problems can be translated into solutions and these processes vary in terms of the potential amount of participation by subordinates in the problem-solving process.

3. No one leadership method is applicable to all situations; analysis of situational requirements can be translated into prescriptions of leadership styles.

4. The most appropriate unit for the analysis of the situation is the particular problem to be solved and the context in which the problem occurs.

5. The leadership method used in response to one situation should not constrain the method or style used in other situations.

The Normative Model emphasized the relations of decision-making processes to leader behavior. Vroom and Yetton (1973) point out:
"We are interested in the way in which leadership is reflected in social process utilized for decision-making, specifically in leaders choices about how much and in what way to involve their subordinates in decision-making" (p. 5).

This model is based on the contention that a leader is a problem-solver or a decision-maker—that the task of translating problems into solutions is inevitably his task (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Under this model the leader's task can be viewed as one of determining the method or process used in problem solving. A major portion of the leader's job is to determine what person or persons should take part in the solution of the problem. This, in turn, would reflect his leadership style.

This model provides a means of separating two issues that have seldom been clearly differentiated by those studying leadership behavior. Two theoretically distinct sets of questions can be asked concerning the leader's choice of a decision process. One contains the normative questions as to which process should be used to make the decision. The other consists of the descriptive questions concerning which decision-making process would actually be used (Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

One notable feature of this model, according to the authors, is the possible reduction of biased reports of leaders of their own behavior. The leader's self-perception would possibly be biased in the direction of what he considers to be an ideal leadership style. If a leader has to judge the degree to which he typically employs participation methods, his estimates are likely to contain a greater
degree of bias than the report of the method he used in a particular decision. Thus, substantially greater bias would be expected in a direction of overestimating democratic methods in leaders' judgment of the relative frequency with which they employ different methods in their jobs—the basis of the ideal measurement—than in their reports of the method they used in solving a particular problem.

While biases in leaders' reports of their own behavior are likely part of the explanation of the mean difference, the greater specificity of the reports of the leaders' behavior in decision making should operate in such a way to hold that bias to a minimum. This would reduce the possibility of the "halo" effect in reporting self-perceived leader behavior.

This model does not consider the effectiveness of a particular leadership style in a particular type situation. As Vroom and Yetton (1973) noted:

One is not likely to ask, let alone receive answers to, such questions as "what situations cause leaders to show consideration or lack of consideration for their subordinates"? One cannot predict to much extent a leader's behavior in a situation by knowing his LPC score (Fiedler, 1967) or his score on structure and consideration (Halpin and Winer, 1957). (p. 62)

Some models, including the models previously described, are based on the analysis of two variables, which may be called Task Orientation and Relations Orientation. Shown in Figure 2 are three other models which may be used in leadership analysis, the basis of their classifications, and types of leader arising from those classifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Basis of Classification</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewin-Lippitt-White (1939)</td>
<td>Initiation-Guidance</td>
<td>Democratic, Laissez-Faire, Autocratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor (1960)</td>
<td>Assumptions About the Nature of Man</td>
<td>Theory &quot;X&quot;- Theory &quot;Y&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake-Mouton (1964)</td>
<td>Concern for Production, Concern for People</td>
<td>Production-oriented, Relationship-oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

Three Models for Possible Use in Leadership Analysis

**Research Concerning Leadership Styles in Educational Administration**

McGrath (1961) in his summary of the literature has pointed to two clusters of leadership behavior and attitudes which have been the focus of most psychological research in the area. These clusters have been variously labeled as autocratic, authoritarian, task-oriented, and initiating on the one hand versus democratic, equalitarian, permissive, group-oriented, and considerate on the other. The leader can either take the responsibility for making the decisions and for directing the group members or he can, to a greater or lesser extent, share the decision-making and coordinating functions with the members of the group. All these methods and any combination of them have worked in some situations and not in others (Gibb, 1954; Hare, 1962).
Most of the studies in educational administration dealing with leader behavior in groups and organizations have used the LBDQ or some adaptation of this instrument.

Stogdill et al. (1956) found that there was a tendency for patterns of interpersonal behavior to be transferred from one situation to another, but patterns of work performance were changed in response to the requirements of new situations. Contrary to this study, Borgatta (1964) found considerable consistency of behavior in the same leader performing in different groups with varying tasks.

A number of investigators pointed out that different leadership situations require different leadership styles. Carter, Haythorn, Shriver, and Lanzetta (1951) found the behaviors of leaders differed from one situation to another depending upon requirements of the group task. Results from a small number of studies (Blake, Mouton, & Fruchter, 1954; Borg & Tupes, 1958; Borgatta, 1964) supported the view that leaders tend to change certain aspects of their behavior in response to changes in group task demands. Campbell (1961) reported significant differences between leaders in eight different situations when described on the consideration and initiating structure scales of the LBDQ. Fiedler, Chemers, and Mahar (1976) found that the effectiveness of leaders and their groups depends on two major factors: the leadership style and the leadership situation.

Leadership styles depend upon the two basic scales of consideration and initiating structure. The following descriptions are taken from Fleishman (1961):
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Consideration reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration of their feelings.

Initiating structure reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individuals who play a more active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, trying out new ideas, etc. (pp. 43-44)

The style of leadership exhibited by an administrator is also influenced by the surrounding environment. In fact, a California study completed by Schutz (1977) included three basic variables of inclusion, control, and affection in the environment of an effective leader. Schutz (1977) found the first area of administrative functioning to be the inclusion of all the available resources for doing the administrative job. The various people and groups that may help administer a school or school district must be identified and developed optimally by the administrator. This area is called effective use of human resources. The second major area of administrative functioning is controlling. By this Schutz means controlling the above inclusion elements in such a way as to organize and integrate their contributions most usefully and calling this control task effectiveness. The third area of administrative functioning is that of creating a personal bond among the people involved in the educational enterprise that is essential for the continuation of the coordinated activity required to run a school efficiently. Ability to create these successful affectional relations is called interpersonal effectiveness. The areas of measurement of administrative
effectiveness in Schutz's study are use of human resources, task, and interpersonal. Task and interpersonal are two measures of administrative effectiveness that closely parallel the task orientation and the relations orientation of this study. Other areas of common interest were school district size, birth order, family size, marital status, time spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent, and length of time a superintendent has served in that capacity. Some of Schutz's and some others' areas of interest that parallel this study will be listed in the following paragraphs. Along with these findings will be the hypotheses of this study as suggested by these areas of interest as discussed by Schutz and some others.

Research Hypotheses

The following section presents the 12 research hypotheses and a supporting review of the literature for each independent variable.

Leadership Style Related to School District Size

Environment influences the style of leadership exhibited by an administrator. In a study of administrative effectiveness evidence was found that the size of a school district called for varied types of leadership (Schutz, 1977). In larger school districts a task oriented leader was more effective while in smaller school districts a relations oriented leader was more effective. The first and second research hypotheses relate to the above findings.
Research Hypothesis 1: The larger the school district the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership.

Research Hypothesis 2: The larger the school district the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership.

Leadership Style Related to Birth Order

Just as a leader's current environment influences his/her style of leadership, so also can his former environment influence his/her style of leadership. Interest in the effect of birth order on subsequent functioning was given a strong impetus by the publication of Schachter's (1959) The Psychology of Affiliation. Several studies have determined special characteristics of first born children compared to later born, including higher achievement (Sampson, 1961); higher conformity (Capra & Dittes, 1962; Sampson, 1961); more independence (Haeberle, 1959); higher verbal ability (Koch, 1954); less aggression (Mussen & Conger, 1956; Sears, 1951); and less leadership ability (Roberts, 1938). Even more directly related to the administrative role is Stewart's (1961) study showing the preponderance of first and third born presidents.

First born sons tend to go, or be pushed, into technical fields (Schutz, 1977), while later born sons tend more to administrative positions. Large families require administration much more than small families. Division of labor, allocation of reward and punishment, sharing, and all the other problems of group life must be
dealt with in large families, whereas they exist only in rudimentary forms in small families. Not only birth order but family size might be significant in determining administrative propensity.

The sex pattern of a family seems relevant also. If a second-born son has an older sister, his family role and probably his attitude toward women may be quite different than if he has an older brother. Or if he is the only boy in a large family, he is probably expected to perform differently than in a family of all boys.

Administrators who are earlier born within their own family tend to be more relations oriented and not as task oriented (Schutz, 1977). The third and fourth research hypotheses follow and are related to the above findings.

Research Hypothesis 3: A superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

Research Hypothesis 4: A superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high task oriented rather than low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

Leadership Style Related to Family Size

Administrators who come from large families do very well as leaders in small districts because they are more relations oriented but not very well as leaders of large districts which seem to require a more task oriented style of leadership (Schutz, 1977).
Large families seem to produce a more relations oriented person (Burns, 1978). The fifth and sixth research hypotheses relate to the above findings.

**Research Hypothesis 5:** The larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented will be his/her style of leadership.

**Research Hypothesis 6:** The larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented will be his/her style of leadership.

**Leadership Style Related to Marital Status**

Marriage is a part of a family pattern that exerts influence upon a leader. Administrators who are married tend to rank higher on the consideration scale than on the initiating structure scale of the LBDQ. Married administrators do well in small school districts because of their relations orientation (Schutz, 1977). Therefore, follows the seventh and eighth research hypotheses which relate to the above findings.

**Research Hypothesis 7:** A superintendent who is married will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership.

**Research Hypothesis 8:** A superintendent who is married will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership.
Leadership Style as Related to Time Served as a Teacher

Superintendents must serve a period of training as a teacher. Being a teacher for a long period of time is not necessarily good for a leader. The longer an administrator remains a teacher before becoming an administrator the more task oriented he tends to become in his/her behavior (Schutz, 1977). Therefore follows the ninth and 10th research hypotheses which relate to the above findings.

Research Hypothesis 9: A superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership.

Research Hypothesis 10: A superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership.

Leadership Style Related to Tenure in Office

Tenure is a factor to be considered in the style of leadership. Administrators who have held administrative positions for a long time do well in task performance but not as well in consideration or relations orientation (Schutz, 1977). Thus follows the 11th and 12th research hypotheses which relate to the above findings.

Research Hypothesis 11: A superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high relations oriented rather than a low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership.
**Research Hypothesis 12:** A superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high task oriented rather than a low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

**Summary**

The research reviewed indicated that there are discrepancies in the most commonly used leadership style (democratic or autocratic), as evidenced by the studies of Farrar (1956), Grobman (1958), and Hooker (1971). No research was found that analyzed the self-perceived leadership style of the superintendent in relation to the leadership style used in situations. Most of the research reviewed analyzed teacher or subordinate perceptions of the superintendent's leadership behavior or style. Few studies were conducted which analyzed the leadership behavior of superintendents in situations. Of those studies reviewed, the superintendent or leader was shown to have varied his/her leadership style from situation to situation. Theorists in leadership behavior disagreed upon the influence of the situation on leadership behavior. One group of theorists (Fiedler, 1967; Mitton, 1970) maintained that it was easier to change the situation to suit the leadership style of the leader, while another group of theorists (Tannebaum & Massarik, 1961; Tannebaum & Schmidt, 1958; Vroom & Yetton, 1973) contended that situational factors influence the leadership style the leader uses.

In his discussion on the theories of leadership, Stogdill (1974) concluded that:
Theorists no longer explain leadership solely in terms of the individual or the group. Rather, it is believed that characteristics of the individual and the demands of the situation interact in such manner as to permit one, perhaps a few persons to rise to leadership status. (p. 23)

In his article, "Educational Leadership for the Seventies,"

Havighurst (1972) stated:

In order to examine the problem of leadership, it may be useful to look critically at our leaders. We can identify them by the positions they occupy.

... situation affects leadership...

Successful educational administrators are men and women of action, who lead the way to improved concerted action by people who participate in educational systems. (pp. 403-406)

The situation exerts influence upon the administrator to become the type of leader for which the environment calls.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The behavior of a leader can be and is affected by many factors. To match the right leader with the correct situation is the goal of all society. Toward that end this research was directed.

Population

The study surveyed Michigan school superintendents. Data concerning these subjects were obtained by two methods. First, a Michigan School Buyers Guide was used to determine the superintendent's name, address, and enrollment size of his/her district. Utilizing this list and a random number table, a random sample was selected from each of three predetermined school district sizes. In the state of Michigan there are approximately 530 school districts. These districts were divided into small, medium, and large according to enrollment. A student enrollment of 0-1,499 was considered a small district. A student enrollment of 1,500-2,999 was considered a medium district. A student enrollment of 3,000 and up was considered a large school district. This method of categorization by certain sizes of enrollment was done and in so doing placed all superintendents in Michigan into approximately three equal groups. The total population for the small sized school districts was 191. The total for the medium sized school districts was 165, and the total population for the large sized school districts was 40.
Therefore, a sample size was needed, according to Krejcie (1970), of 127 for the small sized school districts, and a sample size for the medium school districts of 116, and a sample size for the large school districts of 120.

Instrumentation

Next, a pilot study in which a mailed survey was circulated to 20 superintendents in each district size was conducted to determine the rate of return. In each size case the rate of return was approximately 70%, which was deemed adequate to proceed. The mailed survey was then circulated to all other superintendents in the prepared sample. The purpose of the random stratified sample was to obtain information about the superintendents as related to the size of the school district they serve. This survey was followed by a postcard to nonrespondents in an effort to obtain data from a representative sample.

This survey instrument needed to measure the leadership style of a superintendent. The instrument utilized needed to be easy to self-administer and have high reliability and validity coefficients. The time needed to complete such a task needed also to be brief so as not to intrude upon a busy superintendent's schedule. Three instruments were considered as possible tools to achieve this purpose. They were the Management Style Diagnosis Test, the Leadership Evaluation and Development Scale (LEADS), and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).
The Management Style Diagnosis Test was reviewed as a possible instrument as it purports to measure a leader's behavior along the lines of task orientation and relations orientation by having the leader respond to 64 items. This test would meet the criterion of brevity. But further study revealed the test to have no validity (Buros, 1978). Hence it was rejected for use in this study.

The Leadership Evaluation and Development Scale (LEADS) was also considered as a possible instrument for this study. The "Preliminary Manual" reports a split-half reliability of .81. LEADS did relate moderately to a verbal comprehension measure (.49) (Buros, 1978). Still, this evidence was definitely favorable with respect to the practical validity of LEADS. Unfortunately, no other studies of the final form of LEADS were available. At the very least, more validity evidence is required before considering the use of LEADS as an indication of leadership potential. The test itself involves reading eight cases and responding to 150 multiple choice questions. In the absence of more data about validity and considering the length of the instrument, LEADS was not chosen to be used in this study.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) self-report form was examined as a possible instrument for use in this study. The LBDQ was developed at Ohio State University. It was modified by Halpin and later by Stogdill (1963) and was called the LBDQ FORM-XII. The questionnaire measures two key dimensions of leader behavior: consideration (RO) and initiating structure (TO). The LBDQ was meticulously developed in the late 1940's and early
1950's as a stellar example of how a leadership scale should be developed. The most recent information about the LBDQ was obtained by telephone conversation with Dr. Phillip Podsakoff in November of 1980. He suggested obtaining an article by Schreisheim and Stogdill (1975) in Personnel Psychology as this would contain the very latest information on the LBDQ. The article praises the LBDQ and especially the FORM-XII.

Reliability Statement

The LBDQ has test-retest reliability coefficients of between .57 and .72 for the initiation of structure (task orientation) and between .71 and .79 for the consideration scale (relations orientation).

Validity Statement

In several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a "between vs. within group" analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly (Buros, 1978), making the instrument valid. Based upon the preceding data, the LBDQ was selected for use in this study. In addition to the LBDQ, questions were asked of the superintendents against which to test the aforementioned hypotheses.
Inferential Techniques

There were 12 hypotheses listed in Chapter II. They are as follows:

**Research Hypotheses**

1. The larger the school district the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership.

2. The larger the school district the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership.

3. A superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

4. A superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high task oriented rather than low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

5. The larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented will be his/her style of leadership.

6. The larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented will be his/her style of leadership.

7. A superintendent who is married will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of
leadership.

8. A superintendent who is married will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership.

9. A superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership.

10. A superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership.

11. A superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high relations oriented rather than a low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

12. A superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high task oriented rather than a low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership.

The dependent variable in each hypothesis is the style of leadership. This variable was determined by the LBDQ FORM-XII which measures the leader's relations orientation and his/her task orientation. The independent variable in each hypothesis was determined by the remaining questions on the survey. The independent variables were concerned with school district size, birth order, family size, marital status, time spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent, and length of time a superintendent has served in that capacity.
Categorization of Individuals on Their Leadership Style

The data obtained from the questionnaire concerning the dependent variable placed superintendents as either high task oriented or low task oriented and either as high relations oriented or low relations oriented. These categories of placement were determined by examination of a superintendent's score on both relation and task orientation. On each of the two variables a score above the mean of the scores obtained by the survey became high relations or high task orientation, while a score below the mean became low relations or low task orientation. This was done to place a superintendent's leadership style into four mutually exclusive categories. These leadership styles were then tested against district size, birth order, family size, marital status, time spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent, and length of time a superintendent has served in that capacity as independent variables.

Categories of Data as Related to the Hypotheses

Each hypothesis as stated contained either high or low relations orientation (scores above or below the mean) or high or low task orientation (again scores above or below the mean) as the dependent variable. Each hypothesis also contained a stated independent variable. The categories used with each of the independent variables are described in the following sections.
Hypotheses 1 and 2—district size. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were concerned with the district size as the independent variable. District size was stated as small, medium, and large to indicate a continuum from small to large as stated in the Hypotheses 1 and 2.

Hypotheses 3 and 4—birth order. Hypotheses 3 and 4 were concerned with the leadership style as the dependent variable and the birth order as the independent variable. Two categories were indicated for these hypotheses and were called early born (first or second) or later born (third on) position of birth in the family.

Hypotheses 5 and 6—family size. Hypotheses 5 and 6 were concerned with the leadership style as the dependent variable and the family size as the independent variable. Three divisions for family size were chosen and stated as small, medium, and large so as to indicate a continuum from small to large as stated in the Hypotheses 5 and 6. The small category was to be 1-2 children, medium was to be 3-4 children, and large was to be 5 and up children.

Hypotheses 7 and 8—marital status. Hypotheses 7 and 8 were concerned with the leadership style as the dependent variable and the marital status of the leader as the independent variable. Two categories were chosen for these hypotheses: married and all other possibilities were chosen as the independent variable.
Hypotheses 9 and 10—time served as a teacher. Hypotheses 9 and 10 were concerned with the leadership style as the dependent variable and the period of time the superintendent has served as a teacher prior to becoming the superintendent as the independent variable. The time that a perspective superintendent spends intern­ing as a teacher was defined as short at 1-3 years. This time period was chosen because it is the minimum amount of time a person is required to teach by state law before one can advance to the position of superintendent. A moderate amount of time was defined as 4-6 years, or double the short period of time. A long time was to be any time spent as a teacher above the 6-year time period.

Hypotheses 11 and 12—tenure in office. Hypotheses 11 and 12 were concerned with the leadership style as the dependent variable and the amount of time a person has served as a superintendent as the independent variable. A short period of time as superintendent was considered 3 years. A medium time as superintendent was 4-6 years, and a long time as superintendent was, by definition, 7 or more years.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data for each hypothesis were computer analyzed utilizing the chi-square test for k independent groups. Two statistical tests were considered for use in analyzing the data. One such test was parametric while the other was nonparametric. Parametric tests are usually more powerful and generally to be preferred. By "more
powerful" is meant more likely to reject a null hypothesis that is false; in other words, the researcher is less likely to commit a Type II error and less likely to not reject a null hypothesis which should be rejected (Gay, 1976). The parametric test considered was the one-way analysis of variance. Generally, the conclusion of an ANOVA is a statement that the null hypothesis of no treatment differences is either true or false with an accompanying probability level (alpha) that gives the probability of committing a Type I error (Glass & Stanley, 1970). However, ANOVA uses actual mean scores for a significant difference between two groups (Gay, 1976), and since the data obtained concerning the independent variable from this questionnaire was not in the form of scores, but in the form of categories, it seemed more appropriate to consider the non-parametric test of significance known as chi square. Chi square is appropriate when the data are in the form of frequency counts occurring in two or more mutually exclusive categories (Gay, 1976).

Summary

This chapter on methodology was divided into the areas of population, instrumentation, and inferential techniques. The population was described as a random sample of Michigan school superintendents. The instrumentation utilized was the LBDQ FORM-XII and survey questions pertinent to the independent variables. This section also contained the reliability and validity statements. The inferential technique used to analyze the data from the LBDQ and the survey was the chi square. This section also contained the research hypotheses.
and a statement about data analysis procedures. The categorization of survey data was also explained in this section.

The presentation and interpretation of data will follow in Chapter IV. Chapter V will consist of the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and interpret the data obtained from the questionnaire. The research hypotheses are presented along with explanatory tables of statistical analyses. A summary follows at the end of the chapter.

A total of 363 of the previously described survey instruments were sent at random to superintendents of K-12 districts within the state of Michigan. Of these 363 subjects, 236 superintendents returned completed questionnaires, or this was a 65% return. The subjects were subdivided into three groups according to the size of the district in which they were a superintendent. The sizes of the district were noted as small, medium, and large by their student population. Surveys were sent to 127 of the superintendents noted as a small district and of these 127, 81, or 65%, were returned. In the medium sized district 116 surveys were sent and 81, or 70%, were returned. In the large sized district 120 surveys were sent and 74, or 62%, were returned. A smaller percentage than those listed above were originally obtained; however, a postcard reminder was sent to nonrespondents and this resulted in a higher return of the questionnaires as reflected in the above percentages.
Research Hypotheses

The material which follows presents 12 hypotheses and their related statistical data.

Leadership Style Related to School District Size

The first and second hypotheses deal with a relationship between school district size and the leadership style of a superintendent. Tables 1 and 2 present data concerning the independent variable school district size (small 0-1,499 students, medium 1,500-2,999 students, and large 3,000 and up students) and the dependent variables of high or low relation orientation and high or low task orientation as related to leadership style of a superintendent.

Table 1

Relations Orientations of Superintendents According to the Size of Their School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations orientation</th>
<th>Size of school district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small ((n = 75))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 2.15 with 2 degrees of freedom, \(p = .341\).
Table 2

Task Orientations of Superintendents According to the Size of Their School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Size of school district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small (n = 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 4.04 with 2 degrees of freedom, p = .133.

No support was found for the hypothesis that the larger the school district the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership. There was a tendency for the small districts to have high relations oriented superintendents and the medium size tended to have low relations oriented superintendents.

Table 2 presents the data concerning the independent variable school district size and the dependent variable of high or low task orientation as related to the leadership style of a superintendent.

No support for the hypothesis that the larger the school district the more high task oriented rather than low task oriented a superintendent will be in his/her style of leadership was found. There was a tendency for the superintendent of a small district to be high task oriented in his/her style of leadership, while in the medium district the tendency was towards being a low task oriented
style of leader.

Leadership Style Related to Birth Order

The third and fourth hypotheses deal with a relationship between birth order and the leadership style of a superintendent. Tables 3 and 4 present data concerning the independent variable birth order (first or second born, as opposed to third or later than third born) and the dependent variables of high or low relations orientation and high or low task orientation as related to leadership style of a superintendent.

Table 3

Relations Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on Their Birth Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations orientation</th>
<th>1st or 2nd</th>
<th>3rd on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .003 with 1 degree of freedom, p = .953.

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership was found. Independent of the relations
orientation there was a tendency to have first or second born superintendents outnumber the third or later born superintendents by about two to one.

Table 4 presents the data concerning the independent variable birth order and the dependent variable of high or low task orientation as related to the leadership style of a superintendent.

Table 4
Task Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on Their Birth Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Birth order</th>
<th>1st or 2nd n = 145</th>
<th>3rd on n = 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .56 with 1 degree of freedom, $p = .456$.

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who is a first or second born child in his/her family will be a more high task oriented rather than low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership was found.

Leadership Style Related to Family Size

The fifth and sixth hypotheses deal with a relationship between family size and the leadership style of a superintendent. Tables 5
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Table 5
Relations Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on the Family Size in Which They Were Raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations orientation</th>
<th>Family size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small (n = 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .63 with 2 degrees of freedom, \(p = .730\).

No support for the hypothesis that the larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented will be his/her style of leadership was found.

Table 6 presents the data concerning the independent variable family size and the dependent variable of high or low task orientation as related to the leadership style of a superintendent.

No support for the hypothesis that the larger the family a superintendent is raised in the more high task oriented rather than
low task oriented will be his/her style of leadership was found. There was a tendency of the superintendents to have been raised in a family along with two or three other children.

Table 6

Task Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on the Family Size in Which They Were Raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Family size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small n = 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .34 with 2 degrees of freedom, p = .845.

Leadership Style Related to Marital Status

The seventh and eighth hypotheses deal with a relationship between marital status and the leadership style of a superintendent. Tables 7 and 8 present data concerning the independent variable of marital status (married, all other possibilities) and the dependent variable of high or low relations orientation and high or low task orientation as related to leadership style of a superintendent.

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who is married will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership was found. It is interesting to note that all of the 222 superintendents except 10 were married.
Table 7

Relations Orientations of Superintendents
Dependent on Their Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations orientation</th>
<th>Married n = 212</th>
<th>All other possibilities n = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .07 with 1 degree of freedom, p = .791.

Table 8 presents the data concerning the independent variable marital status and the dependent variable of high or low task orientation as related to the leadership style of a superintendent.

Table 8

Task Orientations of Superintendents
Dependent on Their Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Married n = 212</th>
<th>All other possibilities n = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .00 with 1 degree of freedom, p = 1.000.
No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who is married will be more high task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership was found.

Leadership Style as Related to Time Served as a Teacher

The ninth and 10th hypotheses deal with a relationship between the length of time that was spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent and the leadership style of a superintendent. Tables 9 and 10 present data concerning the independent variable of number of years spent as a teacher (short 1-3 years, medium 4-6 years, long 7 or more years) before becoming a superintendent and the dependent variable of high or low relations orientation and high or low task orientation as related to leadership style of a superintendent.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations orientation</th>
<th>Years as a teacher before becoming superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short n = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 5.11 with 2 degrees of freedom, p = .078.
Table 10
Task Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on Their Years Spent as a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Years as a teacher before becoming superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short ( n = 51 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = .57 with 2 degrees of freedom, \( p = .754 \).

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high relations oriented rather than low relations oriented in his/her style of leadership was found. Independent of the relations orientation there was a tendency for persons to spend a medium to long period of time as a teacher before becoming a superintendent. There was also a tendency noted that the longer a person remained as a teacher before becoming a superintendent the more high relations oriented in his/her style of leadership that person tended to be.

Table 10 presents the data concerning the independent variable of number of years spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent and the dependent variable of high or low task orientation as related to leadership style of a superintendent.

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who has served as a teacher for a minimum period of time will be more high
task oriented rather than low task oriented in his/her style of leadership was found. Independent of the task orientation there was a tendency for persons to spend a medium to long period of time as a teacher before becoming a superintendent.

**Leadership Style Related to Tenure in Office**

The 11th and 12th hypotheses deal with a relationship between the number of years spent as a superintendent and the leadership style of a superintendent. Tables 11 and 12 present data concerning the independent variable of number of years spent as a superintendent (short 1–3 years, medium 4–6 years, and long 7 or more years) and the dependent variable of high or low relations orientation and high or low task orientation as related to leadership style of a superintendent.

**Table 11**

Relations Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on Number of Years Spent as a Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations orientation</th>
<th>Years spent as a superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short $n = 47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 1.04 with 2 degrees of freedom, $p = .594$. 
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Table 12

Task Orientations of Superintendents Dependent on Number of Years Spent as a Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Years spent as a superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 2.28 with 2 degrees of freedom, $p = .320$.

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high relations oriented rather than a low relations oriented person in his/her style of leadership was found. There was a tendency for persons to have been superintendents for more than 7 years.

Table 12 presents the data concerning the independent variable of number of years spent as a superintendent and the dependent variable of high or low task orientation as related to the leadership style of superintendent.

No support for the hypothesis that a superintendent who has served in that capacity for a long period of time will be a more high task oriented rather than a low task oriented person in his/her style of leadership was found.
Summary

The data presented in this chapter were obtained by a mailed questionnaire. Of the questionnaires sent for this survey, 65% were returned. This is a good rate of return for a mailed questionnaire. Nonrespondents were reminded to reply by a follow-up postcard which helped to account for the good rate of return.

Twelve hypotheses were presented along with tables illustrating the data pertaining to these 12 hypotheses. None of the 12 hypotheses were significantly supported. There were many tendencies noted in the data and these were briefly reported upon.

Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

In this dissertation the leadership styles of Michigan public
school superintendents were determined by mailed survey. These
leadership styles were determined by the LBDQ (Leadership Behavior
Description Questionnaire) FORM-XII Instrument (self-evaluation).
This instrument measures the high or low relations orientation and
the high or low task orientation of a leader. The superintendents
were randomly stratified by the size of the district (small, medium,
or large) in which they served. This stratification placed the
superintendents into approximately three equal sized samples. Their
leadership styles were compared to district size and certain other
sociological factors. These factors were: birth order, family size,
marital status, number of years spent as a teacher before becoming a
superintendent, and number of years served in the capacity of super­
intendent. These aforementioned leadership styles and sociological
factors placed the superintendent into certain categories. An ex­
ample would be a person with a high relations leadership style work­
ing in a small school district. This categorical placement made it
possible to test each of the hypotheses using the test for k inde­
pendent samples. None of the hypotheses were supported.
Conclusions

Since the data analysis produced no support for the hypotheses, the results were reviewed to ascertain the areas of near significance. There was one area in this category. It was the relationship between relations orientation and the number of years spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent. In this case the $p$ is .078 (see Table 9). The fact that the significance is this close seems to indicate some relationship might be possible between the relations orientation leadership style and the number of years spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent. Closer examination of Table 9 would seem to indicate that persons who have been a teacher for 7 or more years before becoming a superintendent would have a high relations orientation in their style of leadership. At this point this is only a speculation.

Findings Related to Review of Literature

The data analysis produced no significant results even though there was sufficient indication in the literature to support the hypotheses of the study. Leadership styles would vary according to district sizes was significantly proved in a study by Schutz (1977). Different situations require different leadership styles was the subject of many studies. One group of theorists (Fiedler, 1967; Mitton, 1970) maintained that it was easier to change the situation to suit the leadership style of the leader, while another group of theorists (Tannebaum & Massarik, 1961; Tannebaum & Schmidt, 1958;
Vroom & Yetton, 1973) contended that situational factors influence the leadership style the leader uses. The sociological factors concerned with this study were supported in the literature by several researchers. Birth order and family size were studied by Sampson (1961), Capra and Dittes (1962), Stewart (1961), and most notably by Schutz (1977). The review of the literature seemed to indicate support for this study.

Implications on Leadership Theory

Leadership theory encompasses a vast kaleidoscopic body of knowledge. To add to this body in part was the purpose of this study. This study was never meant to report on the leader in totality, but to merely add to a facet of leadership theory. More specifically, the purpose of this study was concerned with the leadership style of initiating structure and consideration. These two facets of style have also been referred to as relations orientation and task orientation without either one of which a leader would be quite ineffective. If we are to move, grow, and learn more about leadership theory, much research must be done in many areas but especially in the areas of leadership style related to task orientation and relations orientation.

Implications on Practitioners

This study found one interesting dichotomy in the review of the literature that would be enlightening for the leader. In regards to situations in which one may lead there is the school of thought that
says that a leader in one situation will not automatically be a leader in another situation. Fiedler (1967) feels that a leader is not capable of varying his behavior to a large degree. The opposing school of thought says that a leader can behave flexibly enough to cope with varied situations. Tannebaum and Schmidt (1958) suggested that a leader is capable of exhibiting a wide range of behaviors and can vary these behaviors from one situation to another depending upon requirements of the group and task. This study found no evidence to support or deny either of the above schools of thought.

Recommendations for Further Research

In this study the above areas of leadership style and district size or other aforementioned sociological factors produced no significant results. The one exception to no significant results is the one near significant result. That is the area of leadership style of relations orientation when compared to the length of time spent as a teacher before becoming a superintendent. Since this area was nearly significant, it would seem appropriate to do some further study in this arena.

Another area worthy of further study may be the area of leadership styles compared to other factors. Certainly there is interest in using the "best" leadership style, but in which situation? The aforementioned dichotomy of "can the leader adapt to the situation or not" is worthy of further study.

While reviewing the literature no research was found that analyzed the self-perceived leadership style of the leader in relation
to the behavior exhibited in this situation or that situation.

Self-perceived leadership style as varied from situation to situation is another area worthy of further study.
Appendix A

Letter of Introduction
Dear Sir:

The papers in this envelope contain a survey being conducted as part of a research project in the Educational Leadership Department at Western Michigan University to investigate the styles of leadership exhibited by superintendents in Michigan.

I am requesting your help to accumulate information. While realizing you are busy, I sincerely hope you can take the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Needless to say, all information you provide will remain confidential.

Completion of these forms should take about 20 to 25 minutes of your time. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gerald E. Lohr
Doctoral Student

Uldis Smidchens
Professor

Enclosures
Dear Superintendent:

A short time ago, a research study dealing with the leadership styles of Michigan school superintendents was sent to you.

I would appreciate it greatly if you would fill out the questionnaire, if you have not already done so, and return it to me as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Gerald E. Lohr  
Doctoral Student  
Western Michigan University
Appendix C

Letter of Instructions
To: SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS

All information gathered in this study will be treated as COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL, and it is not necessary for you to identify yourself in any way. The identifying mark on the survey will be removed as the survey is returned. It is for follow-up purposes only.

LEADERSHIP STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to obtain information concerning the styles of leadership exhibited by Michigan school superintendents. These styles of leadership will be studied as they relate to school district size and other sociological factors.

Your answers will be valuable in helping to provide information on styles of leadership exhibited by persons in a superintendent's position.

Please complete both Parts I and II of the questionnaire and mail in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided.

Thank you.
Appendix D

Questionnaire
QUESTIONNAIRE—PART I

Ideal Leader Behavior—Ideal Self
(What You Expect of Yourself as a Leader)

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior as you think you should act. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe how you believe you ought to act as a leader of your group.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which you supervise.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently you SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether you SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

   A = Always
   B = Often
   C = Occasionally
   D = Seldom
   E = Never

When acting as a leader, I OUGHT to:

1. Do personal favors for group members ........ A B C D E
2. Make my attitudes clear to the group .......... A B C D E
3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group .............. A B C D E
4. Try out my new ideas with the group ........ A B C D E
5. Act as the real leader of the group  
6. Be easy to understand  
7. Rule with an iron hand  
8. Find time to listen to group members  
9. Criticize poor work  
10. Give advance notice of changes  
11. Speak in a manner not to be questioned  
12. Keep to myself  
13. Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members  
14. Assign group members to particular tasks  
15. Be the spokesman of the group  
16. Schedule the work to be done  
17. Maintain definite standards of performance  
18. Refuse to explain my actions  
19. Keep the group informed  
20. Act without consulting the group  
21. Back up the members in their actions  
22. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines  
23. Treat all group members as my equals  
24. Encourage the use of uniform procedures  
25. Get what I ask for from my superiors  
26. Be willing to make changes  
27. Make sure that my part in the organization is understood by group members  
28. Be friendly and approachable
29. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations 

30. Fail to take necessary action 

31. Make group members feel at ease when talking with them 

32. Let group members know what is expected of them 

33. Speak as the representative of the group 

34. Put suggestions made by the group into operation 

35. See to it that group members are working up to capacity 

36. Let other people take away my leadership in the group 

37. Get my superiors to act for the welfare of the group members 

38. Get group approval in important matters before going ahead 

39. See to it that the work of group members is coordinated 

40. Keep the group working together as a team 

QUESTIONNAIRE—PART II

Please Complete the following items:

1. How many years have you been a superintendent? 

2. How many years were you a teacher before becoming a superintendent?
3. For each brother you have (or had) write down the number of the item indicating how much older or younger he is than you are (Check here if you have no brothers ____).

Brother #1__ #2____ #3___ #4____ #5___ #6____
1. 15 or more years older 9. 1 year younger
2. 10 to 15 years older 10. 2 years younger
3. 5 to 9 years older 11. 3 years younger
4. 4 years older 12. 4 years younger
5. 3 years older 13. 5 to 9 years younger
6. 2 years older 14. 10 to 15 years younger
7. 1 year older 15. 15 or more years younger
8. same age

4. For each sister you have (or had) write down the number of the item indicating how much older or younger she is than you are (Check here if you have no sisters __). 

Sister #1___ #2____ #3___ #4____ #5___ #6____
1. 15 or more years older 9. 1 year younger
2. 10 to 15 years older 10. 2 years younger
3. 5 to 9 years older 11. 3 years younger
4. 4 years older 12. 4 years younger
5. 3 years older 13. 5 to 9 years younger
6. 2 years older 14. 10 to 15 years younger
7. 1 year older 15. 15 or more years younger
8. same age

5. Please check your marital status.
   ____ Single
   ____ Divorced
   ____ Widowed
   ____ Married
   ____ Separated
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