



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

4-1990

A Study of Leadership Styles of the County Sheriffs in the State of Michigan

David A. Miramonti
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, and the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation

Miramonti, David A., "A Study of Leadership Styles of the County Sheriffs in the State of Michigan" (1990). *Dissertations*. 2054.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2054>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF THE COUNTY
SHERIFFS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

by

David A. Miramonti

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1990

A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF THE COUNTY
SHERIFFS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

David A. Miramonti, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1990

This study sought to determine if there was an identifiable preferred leadership style used by law enforcement administrators, as represented by the county sheriffs in the state of Michigan. The study also sought to determine whether there was any relationship between certain previously identified variables and leadership style preference. Finally, the study gathered information about the background of county sheriffs.

The available literature in the field established the main hypothesis: that a humanistic style of leadership is preferred. Eight other hypotheses were developed to analyze the relationship between the variables of age, educational level, education major, years in law enforcement, years as the sheriff/administrator, size of department, administrator self-confidence, administrator self-perception, and leadership style preference.

Two instruments were used to gather data: a researcher-designed Biographical Information Questionnaire for background data and the LEAD Self questionnaire developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1974/1983) to identify a preferred leadership style. A chi-square (χ^2) data analysis was carried out, with .05 as the level of significance (alpha).

The study supported the main hypothesis, that there is a preferred leadership style among county sheriffs, who indicated Style 2 (S_2), high task and high relationship, as their preferred leadership style. However, the eight additional hypotheses, dealing with the relationships of age, education level, education major, years in law enforcement, years as sheriff/administrator, size of department, self-confidence, and self-perception with leadership style, were not supported.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9023953

**A study of leadership styles of the county sheriffs in the state of
Michigan**

Miramonti, David Alexander, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Miramonti, David Alexander. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright by
David A. Miramonti
1990

DEDICATION

You can get everything in life you want, if you will just help
enough other people get what they want.

Zig Ziglar

To my parents:

Dad: The memory of love and family.

Mom: Continued love and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completing this degree is a dream come true. My heartfelt thanks to all who provided assistance and support.

To Dr. David Cowden, Dr. Uldis Smidchens, and Dr. Zigmund Kryszak, members of my dissertation committee, who made many contributions.

To Dr. David Cowden, chairperson of my dissertation committee, for his encouragement and leadership in helping make my seemingly impossible dream come true.

To the staff of the Educational Leadership Department at Western Michigan University for all their help.

To William H. Hackel and the county sheriffs who took the time from their busy schedules to answer the questionnaires.

There are no words to express my special appreciation for my family's understanding and tolerance of the emotional and time constraints that this work created. My mother and father taught me that without family one has nothing. I am lucky because I have three families--my biological family, the faculty and staff at Western Michigan University, and my fellow students in the Sang III Program at Selfridge.

Thank you, one and all.

David A. Miramonti

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Definition of Terms	8
Summary	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Law Enforcement	11
Selected Theories of Leadership	16
Weber's Bureaucratic Theory	16
McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y	16
Likert's Four Systems of Management	18
Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model	20
LEAD Self Instrument	22
Statement of Hypotheses	24
Hypothesis 1: Preferred Leadership Style	24
Hypothesis 2: Age of Leader	24
Hypothesis 3: Education Level	25
Hypothesis 4: Education Major	26

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Hypothesis 5: Years in Law Enforcement	26
Hypothesis 6: Years as Administrator	27
Hypothesis 7: Size of Department	27
Hypothesis 8: Administrator Self-Confidence . . .	28
Hypothesis 9: Administrator Self-Perception Versus Style	28
Summary	29
III. STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	30
Population of the Study	30
Instrumentation	30
Administration	33
Analysis of Data	33
Summary	34
IV. RESULTS	35
Preferred Leadership Style	35
Demographic Information	39
Age	40
Education Level (Years of Education)	40
Education Major	41
Years in Law Enforcement	42
Years as Sheriff/Administrator	42
Size of Departments (Employees)	43
Confidence Level	45
Effectiveness as Administrator	45

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER	
Leadership Style Self-Perception	45
Future Leadership Philosophy	46
Test of the Hypotheses	46
Hypothesis 1: Preferred Leadership Style	48
Hypothesis 2: Age of Sheriff/Administrator	48
Hypothesis 3: Education Level	50
Hypothesis 4: Education Major	51
Hypothesis 5: Years in Law Enforcement	53
Hypothesis 6: Years as Administrator	54
Hypothesis 7: Size of Department	55
Hypothesis 8: Administrator Self-Confidence	56
Hypothesis 9: Administrator Self-Perception Versus Style	58
Summary	60
V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS	62
Conclusions	62
Suggestions for the Future	67
APPENDICES	69
A. Figures 1-6	70
B. Biographical Information Questionnaire	77
C. Cover Letter	80
D. Endorsement Letter	82
E. Postcard for Follow-up	84
F. Follow-up Letter	86

Table of Contents--Continued

G. Confirmation Letter From Human Subjects Institutional Review Board	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

LIST OF TABLES

1. Preferred Leadership Style	38
2. Age of Sheriff	40
3. Education Level	41
4. Education Major	42
5. Years in Law Enforcement	43
6. Years as Sheriff/Administrator	44
7. Size (Number of Employees)	44
8. Effectiveness as Administrator	45
9. Style Self-Perception	46
10. Future Leadership Style	47
11. Preferred Leadership Style	49
12. Age of Sheriff/Administrator	49
13. Education Level	50
14. Education Major	52
15. Years in Law Enforcement	54
16. Years as Sheriff/Administrator	55
17. Size of Department	56
18. Administrator Self-Confidence	57
19. Biographical Data	59
20. LEAD Self Questionnaire	59
21. Self-Perception	60

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Ohio State Leadership Quadrants	71
2. Hersey and Blanchard Basic Leader Behavior Styles	72
3. Hersey and Blanchard's Styles of Leadership	73
4. Relationship Between Hersey and Blanchard, McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, and Likert's Management System . . .	74
5. Relationship of Quadrants With the Leadership Styles . . .	75
6. Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model	76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of individual leadership styles in the field of law enforcement administration. Whether the title given to the administrator is sheriff, police chief, commissioner, or director, the function is the same: The person is responsible for overseeing the operation of a law enforcement agency (Brown, 1984). This study, however, is concerned with the leadership styles of county sheriffs in the state of Michigan as these individuals perceive their roles.

The study is pertinent today, because law enforcement administrators are facing radical changes in their field. One of these changes is technological and stems from the fact that computers make information available in a matter of seconds. Another change is behavioral, reflecting an increasing public awareness of human and civil rights.

The findings of the study should have theoretical and practical applications. One such application might be the improvement of police and public administration course offerings in institutions of higher learning.

Background

Some form of law enforcement has existed since mankind developed a social structure with rules and regulations and an accepted

behavior pattern (Waters & McGrath, 1974). The first centralized law enforcement administration can be traced to William the Conqueror after the Norman Conquest of 1066. William divided the country into counties, called shires, which were placed under the control of a reeve (known as shirereeve) who later became sheriff (Waters & McGrath, 1974).

Modern law enforcement can trace its beginnings to London, England, and the passage of the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829. This was the first time an entire city was served by a single organized police force (Bailey, 1985). The first city in the United States to establish this type of policing was Philadelphia in 1833 (Fosdick, 1920/1969; Waters & McGrath, 1974).

As civilization has become more complex and individuals more sophisticated, law enforcement administration has become more involved. Generally, the supervisor is in charge of a staff who must act independently in problematic situations. The only time a subordinate police officer may see a supervisor is at the beginning of the work shift. In addition to providing leadership direction to a staff that operates at a distance, law enforcement administrators must also deal with affirmative action and equal opportunity guidelines. They face citizen hostility and other external problems (Bopp, 1984). Indeed, problems abound; but there are few solutions, leading some officials to conclude that there is a crisis in law enforcement administration.

In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice reported a lack of qualified leadership in

many police departments and recommended an educational and training requirement to enable the administrator to better understand and manage the activities of the department. Bouza (1978) concurred, remarking on the need for professional managers in law enforcement. According to Bouza, a law enforcement administrator should be an innovative leader, who is flexible enough to permit change and growth in the organization. Such an individual could maintain morale and motivate staff, while recognizing that experienced personnel are important resources who can help the organization survive. Bouza recognized that this law enforcement leader had to be trained for his or her task, and he recommended the establishment of a national institute for law enforcement training to generate the leaders needed in the field.

Berkley (1981), who described law enforcement as a quasi-military organization with an autocratic structure where information flows from top down, noted that "new administrative styles with their looser structures and more liberal procedures" (p. 488) have been accepted in many organizations. This new administrative style, which allows police officers to participate in the decision-making process and determine how best to serve their communities, can work effectively even in organizations such as the police and military that have been traditionally dominated by hierarchical, autocratic authority.

An excellent example of this new breed of law enforcement administrator is Robert Ficano, the Wayne County Sheriff. Ficano is responsible for a community located in the southeastern part of

Michigan, which includes the city of Detroit and its western and southern suburbs. Wayne County is the largest county in the state of Michigan, and the Sheriff's Department is the fourth largest in the United States (Cauffiel, 1985). When he assumed his position, Ficano inherited a department whose morale was low, one which had no patrol division and an ineffective detective unit, and whose main activity was to perform a taxi service, delivering and picking up prisoners from courts and other jails.

To make things even worse, Ficano had never been a police officer (Cauffiel, 1985). This lack of experience would appear to be a major obstacle for a sheriff; but it did not impede Ficano, who turned the department completely around. He now has the support of the deputies and their union, earning their trust and respect by giving his. He implemented an open-door management policy and established monthly meetings with union stewards so that deputies could suggest how best to improve the overall functioning of the department (Cauffiel, 1985).

His leadership style, a major departure from the norm, created a feeling of the department's being one family. He is firmly committed to treating his personnel the way he would like to be treated (Cauffiel, 1985). The union president said of him: "He is a new breed of police manager, bringing with him some principles of private industry and implementing them successfully into a law enforcement setting" (Cauffiel, 1985, p. 14). The union president also stated the belief that Ficano represents the start of a new trend in law enforcement administration. In the past, people worked their way up

through the organization, but as Cauffiel noted: "A good police officer does not guarantee an effective or competent administrator" (p. 14).

A case like Ficano's makes one wonder whether the leadership style of a law enforcement administrator can be this humanistic and still be effective, or whether Ficano's success was just an accidental outcome? The question can also be phrased: Does the leadership style of law enforcement have to follow a traditional, militaristic form, or are modern police leaders blazing a path toward a new humanistic style of leadership?

Statement of the Problem

Law enforcement is still operating according to a traditional management philosophy in a highly structured, formal organization environment that is paramilitary in nature (Rippy, 1984). Becker (1970) stated that "most police administrators can be described as archaic in their philosophy and knowledge of the management of men and institutions" (p. 74). Although law enforcement has used the traditional management philosophy, it must adopt a more humanistic style of management if it is to survive effectively (Fischer & Garret, 1984). The 19th century philosophy of management is as applicable to law enforcement as are 19th century crime-solving techniques.

Today's society operates in an environment of continuous and rapid change. It would be impossible to predict all the changes that will take place, but it is known that "yesterday's plan will need

updating to take into account today's realities" (Schowengerdt, 1985, p. 24). To be efficient and effective, law enforcement administrators will require a management philosophy that allows for management flexibility (Rippy, 1984).

According to Bouza (1978), every organization has its needs and objectives, such as productivity, efficiency, and results. Along with these organizational needs and objectives are the needs and objectives of the individual members of the organization, which include Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs. The effective administrator must harmonize the needs and objectives of the organization with those of the individual to achieve a more effective organization with satisfied members who are dedicated to the organization's survival and goals (Ziglar, 1986).

Law enforcement administrators must deal with the human and civil rights of society, with changes to the environment and advances in technology. They cannot afford to react to these changes; they must be in the forefront of change. Administrators must plan for the future and adopt a management philosophy that is compatible with and capable of dealing with rapid change. They must develop a leadership style that is appropriate for the future and compatible with the goals of the organization and the needs of the individual members of the organization.

The question then is whether law enforcement administrators of today are adopting a leadership style that is compatible with the environment in which they must function? If there is a reliance on a

particular leadership style, is there a relationship between the leadership style and certain independent variables?

Purpose of the Study

This study determined if there is an identifiable, preferred leadership style used by sheriffs, the chief law enforcement officer in the county (Guralnik, 1984). It is limited to the 83 county sheriffs in the state of Michigan.

Since there is not one successful model or style of leadership that can be applied to all situations and problems that might arise in an organization (Hersey & Blanchard, 1976), importance is placed on the diagnostic skills of the leader in identifying the underlying cause of the problem. According to Fay (1981), the leader's perception of others will also help to bring about successful and effective leadership.

This study also attempted to identify any existing relationship between the education level of the sheriff/administrator, his education major, age, years in law enforcement, years as administrator, the size of his department, and his degree of self-confidence with his leadership style.

Information was obtained through a Biographical Information Questionnaire, which helped profile county sheriffs in the state of Michigan. Till now this information has been virtually nonexistent; only a list of names and addresses existed at the start of this study.

A profile of law enforcement officers and their leadership styles will benefit the entire criminal justice system by identifying trends that may be occurring or by showing that individual cases like Ficano are the exceptions to the rule.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms used in this study may have several different interpretations. The definitions offered in this section will specify meanings and usage pertinent to this study.

Administrator: An administrator is a person within an organization who is expected to implement policies established by others. The term is most often used in public agencies (Boles, 1980).

Humanistic style: Pioneered by Argyris (1957), McGregor (1960), and Likert (1961), this term references an individual who is making the following assumptions:

1. People are not lazy, passive, or dumb; they are generally willing to work, show initiative, and bear responsibility.
2. Work is a natural activity and people by nature want to perform it.
3. People work best in an environment that treats them with regard and respect and encourages them to develop and utilize their abilities.
4. There is no inherent and intrinsic conflict between the goals of the organization and the goals of the individual member. Meeting the goals of the individual will only make the organization itself more productive (Berkley, 1981).

Leader: A leader is a person who is recognized by others as exerting either long-term or short-term influence, power, or authority in a given situation (Boles, 1980).

Leadership: Leadership is a process in which an individual takes the initiative to assist a group in moving toward production goals that are acceptable, helps maintain the group, and assures the needs of individuals within the group that impelled them to join it (Boles & Davenport, 1982).

Leadership position: This denotes the status of an administrator, executive, or manager who is expected to influence others (Boles, 1980).

Leadership style: This is the consistent pattern of behavior that leaders exhibit when they are working with and through other people, as perceived by other people (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Traditional management: As used here, this term refers to a classical management philosophy where the organizational environment is formal, highly structured, and paramilitary in nature (Rippy, 1984).

Summary

This chapter presented the background to the problem, a statement of the problem, and a description of purpose of the study. A short list of pertinent definitions was also given.

The background of the problem showed that law enforcement administrators are traditionally rigid but need to develop a leadership style that is based on a humanistic management philosophy.

The study will help identify a leader's preferred leadership style and perhaps also determine if a relationship exists between the education level of the administrator, his educational major, his age, his years in law enforcement and years as administrator, the size of his department, his level of self-confidence, and his leadership style.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will review the literature on law enforcement, present some selected theories of leadership, and discuss the Hersey and Blanchard (1974/1983) Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) Self instrument and its ability to identify leadership styles. A concluding section will advance some research hypotheses, based on the material presented.

Law Enforcement

The sheriff's department, like any other police agency, owes its existence to society's need for an organization that will protect property and lives, maintain peace, enforce laws, and prevent crime (Becker, 1970, Bopp, 1974/1975; Cizancas & Hanna, 1977). Traditionally, the law enforcement administrator has been first a law enforcement veteran with years of police training but little management skill or training (Hale, 1977). According to Handberg (1985), many county sheriffs come from within the department itself (40%); from other police agencies (22%); and less frequently, from the state police (8%).

Law enforcement organizations have traditionally followed the "classical" management style, characterized by rigid structure, formal hierarchies, and paramilitary procedures (Kuykendall & Unsinger,

1975; Pursley, 1971/1975; Walsh, 1983). This paramilitary or quasi-military style can be seen in the formal chain of command that is prevalent in law enforcement agencies. Even the titles given to the various levels of supervision and the uniform insignia suggest the military: corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, captain, etc. (Becker, 1970; Wilson & McLaren, 1977).

The paramilitary style of management, however, is in the process of giving way to a more democratic, humanistic, and participative style of management (Crane, 1976/1979; Washo, 1984). The change is due, in part, to the failure of authoritarian management to adjust to changes in society. In contrast, the humanistic model is more capable of dealing with rapid change (Rippy, 1984; Washo, 1984).

Law enforcement, like many other organizations, is currently being asked to perform more services. At the same time its budget is shrinking and new constraints are added (Phillips & McKissick, 1984; Pratt, 1984). The institution must do more with less, must make better use of all resources at its disposal, and learn to accept new techniques and technology. One way to do more with less is to rely on such internal resources as personnel, and the best way to make use of this resource is through the participative style of management.

Probably one of the most important problems facing law enforcement leadership today is training, or its absence. Today's administrator usually has many years of law enforcement experience but little practical management training. This individual has most likely progressed through the ranks and may even have taken seminars in innovative management technology. However, lacking an actual

understanding of humanistic management philosophies, the person probably will continue to follow an authoritarian leadership style (Rippy, 1984).

Nichols (1984) proposed that law administrators be competent in personnel administration, statistics, and research and suggested that the administrator could acquire these skills through college training. Schembri (1983) concurred and added that the colleges and universities need to develop programs that will properly train the law enforcement administrators of the future. Bouza (1978) argued for a national institute that will train much needed law enforcement administrators.

Bennis (1983) pointed out that our educational institutions are training people to be good staff persons but not necessarily leaders. Walsh (1983) believed that a major problem of law enforcement administrators was their failure to see themselves as an influence on people.

A study conducted by Jermier and Berks (1979) found little support for the paramilitary model of administrator management behavior among police officers. According to Cizancas and Hanna (1977), the paramilitary model impedes the development of a mature, healthy police organization. Administrators see themselves as order-givers and their subordinates as passive order-receivers. In the paramilitary model, the law enforcement officer is expected to act immaturely (Cizancas & Hanna, 1977).

This autocratic style must contend with modern police officers who are better educated than their predecessors (Litsey, 1984;

Melancon, 1984). Kenney (1972/1975) suggested that the officer who brings more education and knowledge to the organization should be more involved in the decision-making processes. Melancon (1984) stressed the need for individual members to be allowed to participate in decisions, particularly when those decisions will affect them. Being involved usually makes the individual feel part of the organization (Syme, 1986). Personal interest and pride become important aspects of the way of doing things; and this, in turn, should help bring about an increase in productivity and a more effective organization, where morale is high and organizational commitment is strong (Schembri, 1983).

In general, the criminal justice system tends to react to change; seldom does it initiate change (Litsey, 1984). Litsey went on to say that law enforcement even shows a high resistance to change. This, in part, is caused by a reliance on the McGregor (1960) Theory X philosophy that assumes people to be lazy and resistant to work. According to Theory X, the organization's members must be controlled and watched; they must not be allowed to participate or have any input in the organization. Litsey intimated that this is changing and that some administrators are now adopting a Theory Y philosophy, which assumes that people like their work and sometimes excel at it, that they are not lazy and do not need to be firmly controlled or watched. Theory Y suggests that the organization's people should be allowed, and even asked for, input into the organization.

Because society is changing, the law enforcement field must also change and adopt an approach that takes into account today's real world activities and allows input from all its members (Schowengerdt, 1985). Law enforcement administrators must make full use of the abilities and talents of the organization's members (Dintino & Pagano, 1984). Lines of communications must be opened and improved (Berg, Gertz, & True, 1984). According to Favreau and Gillespie (1978), the successful law enforcement administrator must be people oriented and understand human relations and behavior, because effective administrators get results through people (Syme, 1986). The administrator must mold a group of separate individuals into a cohesive group that works toward the attainment of personal and organizational goals and objective (Auten, 1984).

McClain (1985) concluded that law enforcement administrators must examine new methods of reaching organizational goals and individual member satisfaction, including humanistic and participative management styles. The traditional paramilitary style of law enforcement, however, offers strong resistance to the implementation of participation. Argyris (1973) found that administrators, when asked about their management style, would claim to be using a participative style of leadership. Their subordinates, however, tended to describe these administrators as autocratic. England (1967) found that older administrators tended to be more interested in the status and growth of their organization than in the style of management. Nevertheless, there is still hope for progress in law enforcement administration. Whisenand and Ferguson (1973) reported that the traditional

management style of law enforcement is changing toward a more participative style.

Selected Theories of Leadership

Weber's Bureaucratic Theory

Weber's (1947) Bureaucratic Theory is traditional, presenting a hierarchal structure with orders and information flowing from the top level of the organization to the bottom. Management uses rules and regulations that are written and clearly defined. Job specialization requires the necessary training, which is provided, and relations are kept impersonal. Each manager has the authority to control his or her area of responsibility, and the number of subordinates for which any one manager is responsible is kept at a minimum so as to insure control (Burger, 1976; Weber, 1947). The theory describes the law enforcement organization.

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor's (1960) Theory X is similar to Weber's (1947) because it too assumes that:

1. The organization is managed to promote productivity based on economic needs.
2. The needs of the organization come first, and the human element must be modified and controlled for the good of the needs of the whole.
3. The average human being is lazy and dislikes work.

4. The average human being must be directed, controlled, and punished or rewarded in order to get him or her to produce efficiently and effectively.

5. The average human being is also gullible and not interested in the needs and goals of the organization.

McGregor (1960) then went on to say that Theory X management is not adequate or capable of dealing with conditions in today's organizations. Instead, management today must provide an environment that will foster effective human effort toward organizational needs and goals. The human element is key to organizational survival.

McGregor's Theory Y is based on the human element and assumes:

1. The average human being is not lazy and will accept responsibility if given the opportunity.

2. Management must make it possible for people to recognize and develop the human characteristics that will allow them to accept responsibilities as well as seek them and to adopt a behavior that will result in the attainment of organizational needs and goals.

3. Management must blend the individual member's goals and needs with the goals and needs of the organization.

4. Management must give individual members of the organization the opportunity to develop to their full potential by removing obstacles, encouraging individual growth, and providing the necessary guidance.

5. The average human being is not passive or resistant to organizational needs and goals but really wants to take an active part in defining them.

According to McGregor (1960), Theory X relies exclusively on external control of human behavior, while Theory Y relies on self-direction and self-control. Theory X strategy treats people as if they were children, while Theory Y treats them like adults.

Fortunately, the change in management philosophy, from Theory X to Theory Y, is in process (McGregor, 1960). More (1979) demonstrated that Theory Y philosophy was being implemented. Litsey (1984) agreed that there was a movement toward Theory Y, but believed that the changes evident in organizations were a combination of McGregor's Theories X and Y. He noted that there was still strong resistance in the field of law enforcement to change from the more traditional autocratic (Theory X) style of leadership to the more humanistic (Theory Y) style of leadership.

Likert's Four Systems of Management

Likert (1967) described his four systems this way:

System 1: This system is authoritarian, autocratic, and sometimes exploitive.

System 2: This system is best described as that of a paternalistic or benevolent autocrat. The manager does not delegate, uses participation minimally, and is always in control. This administrator compliments the employee for a job well done but this is only lip service to make the employee feel good.

System 3: This system is participative but only to a limited degree. The manager asks for and wants input from subordinates but always makes the final decision.

System 4: This is a democratic system, with the manager allowing for total participation in decisions that affect the subordinates themselves. The manager provides some direction, but decision making is developed by consensus, and majority is the rule. After the decision is agreed upon, the manager implements it.

Likert (1967) and his associates researched which style was most effective and found that Systems 1 and 2 were consistently the lowest producing and least effective, while Systems 3 and 4 were the highest producing and effective.

Likert (1973/1980) described System 1 as exploitative-authoritative, System 2 as benevolent-authoritative, System 3 as consultative, and System 4 as participative. System 4, Likert stated, achieves the highest productivity at lowest cost, contributes to excellent labor relations, and produces subordinates who are healthy and the most satisfied. The following characteristics were what made System 4 the most effective and highest producing:

1. Subordinates are trusted and management shows confidence in them.
2. Subordinates' ideas are frequently used. Ideas are actively sought by management.
3. Information flow in the organization is multidirectional, up, down, and lateral.
4. Decision making that involves the work of the subordinate is participative.
5. Teamwork and participation are widely used.

6. Except in a crisis, organizational goals are set by group participation.

7. Subordinates actively participate in the sharing of review and control functions of the organization.

Likert's (1967) System 1 is similar to Weber's (1947) traditional Bureaucratic Theory, McGregor's (1960) Theory X, and Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) Tridimensional Theory Style S-1. His System 4 is similar to McGregor's Theory Y and Hersey and Blanchard's Tridimensional Theory Style 5-3 (see Appendix A, Figure 4).

Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model

This model, developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982), is considered to be a behavior model because it highlights only the activities with which managers are actually involved. It is an extension of the earlier studies of leadership conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University, and the 3-D Management Style Theory developed by Reddin (cited in Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

The Michigan studies were the first to identify two concepts of leader behavior: employee orientation and production orientation. The Ohio State University studies identified the two dimensions of leader behavior as initiating structure (task) and consideration (relationship) (see Appendix A, Figure 1). They also plotted leader behavior on two separate axes rather than on a continuum (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

The Tridimensional Model took this progression one step further by identifying these dimensions as task behavior (initiating structure) and relationship behavior (consideration) (see Appendix A, Figure 3). Hersey and Blanchard (1982), who developed the Tridimensional Model, added the concept of effectiveness, borrowing from the 3-D Management Style Theory of Reddin that dealt with effectiveness. By adding effectiveness, Hersey and Blanchard joined the style of the leader to the situation requiring leadership. They concluded that when the style appropriately matches the situation, it is said to be effective. When the selected style does not match the situation properly, it is said to be ineffective. As stated earlier, there is not one best style of leadership that will produce maximum results in all situations (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) also believed that this third dimension, effectiveness, was actually the environment in which the leader is involved. Thus, whether a particular style was effective or ineffective was not necessarily a fault of leader behavior but rather a problem of using an inappropriate style for a particular situation. Effectiveness, according to this model, is on a continuum even though it seems to be an either/or situation.

The Tridimensional Model posits four basic leader dimensions or styles: S-1, high task and low relationship, also called "telling"; S-2, high task and high relationship, also called "selling"; S-3, high relationship and low task, also called "participating"; and low relationship and low task, also called "delegating" (see Appendix A, Figure 3). These four behaviors are actually four separate

leadership styles (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Unlike other theories, this model does not identify a single best leadership style to be used in all situations; any style can be effective given the appropriate situation. Management of Organizational Behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982) presents, as an example, a fire chief at the scene of a fire or other emergency situation, who must use a highly structured style (high task and low relationship) because there isn't time for participative input from the individual members of the organization. Commands and orders must be followed immediately. Once back at the station house, the chief can switch to other styles of leadership if they are appropriate.

LEAD Self Instrument

In 1974, Hersey and Blanchard developed the LEAD Self instrument to gather data about leader style behavior for their Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model. The instrument was originally named Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (LASI-Self) at the Center for Leadership Studies, Ohio State University (Hersey & Blanchard, 1974/1983). It was renamed the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description, or LEAD Self.

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1982), this instrument was developed to help a person gain some insight into the perception of how he or she behaves as a leader. The instrument also measures the leader behavior aspects of leader style, leader style range, and leader style adaptability (Hersey & Blanchard (1974/1983).

Leader style is described as the consistent patterns or behaviors which an individual exhibits and which are perceived by those being influenced (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Research has shown that leaders have a favorite, or primary, leadership style that they use most often. Leaders also have one or more back-up styles that they use on occasion. This is called the leader's supporting leadership style. Style range is the ability of the leader to vary leadership styles (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Style adaptability is concerned with the leader's ability to vary leadership styles so that his or her behavior is appropriate to the demands of the situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). The leader's skill is in identifying the problem and using a leadership style that will obtain the desired results.

Greene (1980) developed an executive summary for the LEAD instrument that attests to its validity in determining leader behavior/style. The instrument has 12 items and requires only 10 minutes to complete. The LEAD Self instrument uses four ipsative style scores and one normative adaptability (effectiveness) score. The LEAD Self was standardized on the responses of 264 managers constituting a North American sample. The managers ranged in age from 21 to 64; 30% were at the entry level of management, 55% were middle managers, and 14% were at the high level of management.

In two administrations across a 6-week interval, 75% maintained their preferred or favored leadership style, and 71% maintained their supporting or back-up style. "The logical validity of the scale was clearly established, face validity was based upon a review of the

items, and content validity emanated from the procedures employed to create the original set of items" (Greene, 1980, p. 1).

Empirical studies established a correlation with demographic/organismic variables that were generally low, indicating the relative independence of the scales with respect to these variables. Satisfactory results were reported supporting the four dimensions of the scale. In 46 of the 48 item options (96%), the expected relationship was found. "Based upon these findings, the LEAD Self is deemed to be an empirically sound instrument" (Greene, 1980, p. 1).

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Preferred Leadership Style

Favreau and Gillespie (1978) indicated that law enforcement is adopting a more humanistic and participative style of leadership, a necessary change if the discipline is to be effective. Syme (1986) found that the change toward a participative and humanistic style was still in progress. Given this general trend, it is hypothesized that a humanistic style of leadership is preferred by county sheriffs in the state of Michigan.

Hypothesis 2: Age of Leader

Esser and Strother (1962) found that the age of the leader does not appear to have any influence on leadership style. In a study of 27 organizations in government and industry, Stogdill (1965) found that older managers in some organizations tended to be more

humanistic in their chosen style of leadership, resulting in a higher sense of employee satisfaction. But there is no clear-cut evidence in all organizations to make this a statement of fact. In general, the literature identified status and growth of the organization as more important to older administrators than leadership style (England, 1967). For the purpose of this study, therefore, it is hypothesized that administrators under the age of 45 more frequently use a humanistic leadership style than administrators 45 years of age and over.

Hypothesis 3: Education Level

Esser and Strother (1962) reported that persons with the least amount of formal education tended to be the least rule-oriented, relying on a more humanistic style. Those who were most educated were a close second, using a more humanistic, less rule-oriented style, while those with average education used the most rule-oriented, traditional leadership style. England (1967), on the other hand, did not find any relationship between leadership style and education level. Stogdill (1965) found that in some organizations there was a relationship between least educated administrators and the use of a more humanistic style of leadership style. Gopala and Hafeez (1964) found that those with the most education tended to be more humanistic in leadership style, and those with the least education tended to be traditional, or rule-oriented. The literature is replete with these contradictions, although it would seem that administrators with the most formal education tended to be younger and

have the least amount of seniority (Stogdill, 1965).

For the purpose of this study, it is hypothesized that there is a difference in leadership style between those administrators with less than a college degree and those with a college degree.

Hypothesis 4: Education Major

England (1967) concluded that administrators who majored in the humanities, fine arts, or social sciences were more likely to stress high productivity and organizational efficiency. Those who were social science majors were also found to strive for organizational growth. According to England, those administrators who survived organizationally and had formal training about human behavior tried harder to achieve goals with a task orientation. Therefore, it is hypothesized that those administrators who have a behavioral science background will be more concerned with task orientation than those administrators with a non-behavioral-science major.

Hypothesis 5: Years in Law Enforcement

As this review of literature has shown, law enforcement seems to follow the traditional, paramilitary, task orientation style of management (Hale, 1977; Litsey, 1984; McClain, 1985; Walsh, 1983). The change toward a more humanistic, participative style of management is a product of the administrator who sometimes comes from outside law enforcement and is usually younger than the traditional administrator (Cauffiel, 1985). Therefore, it is hypothesized that those administrators with 15 years or less of law enforcement experience will more

often follow a humanistic philosophy than those administrators with more than 15 years of law enforcement experience.

Hypothesis 6: Years as Administrator

Lawler (1984) found that until recently in the United States there did not exist participative managed or humanistic organizations in any significant numbers. Therefore, administrators who had been in these organizations for any length of time would most likely have been exposed to the traditional or autocratic leadership style and would favor this style. He carried this concept one step further and stated that most of these administrators would not be effective in a participatory or humanistic setting.

Stogdill (1965) found that in some organizations the longer the length of time as an administrator, the greater the concern for people (consideration) and for tasks (initiating structure). England (1967) and Esser and Strother (1962) found no relationship of any significance between length of time and preferred leadership style. Therefore, it is hypothesized that administrators with more than 10 years of experience as sheriff/administrator will differ in their choice of leadership style from those with 10 years or less of experience.

Hypothesis 7: Size of Department

Hemphill (1950) found that as the size of the department increased, the administrator's leadership tended to be autocratic rather than humanistic. England (1967) made a similar finding.

Esser and Strother (1962) concluded just the opposite, that as size increased, leadership style tended to become more humanistic. The literature is inconclusive. Therefore, it is hypothesized that administrators of departments with up to 30 people will differ in their choice of leadership style as compared with administrators of departments with 31 or more people.

Hypothesis 8: Administrator Self-Confidence

Kipnis and Lane (1962) found that administrators who lacked self-confidence in their leadership ability tended to be more rule-oriented, favoring the traditional management philosophy. Those who were self-confident with their leadership style tended to be more humanistic and participative. Boles and Davenport (1982) believed that the administrator's leadership style success is directly related to self-confidence. Therefore, it is hypothesized that administrators who are self-confident in their leadership style will more often employ a humanistic style of leadership than those administrators who feel they lack self-confidence.

Hypothesis 9: Administrator Self-Perception Versus Style

Hersey and Blanchard (1974/1983) reported a difference between an administrator's self-perception of leadership style and actual leadership style. In other words, an administrator's self-perception of leadership style may not accord with the perception of subordinates. Thus, self-perception may or may not identify one's true leadership style.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) defined self-perception as the administrator's perception of his or her behavior. The two questionnaires that were used in this study implement this definition of self-perception. The Biographical Information Questionnaire also follows Babbie's (1973) guidelines: that a questionnaire should be short and uncluttered, with clear uncomplicated items and written at a level that respondents are competent to answer. The LEAD Self instrument presents questions and answer choices in scenario form.

This study hypothesizes a difference in the administrator's self-perceived leadership style identified through the Biographical Data Questionnaire and that identified through the LEAD Self instrument.

Summary

This chapter offered a review of the pertinent literature on law enforcement, identified some selected theories of leadership, reviewed the LEAD Self instrument, and presented the nine hypotheses of this research study.

Hersey and Blanchard (1976, 1982) and other theorists expressed the belief that there was no one best leadership style. The theories presented in this study are offered only as samples of the many that are available and should not be construed as the only ones extant.

As stated earlier, there seems to be a trend away from the autocratic/authoritarian style of leadership toward a more humanistic/participative style. The nine hypotheses of this study were developed with an eye towards further pinpointing this trend.

CHAPTER III

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the design and methodology of the study, including: the population selected, the instruments used to collect pertinent data, a review of the pilot study conducted for the study, and procedures used in the administration of the study.

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of the sheriffs of the 83 counties in the state of Michigan, where the sheriff serves as the administrator of a county-wide law enforcement agency.

A list of current sheriffs was made available to this researcher by the Michigan Sheriffs Association (MSA).

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used to collect data for this study.

The first, developed by Hersey and Blanchard in 1974, is the LEAD Self instrument, which uses four ipsative style scores and one normative adaptability (effectiveness) score.

Normative measures are the usual kind of measures obtained with tests and scales: They can vary independently--that is they are relatively unaffected by other measures--and are referred for interpretation to the mean of the measures of a group, individuals' sets of measures having different means and standard deviations.

Ipsative measures, on the other hand, are systematically affected by other measures and are referred for interpretation to the same mean, each individual's set of measures having the same mean and standard deviation. (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 508)

The instrument has 12 items, and the time required to complete it is only 10 minutes. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1982), this instrument was designed to measure one's self-perception of leadership style.

Greene (1980) developed an executive summary for the LEAD Self instrument that attests to the validity of this instrument in determining leader behavior/style. The instrument was standardized on the responses of 264 managers, aged 21-64, who constituted a North American sample. Of this group, 30% were entry level, 55% were considered middle managers, and 14% were upper level managers. The instrument was administered twice across a 6-week period, and 75% of the respondents maintained their dominant or preferred leadership style, while 71% of the respondents maintained their supporting or back-up style. "The logical validity of the scale was clearly established. Face validity was based upon a review of the items, and content validity emanated from the procedures employed to create the original set of items" (p. 1).

Empirical studies established a correlation between the demographic/organismic variables of sex, age, years of experience, degree, and management level that were generally low, indicating the relative independence of the scales with respect to these variables. The four dimensions of the scale were supported satisfactorily, and expected relationships were found in 46 of the 48 item options,

giving this a 96% rate. Greene (1980) found that "the LEAD Self scores remained relatively stable across time, and the user may rely upon the results as consistent measures" (p. 1).

The second instrument was a researcher-designed questionnaire, used to gather personal information about the sheriffs. Before developing this instrument, the researcher identified the information that would be required from study participants. This included: the age of the sheriff/administrator, the years of education, educational major, years in law enforcement, years as sheriff/administrator, size of department, self-perception of confidence in chosen leadership style, self-perception of effectiveness of chosen leadership style, self-perception of leadership style used, identification of leadership style most effective for future law enforcement administration. Ten questions were formulated in a multiple choice format, with wording kept simple because of an expected diversity of education level among the participants.

To validate the Biographical Information Questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted, using a random sample of the 83 sheriffs of the state of Michigan. Each of 15 sheriffs received by mail: a questionnaire, a cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The sample revealed that 9 of the 10 questions gathered the necessary data, and that the 10th required some minor modifications to be effective.

Administration

Following approval by the chairman of the dissertation committee, a LEAD Self instrument and a Biographical Information Questionnaire (Appendix B) were sent to all 83 county sheriffs. Accompanying these instruments were a cover letter from the researcher (Appendix C); an introductory/endorsement letter from Macomb County Sheriff William H. Hackel (Appendix D); a stamped, self-addressed envelope; and a postage-paid postcard (Appendix E).

To insure the confidentiality of the respondents there were no identifying marks on the questionnaires or the envelope. Respondents were asked to mail the instruments in the envelope and then to mail the postcard separately. The post card identified respondents and allowed for follow up (Babbie, 1973).

After a period of 5-6 weeks, a follow-up letter was sent to sheriffs who had not responded (Appendix F).

Analysis of Data

The questionnaires were designed to relate to the hypotheses. The issue of age is dealt with in Hypothesis 2. Question 2 and Hypothesis 3 both deal with the years of education. Question 3 is concerned with education major, the subject of Hypothesis 4. Question 4 and Hypothesis 5 deal with the years in law enforcement. Question 5, years as sheriff, is related to Hypothesis 6. Question 6 and Hypothesis 7 both relate to the size of the department. Question 7, confidence in your leadership style, is consonant with Hypothesis

8. Questions 8-10 were included to gather more information about the opinions of the sheriff/administrator.

Data identifying the preferred leadership style of the 83 county sheriffs are reported as frequency responses of the sheriffs to the four basic leader behavior style quadrants of the LEAD Self instrument: Quadrant 1, high task and low relationship; Quadrant 2, high task and high relationship; Quadrant 3, high relationship and low task; and Quadrant 4, low relationship and low task. The data also are reported in percentage format, indicating the number of responses in each quadrant in relationship to the overall response rate. These data are presented in table form. The level of significance, or alpha level, was set at .05.

Hypotheses 2-9 were tested to identify a relationship between the age, education level, education major, years in law enforcement, years as sheriff/administrator, size of department, self-confidence, self-perception as identified on the Biographical Information Questionnaire, and leadership style as identified by the LEAD Self questionnaire (most humanistic in nature in Style 4 [S_4] and least humanistic in nature in Style 1 [S_1]).

Summary

This chapter presented an overview of the design and methodology of this study, including population, instruments, administrative procedures, and data analysis.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings of the study to identify the leadership styles of county sheriffs in the state of Michigan.

Because this study has two purposes, findings will be presented in two sections. The first will focus on whether county sheriffs use an identifiable preferred leadership style. The second will present background and biographical information on the current county sheriffs and determine whether there are any relationships between the variables of age, education level, education major, years in law enforcement, years as sheriff/administrator, size of department, self-confidence, self-perception, and the sheriff's leadership style.

This chapter concludes with a report on the testing of the nine hypotheses.

Preferred Leadership Style

The Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model (see Appendix A, Figure 6), developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982), was used to assess data. The model identifies two distinct and different behavioral categories or dimensions: task behavior and relationship behavior (Appendix A, Figure 1). Task behavior is defined as the extent to which a leader engages in one-way communication, explaining to each follower what should be done, when and where to do it, and

how tasks are to be accomplished. Relationship behavior is the extent to which a leader engages in two-way communication, providing socioemotional support, psychological strokes, and facilitating behaviors.

These two dimensions were plotted on two separate axes, to which were added the four basic leader behavior. Thus:

Style 1 (S_1) was placed in Quadrant 1 (Q_1) and described as high task, low relationship. This style, called "telling," is considered to be the most autocratic authoritarian of the four and similar to Likert's (1961) System 1 and McGregor's (1960) Theory X.

Style 2 (S_2) was placed in Quadrant 2 (Q_2) and labeled high task, high relationship. This style is called "selling," because the leader engages in two-way communication and socioemotional support to get the followers to agree and support the decisions the leader has made.

Style 3 (S_3), located in Quadrant 3 (Q_3), is high relationship, low task. This style is called "participating," because the leader and the follower now share in the decision-making process. Two-way communication is more than just lip service. This style is considered to be less authoritarian/autocratic than Styles 1 or 2 and more humanistic. Some also believe that this style is similar to Likert's (1961) System 4 and McGregor's (1960) Theory Y (see Appendix A, Figure 5).

Style 4 (S_4), Quadrant 4 (Q_4), considered the most democratic of the four, is low relationship, low task behavior. This "delegating" style is one where the leader has confidence in the ability of the

follower to do the job, and the follower has the willingness and confidence to do the job.

As evident, these four styles range from very autocratic/authoritarian to democratic/humanistic.

The population of this study, the 83 county sheriffs in the state of Michigan, were sent a packet containing two questionnaires. Of this total, there were 69 respondents, with 52 (63%) of these returning both the Biographical Information Questionnaire and the LEAD Self questionnaire, for a response rate of 63%, and 17 (21%) returning only the Biographical Information Questionnaire. No one returned only the LEAD Self instrument.

Table 1 shows that of the 52 respondents who returned both questionnaires, 41 (79%) chose Q_2/S_2 (high task, high relationship) as their preferred style, and 6 (11%) chose Q_3/S_3 (high relationship, low task). Five sheriffs selected more than one leadership style, with four of these choosing Q_2/S_2 - Q_3/S_3 and one choosing three styles Q_4/S_4 (low task, low relationship). If the five tied choices are assigned to Q_2/S_2 the total for Q_2/S_2 becomes 46 (88%).

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) stated that the effectiveness of a leader behavior style depends on the situation in which it is used. They conclude that any of the four basic leadership styles can be effective or ineffective depending on situation and that the difference between effective and ineffective leadership style is often not the leader's actual behavior but the appropriateness of this behavior to the situation. In addition, effectiveness is not an either/or issue but a continuum of impact, from extremely effective to

Table 1
Preferred Leadership Style

Style	Number	Percent
S-1	0	0
S-2	41	79
S-3	6	11
S-4	0	0
S-2-3 (Tied)	4	8
S-2-3-4 (Tied)	1	2
Totals	52	100

extremely ineffective. The effective range is identified from +1 to +24, and the ineffective range from -1 to -24 (Appendix A, Figure 6).

After the LEAD Self questionnaire was scored for leadership style, the score was further analyzed to determine the effectiveness of leadership style choice in a given situation. Only one of the 52 respondents scored in the ineffective leadership style dimension (-2) of the Hersey and Blanchard (1982) Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model. Another respondent scored a zero, leaving 50 persons (96%) who scored in the effective leadership style dimension.

According to Hersey (1981), one of the authors of the Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model and the LEAD Self instrument questionnaire, individuals who have the majority of their responses fall into Style 2/Quadrant 2 and Style 3/Quadrant 3 tend to do well with

people (a) who have average ability and willingness to do the job, (b) who will take the responsibility for doing the job, and (c) who direct their own behavior.

These individuals also find it difficult to handle discipline problems and to effectively delegate tasks. Nevertheless, this style, continued Hersey (1981), is the most frequently identified one in the United States and other countries which have a high level of education and extensive industrial experience. Hersey also noted that 83% of the individuals whose responses fall in Style 2/S₂ and Style 3/S₃ will have an effective leadership style.

Demographic Information

This section deals with demographic data about the population. As noted earlier, the population for this study comprised the 83 county sheriffs of the state of Michigan. Data were obtained from 69 Biographical Information Questionnaires that were returned by the respondents. This information provides a better understanding about the county sheriffs in the state of Michigan, including: age, years of education, major field of study, years in law enforcement, years as sheriff/administrator, size of department (number of persons employed), confidence in one's leadership style, self-perception of effectiveness in chosen style, self-perception of one's leadership style, and a personal observation on the needed leadership style philosophy of the future.

Age

Table 2 shows the age of the sheriffs who responded to this study. This information will also be used in conjunction with Hypothesis 2.

Table 2
Age of Sheriff

Age (in years)	Number	Percent
Under 30	0	0
30-44	30	43
45-60	31	45
Over 60	8	12
Totals	69	100

Education Level (Years of Education)

Table 3 shows the education level of the respondents, which data will be used in conjunction with Hypothesis 3. In cases where more than one item was checked, the highest level of education is used. It is interesting to note that 90% of the respondents have at least some college education, and that 45% have a college degree. Even the two respondents who reported that they did not graduate from high school had some college course work.

Table 3
Education Level

Level	Number	Percent
Did not graduate from high school	0	0
High school graduate	7	10
Some college ^a	31	45
Associate degree	9	13
Bachelor's degree	16	23
Master's degree	2	3
Doctorate	4	6
Totals	69	100

^aThis includes two sheriffs who were not high school graduates.

Education Major

Table 4 shows the major field of study of respondents who pursued higher education. Not surprisingly, 43 of the 69 respondents (62%) reported their major field of study as criminal justice, followed by 11 respondents (16%) who identified law as their major. It should be noted that $N = 78$ in Table 4, because of four sheriffs who did not indicate a major and 13 who reported dual majors.

Table 4
Education Major

Reported major	Number	Percent
Psychology	4	6
Fine arts	0	0
Law	11	16
Education	2	3
Social science	2	3
Humanities	1	1
Criminal justice	43	62
Business/management	9	13
Other	6	9
Totals	78	

Years in Law Enforcement

Table 5 shows how many years the respondents had spent in the field of law enforcement. As the review of literature revealed, the sheriff tended to be someone who was promoted up from the ranks of the department.

Years as Sheriff/Administrator

The number of years in office is shown in Table 6 and will be used with Hypothesis 6. Of the total respondents, 50 (73%) reported that they had been in law enforcement over 15 years, and only 4

Table 5
Years in Law Enforcement

Years	Number	Percent
1-5	1	1
6-10	3	4
11-15	15	22
Over 15	50	73
Totals	69	100

respondents (6%) reported 10 years or less of law enforcement experience. Compare this information with the fact that 62 of the respondents (90%) stated they had 15 years or less as the sheriff/administrator and that 22 respondents (32%) acknowledged that they had 5 years or less as sheriff/administrator. These data thus accord with the findings of the review of literature: that the sheriff/administrator has many years of law enforcement experience before assuming that position and, additionally, is usually a person who came up from the ranks of the department.

Size of Departments (Employees)

The review of the literature did not offer a clear-cut picture of the relationship between the size of the department (number of employees) and leadership style. Table 7 presents the data on department size, which will also be used for Hypothesis 7.

Table 6
Years as Sheriff/Administrator

Years	Number	Percent
1-5	22	32
6-10	21	30
11-15	19	28
Over 15	7	10
Totals	69	100

Table 7
Size (Number of Employees)

Size of department	Number	Percent
Less than 10	6	9
10-30	25	35
31-100	26	38
More than 100	12	18
Totals	69	100

Confidence Level

The sheriff/administrators were asked: Are you confident in your leadership style? The 69 sheriffs who responded indicated that they were.

Effectiveness as Administrator

To the question, Are you an effective administrator? 99% of the respondents indicated yes. The results are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Effectiveness as Administrator

Effectiveness	Number	Percent
Yes	68	99
No	0	0
Don't know	1	1
Totals	69	100

Leadership Style Self-Perception

The literature review noted a long history of law administrators' reliance on the autocratic paramilitary style of management. Although this is equivalent to S_1 , high task, low relationship, only 7%, 5 of the 69 respondents, indicated this as their leadership choice. By contrast, 58 of 69 respondents (84%) identified S_2 , high task, high relationship, as their preferred leadership style choice,

considering themselves both people oriented and task/productivity oriented. See Table 9 for leadership style self-perception.

Table 9
Style Self-Perception

Style	Number	Percent
People oriented	6	9
Task/productivity oriented	5	7
Both people and task/productivity oriented	58	84
None of the above	0	0
Totals	69	100

Future Leadership Philosophy

Respondents were asked to choose between the autocratic and participative leadership styles. Only one person believed that the leadership philosophy of the future should follow a strict autocratic military style. Two respondents checked both choices, possibly because the task/productivity part of Choice B did not have enough control. These data are presented in Table 10.

Test of the Hypotheses

The analysis of the data concerning the hypotheses is reported in this section. These hypotheses test the variables that are of interest to this study. They were developed from the review of the

Table 10
Future Leadership Style

Style	Number	Percent
The old "tried and true" military style with strict rules, regulations, and chain of command	1	1
A more humanistic and participative philosophy that allows and wants input from all members, but also keeps the necessary controls in place so as not to interfere with the policing function of the department	66	96
Both of the above	2	3
Totals	69	100

literature as well as from the experiences and beliefs of this researcher who has 18 years of administrative experience.

A chi-square (χ^2) data analysis of Hypotheses 2-7 and 9 was performed with the assistance of the Statistical Services Division of Western Michigan University, Mathematics and Statistics Department, Kalamazoo, Michigan. The resulting numerical value, identified as chi square (χ^2) is compared with the critical value of chi square obtained from a table of critical values. If the calculated value of chi square exceeds the critical value, the null hypothesis is rejected. The alpha level of significance for this study is .05. The four styles of leadership, here restated are: Style 1 (S_1), high task, low relationship, is considered the least humanistic in leadership style; Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship, is considered more

humanistic in nature than Style 1 (S_1), but less than Style 3 (S_3); Style 3 (S_3), high relationship, low task, is considered to be more humanistic than either S_1 or S_2 but less than Style 4 (S_4); Style 4 (S_4), low task, low relationship, is considered to be the most humanistic of the four leadership styles identified by the LEAD Self questionnaire.

Hypothesis 1: Preferred Leadership Style

It is hypothesized that a humanistic style of leadership is preferred by the county sheriffs in the state of Michigan.

The data analysis identified a preferred leadership style. Of the 52 respondents who returned and answered both instruments of this study, 41 (79%) selected Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship, as their preferred choice. Style 2, called the selling of the leader's philosophy, can be considered one step away from the paramilitary autocratic philosophy of leadership that has dominated law enforcement since its earliest times. Six respondents (11%) selected Style 3 (S_3) as their first, or preferred, choice (see Table 11).

Thus, the research data support the hypothesis that there is a leadership style preference.

Hypothesis 2: Age of Sheriff/Administrator

It is hypothesized that administrators under the age of 45 will have a preferred leadership style that is humanistic in nature more often than administrators 45 years of age and over. Of the 24 respondents who were under 45 years of age, 19 (79%) chose Style 2 (S_2)

Table 11
Preferred Leadership Style

Preferred style	Number	Percent
S ₂	41	78
S ₃	6	12
Tied	5	10
Totals	52	100

as their preferred leadership style. Of the 28 respondents who were 45 years of age or older, 22 (78%) chose Style 2 (S₂) as their preferred leadership style. These data are presented in Table 12.

Table 12
Age of Sheriff/Administrator

Preferred leadership style	Under 45		45 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	19	79	22	78
S ₃	2	8	4	15
Tied	3	13	2	7
Totals	24	100	28	100

The chi square (χ^2) was calculated to be 2.57 and the critical value 5.99. At the .05 level of significance (alpha), the null hypothesis that there is no difference in style preference cannot be rejected, and the alternate hypothesis that younger administrators will be more humanistic in leadership style preference cannot be supported by this study.

Hypothesis 3: Education Level

It is hypothesized that there is a difference between those administrators who have less than a college degree and those who have graduated college with a degree and their leadership style preference. Table 13 shows the data for this hypothesis.

Table 13
Education Level

Preferred leadership style	Some college or less		College degree or more	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	20	82	21	75
S ₃	2	9	4	14
S ₂ -S ₃ tied	2	9	3	11
Totals	24	100	28	100

As can be seen by these data, those administrators with some college or less and those administrators with a college degree or

more identified the same leadership style, Style 2 (high task, high relationship), on the LEAD Self questionnaire, as their preferred style. Those administrators who had some college or less (24) chose Style 2 as their preferred style 20 times, for a response rate of 20 out of 24, or 82%.

Those respondents with a college degree or more (28) chose Style 2 as their preferred choice 21 times, for a response rate of 21 out of 28, or a 75% rate.

The findings suggest that education does not play a role in leadership style preference when administrators with some college or less (83%) are compared with those administrators having a college degree (75%), because this difference is not significant when tested with chi square (χ^2).

The chi square (χ^2) for these data is 0.22, and the critical value is 5.99. The null hypothesis that there is no difference in leadership style preference cannot be rejected, and the alternate hypothesis that there is a difference in leadership style preference between administrators who have more or less than a college degree is not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 4: Education Major

It is hypothesized that those administrators with a behavioral science education will have more of a concern for task orientation than those administrators with a non-behavioral-science major. The review of the literature concluded that those administrators with a behavioral science major stress productivity and task orientation.

For the purposes of this study, the fields included in the behavioral science major category are psychology, fine arts, education, social science, humanities, and criminal justice. The non-behavioral-science major includes only those respondents in business management and law.

The data are presented in Table 14. It is interesting to note that 28 of the 34 respondents who identified a behavioral science as their major reported criminal justice as their major field of study, for a response rate of 82%.

Table 14
Education Major

Preferred leadership style	Behavior science		Non-behavior science	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	28	82	8	66
S ₃	3	9	2	17
S ₂ -S ₃ tied	3	9	2	17
Totals	34	100	12	100

Note. Missing data = 6.

The preferred leadership choice of both categories is the same, with 82% of the behavior science majors and 66% of the non-behavioral-science majors selecting Style 2 as their preferred choice. These percentage totals suggest that behavioral science majors are not more

task oriented in their leadership style preference than the non-behavioral-science majors, because the difference is not significant when tested with chi square (χ^2).

The data analysis revealed a chi square (χ^2) of 0.74 and a critical value of 5.99 at the .05 level of significance (alpha). The null hypothesis that there is no difference in the preferred leadership style choice between behavioral science majors and non-behavioral-science majors in their concern for task orientation cannot be rejected. The alternate hypothesis that there is a difference is not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 5: Years in Law Enforcement

It is hypothesized that those administrators with 15 years or less of law enforcement experience will more often opt for a leadership style that is more humanistically based than those administrators with more than 15 years of law enforcement experience.

The data (see Table 15) show that 62% of the administrators with 15 years or less chose Style 2 as their preferred leadership style, and that 85% of the administrators with more than 15 years of law enforcement experience also chose Style 2 (high task, high relationship) on the LEAD Self questionnaire as their preferred style choice.

Chi square (χ^2) for this hypothesis is 3.8 and the critical value 5.99. The null hypothesis that there is no difference in leadership style preference cannot be rejected, and the alternate hypothesis that those administrators with 15 years or less of law enforcement experience will have a more humanistic leadership style than

Table 15
Years in Law Enforcement

Preferred leadership style	15 years or less		More than 15 years	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	8	62	33	85
S ₃	2	23	4	10
S ₂ -S ₃ tied	3	15	2	5
Totals	13	100	39	100

those administrators with more than 15 years of experience is not supported by this study at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 6: Years as Administrator

It is hypothesized that administrators with more than 10 years of experience as the sheriff/administrator will be different from those with 10 years or less experience in their choice of leadership style.

Of the 35 possible respondents who had less than 10 years as administrator, 26 (74%) selected Style 2. Of those with more than 10 years experience, 15 (88%) selected Style 2 (high task, high relationship) on the LEAD Self questionnaire as their leadership style preference (see Table 16). The findings suggest that there is no difference.

Table 16
Years as Sheriff/Administrator

Preferred leadership style	10 years or less		More than 10 years	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	26	74	15	88
S ₃	5	14	1	6
S ₂ -S ₃ tied	4	12	1	6
Totals	35	100	17	100

The data analysis identified a chi-square (χ^2) value 1.01 and a critical value of 5.99. At the .05 level of significance (alpha), the null hypothesis that there is no difference in leadership style preference cannot be rejected, and the alternate hypothesis that there is a difference in leadership style preference between those administrators with more than 10 years of experience and those with less is not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 7: Size of Department

It is hypothesized that administrators of departments with up to 30 people will differ in their choice of leadership style from those whose departments number 31 or more people. The literature does not evidence a clear trend.

The data for this study show that 15 of the 19 administrators of departments with 30 people or less chose Style 2, for a 78% response rate; and 26 of the 33 administrators with more than 30 people in their departments chose Style 2 (79%). See Table 17.

Table 17

Size of Department

Preferred leadership style	30 persons or less		31 persons or more	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	15	78	26	79
S ₃	2	11	4	12
S ₂ -S ₃ tied	2	11	3	9
Totals	19	100	33	100

The chi-square value was 1.22, and the critical value was 5.99. At the .05 level of significance (alpha), the null hypothesis that there is no difference in leadership style preference related to department size cannot be rejected, and the alternate hypothesis that there is a difference in leadership style preference related to department size is not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 8: Administrator Self-Confidence

It is hypothesized that administrators who are self-confident in their leadership style will more often opt for a humanistic style of

leadership than those administrators who think they lack self-confidence. The review of the literature concluded that those administrators who lack confidence in their leadership style would be task or rule oriented and that those who were self-confident with their leadership style would be humanistic and participative. It was even pointed out that leadership style success is believed to be directly related to self-confidence of one's chosen style.

In this study, all the respondents, even those who responded only to the Biographical Information Questionnaire, believed that they were confident in their choice of leadership style. Because all respondents indicated that they were self-confident, no further data analysis could be run.

Table 18

Administrator Self-Confidence

Preferred leadership style	Self-confident		Lack confidence	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
S ₂	41	78	0	0
S ₃	6	12	0	0
S ₂ -S ₃ tied	5	10	0	0
Totals	52	100	0	0

Hypothesis 9: Administrator Self-Perception Versus Style

It is hypothesized that there is a difference in the administrator's self-perceived leadership style identified on the Biographical Information Questionnaire and the leadership style identified by the LEAD Self instrument. Although the two questionnaires rely on self-perception, the Biographical Information Questionnaire presents clear choices, while the LEAD Self does not define the choice as much as present a scenario.

For the purpose of this hypothesis, Choice B on the Biographical Information Questionnaire (task oriented) will be compared with Style 1 of the LEAD Self questionnaire (high task, low relationship). Choice C on the Biographical Information Questionnaire (both people and task oriented) is compared with Style 2 of the LEAD Self questionnaire (high task, high relationship). Choice A on the Biographical Information Questionnaire (people oriented) is matched with Style 3 of the LEAD Self questionnaire (high relationship, low task), and Choice D (none of the above) is compared with Style 4 of the LEAD Self questionnaire (low task, low relationship). See Tables 19, 20, and 21.

A comparison of the data from the two questionnaires reveals that 41, or 87%, of the respondents chose C on the Biographical Information Questionnaire; and 41 respondents, or 87%, identified Style 2 as their preferred style on the LEAD Self. Choice C and Style 2 are similar in nature. Three respondents chose A on the Biographical Information Questionnaire (6%), and 6 chose Style 3 (13%), the

Table 19
Biographical Data

Leadership style	Number	Percent
B/S ₁	3	6.4
C/S ₂	41	87.2
A/S ₃	3	6.4
D/S ₄	0	0
Totals	47	100.0

Table 20
LEAD Self Questionnaire

Leadership style	Number	Percent
B/S ₁	0	0
C/S ₂	41	87.2
A/S ₃	6	12.8
D/S ₄	0	0
Totals	47	100.0

Table 21
Self-Perception

Leadership style	Biographical data	LEAD Self data
B/S ₁	3	0
C/S ₂	41	41
A/S ₃	3	6
D/S ₄	0	0
Totals	47	47

similar response on the LEAD Self.

The chi-square (χ^2) value was 0.58 and the critical value 9.48. At the .05 level of significance (alpha), the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the leadership style preference identified on the Biographical Information Questionnaire and that identified on the LEAD Self instrument cannot be rejected, and the alternate hypothesis that there is a difference in leadership style preference is not supported by this study.

Summary

In summary, this chapter described the information collected by the two questionnaires: the Biographical Information Questionnaire and the LEAD Self. It identified the preferred leadership styles of the county sheriffs in the state of Michigan.

Hypothesis 1, that there was a preferred leadership style, was supported by this study.

Hypothesis 2, that there was a relationship between age and leadership style, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 3, that there was a relationship between education level and leadership style choice, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 4, that there was a relationship between education major and leadership style preference, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 5, that there was a relationship between years in law enforcement and preferred leadership style, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 6, that there was a relationship between years as sheriff/administrator and leadership style choice, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 7, that there was a relationship between the size of the department and the preferred leadership style, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 8, that there was a relationship between self-confidence and preferred leadership style, was not supported by this study.

Hypothesis 9, that there was a relationship between self-perception and preferred leadership style was not supported by this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a summary of this study, which had the following objectives: (a) to identify a preferred leadership style among the 83 county sheriffs in the state of Michigan, (b) to gain insight into the demographics of the individuals who are sheriffs, and (c) to determine if a relationship exists between certain previously identified variables and leadership styles.

Recommendations for future studies are also presented in this unit.

Conclusions

Law enforcement administration, as identified in the review of literature and corroborated by the hypotheses, is moving toward a more humanistic and participative leadership style. Academic theorists and practitioners agree that this is the trend of the future.

The preferred leadership style identified by this study is Style 2 (S_2 , high task, high relationship). This is a definite departure from the paramilitary and autocratic leadership style, Style 1 (S_1 , high task, low relationship), previously used by law enforcement officials. As a group, the sheriffs seem to be agreed in their attitudes toward leadership styles.

Of the 69 sheriffs who returned at least one questionnaire and the 52 who returned both, it was evident that Style 2 (S_2 , high task, high relationship) was the preferred and dominant leadership style of choice. The data also showed that 56% of the sheriffs are 45 years of age or older, 45% have college degrees, 55% identified criminal justice as their education major, 73% have been in law enforcement over 15 years, 32% have been working as a sheriff for 5 years or less, and 54% of the sheriffs' departments have 31 or more members. According to the data, all the responding sheriffs were confident in their leadership style, and 68 of the 69 respondents believed that they were effective administrators.

The tests of the hypotheses indicated that a preferred leadership style does exist among this group of county sheriffs (Hypothesis 1). The preferred and dominant leadership style was Style 2, high task, high relationship, identified by Hersey and Blanchard (1974/1983) as the selling or persuading style. This style features both directive and supportive behavior to reinforce the confidence of the staff. Even though most of the directives come from the leader, the leader makes use of two-way communication to make subordinates believe they are an important part of the system.

Hypothesis 2, that administrators under the age of 45 have a preferred leadership style that is humanistic in nature more often than administrators 45 years of age and over, was not supported by this study. Both groups had the same preferred leadership style, Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship. The review of the literature did not demonstrate a clear-cut relationship between age and

leadership style choice. Esser and Strother (1962) found that age did not appear to have any influence on leadership style. Stogdill (1965) found that older managers tended to be more humanistic in their leadership style choice.

Hypothesis 3, that there is a difference between those administrators with less than a college degree and those who have a college degree and their leadership style preference, was not supported by this study. The preferred style for both groups was Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship. With regards to education, the literature is replete with contradictions. Stogdill (1965) found a relationship between the least educated administrator and the use of more humanistic styles of leadership. Gopala and Hafeez (1964) found just the opposite. England (1967) did not find any relationship.

Hypothesis 4, that those administrators with a behavioral science education will have more of a concern for task orientation than those administrators with a non-behavioral-science major, was also rejected. Both groups identified Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship, as their preferred leadership style. In the review of the literature, England (1967) concluded that those administrators with a behavioral science major would be more concerned with task orientation.

Hypothesis 5, that administrators with 15 years or less of law enforcement experience will more often opt for a leadership style that will have more of a humanistic philosophy than those administrators with more than 15 years of law enforcement experience, was not supported by this study. Once again, the preferred leadership style

for both groups was Style 2 (S_2). The review of the literature concluded that law enforcement administration has a tradition of reliance on the paramilitary, authoritarian style of leadership (Hale, 1977; Litsey, 1984; McClain, 1985; Walsh, 1983). Favreau and Gillespie (1978) found that law enforcement is veering toward a more humanistic leadership style. Syme (1986) found that the change towards a more humanistic participative style of leadership is still taking place. Cauffiel (1985) concluded that this change is the product of an administrator who sometimes comes from outside law enforcement and is usually a younger individual.

Hypothesis 6, that administrators with more than 10 years of experience as sheriff/administrator will differ in their choice of leadership style from those with 10 years or less experience, was rejected. The preference of both groups was again the same: Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship. The review of the literature found that task orientation and humanistic style of leadership increase the longer the individual has been an administrator (Stogdill, 1965). England (1967) and Esser and Strother (1962) found no relationship between length of service as an administrator and leadership style choice.

Hypothesis 7, that administrators of departments with up to 30 people will differ in their choice of leadership style from those whose departments have 31 or more people, was not supported by this study. Style 2 (S_2) once again was the preferred choice of leadership styles for both groups. The review of the literature concluded that the larger the department the less humanistic the leadership

style of the administrator (England, 1967; Hemphill, 1950). Esser and Strother (1967) found just the opposite.

Hypothesis 8, that administrators who are self-confident in their leadership style will more often exhibit a humanistic style of leadership than those who believe they lack self-confidence, was rejected. All the respondents to this hypothesis indicated that they were confident in their choice of leadership style. No further analysis (chi square) could be run on this hypothesis, because a chi-square statistical test is a measure of the departure of obtained frequencies from the frequencies expected by chance. It is a test of population variances. Kipnis and Lane (1962) found that administrators who were self-confident tended to be more humanistic.

Hypothesis 9, that there is a difference in the administrators' self-perceived leadership styles identified on the Biographical Information Questionnaire and the leadership style identified by the LEAD Self instrument, was rejected. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) stated that a person's actual leadership style may be different from their perceived leadership style behavior. The responses to both questionnaires, however, were very similar. The preferred style was, once again, Style 2 (S_2 , high task, high relationship).

While these data are clear, they may reflect a bias that can be attributed to the instruments. The Biographical Information Questionnaire asked the respondents to describe their leadership style with clear straight forward choices (see Appendix B). The LEAD Self questionnaire presented choices in scenario form, which were perhaps less clear and concise.

Suggestions for the Future

As noted earlier in this study, the population of this study was the 83 county sheriffs in the state of Michigan. The data analysis identified a preferred and dominant leadership style, Style 2 (S_2), high task, high relationship. This style was preferred regardless of age, education level, education major, years in law enforcement, years as sheriff/administrator, size of department, self-confidence, and perceived style.

This study identified a trend. Other studies have also concluded that law enforcement administrators must adopt a more humanistic and participative leadership style if they are to operate effectively and efficiently. Such a development can only occur through education and training. Administrators need to acquire the ability to deal with the many facets of human resource administration.

This study may contribute to the development of such training programs; however, more studies are needed to fully assess leadership styles in the field of law enforcement administration. Future studies could deal with other branches of law enforcement: local and state police, the FBI, and correctional institutions. Others might assess the administrators within the context of the law enforcement system. Another suggestion would be to include subordinates as well as administrators to identify any differences between the administrator's self-perception and the way the administrator is perceived by the subordinate.

Study variables could also include self-esteem, job satisfaction, social attitudes, police-community relations, and the woman's role in law enforcement.

This additional research is essential if appropriate leaders in law enforcement are to be developed.

The participants in this study were very interested in its possible impact on the development of future educational programs for their benefit. It is hoped that their hopes will be realized and that this study will spark interest in law enforcement administration research and in the development of the necessary training and educational programs.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Figures 1-6

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

71-76

U·M·I

Appendix B

Biographical Information Questionnaire

Biographical Information Questionnaire

Please complete the short questionnaire below by placing an "X" over the letter next to the answer you feel is most appropriate. All information will be kept confidential.

1. What is your age?

- (a) Under 30 years of age
- (b) 30-44
- (c) 45-60
- (d) Over 60 years of age

2. Years of education?

- (a) Did not graduate from high school
- (b) High school graduate
- (c) Some college
- (d) Associate degree
- (e) Bachelor's degree
- (f) Master's degree
- (g) Doctorate

3. Education major?

- (a) Psychology
- (b) Fine arts
- (c) Law
- (d) Education
- (e) Social science
- (f) Humanities
- (g) Criminal justice
- (h) Business/management
- (i) Other

4. Your years in law enforcement?

- (a) 1-5 years
- (b) 6-10 years
- (c) 11-15 years
- (d) Over 15 years

5. Your years as sheriff/administrator?
 - (a) 1-5 years
 - (b) 6-10 years
 - (c) 11-15 years
 - (d) Over 15 years
6. Your department size?
 - (a) Less than 10
 - (b) 10-30
 - (c) 31-100
 - (d) More than 100
7. Are you confident in your leadership style?
 - (a) Yes
 - (b) No
 - (c) Don't know
8. Are you an effective administrator?
 - (a) Yes
 - (b) No
 - (c) Don't know
9. I would describe my leadership style as being:
 - (a) People oriented
 - (b) Task/productivity oriented
 - (c) Both people and task/productivity oriented
 - (d) None of the above
10. Where do you believe law enforcement administration leadership philosophy of the future should come from:
 - (a) The old "tried and true" military style with strict rules and regulations and chain of command.
 - (b) A more humanistic and participative philosophy that allows and wants inputs from all members, but also keeps the necessary controls in place so as not to interfere with the policing function of the department.

Appendix C

Cover Letter

P. O. Box 806016
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
(313) 773-6042
November 6, 1987

Sheriff John Doe
Any County
City, MI 48000

Dear Sheriff Doe:

My name is David Miramonti, and I am a Doctoral candidate at Western Michigan University. I am a member of the Michigan Sheriffs Association (MSA) and a Reserve Deputy Sheriff. As part of my dissertation, I need to gather some basic information about the leadership styles of the County Sheriffs in the State of Michigan. The title of my dissertation/study is "The Leadership Styles of the County Sheriffs in the State of Michigan."

The survey is supported by Sheriff William H. Hackel, Sheriff of Macomb County. It is endorsed by the Educational Leadership Department of the College of Education at Western Michigan University. Dr. David Cowden is the faculty advisor, and Dr. Uldis Smidchens of Western Michigan University and Dr. Zigmund Kryszak of the American Society of Employers are committee members.

Would you please take the necessary 20 minutes to fill out the two questionnaires and return them within the next week or 10 days in the enclosed postage-paid, self-addressed envelope. There are no identifying marks on the questionnaire in order to maintain the confidentiality of all responses. Also enclosed is a self-addressed stamped postcard which I ask that you return also. This is to identify non-respondents only. Your participation in this survey is very important and is greatly appreciated.

I must emphasize that your responses will be confidential. Your participation is very important and appreciated. If you have any questions, please feel free to drop me a line or call me collect at home in the evening. If you would like the overall results of the study, just let me know.

Thank you in advance,

David A. Miramonti

Enclosures

C O P Y

Appendix D

Endorsement Letter



William H. Hackel
SHERIFF

Ronald P. Tuscany
UNDERSHERIFF

November 23, 1987

Mr. David A. Miramonti
24612 Beierman
Warren, Michigan . 48091

Dear Mr. Miramonti:

Per our discussion on November 2, please feel free to use this letter to encourage the county sheriffs of the State of Michigan to participate in your study of their leadership styles.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'William H. Hackel', is written over the typed name.

WILLIAM H. HACKEL
Macomb County Sheriff

et

Appendix E

Postcard for Follow-up

Sheriff Doe:

Please return this postcard separately from the sealed questionnaire.

This postcard will be used to identify the non-respondents.

Since the questionnaires have no identification marks, you will be totally anonymous when we analyze the data.

David Miramonti

C O P Y

Appendix F

Follow-up Letter

P. O. Box 806016
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
January 14, 1988

Dear Sheriff Doe:

About a month ago, you received a packet of information that included two questionnaires. If, by the time you receive this note, you have already mailed back the questionnaires, please accept my sincere thanks.

If, by chance, you have not yet mailed in the questionnaires, I would just like to remind you that your participation in this study is very important. Would you please take a few moments to complete and return the questionnaires in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which you received.

Thank you once again for your time.

Very truly yours,

David A. Miramonti

C O P Y

Appendix G

Confirmation Letter From Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board



Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-3899

*Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board*

TO: David A. Miramonti

FROM: Ellen Page-Robin, Chair *EP-R*

RE: Research Protocol

DATE: November 18, 1987

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Leadership Styles of the County Sheriffs in the State of Michigan," has been approved as exempt by the HSIRB.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 383-4917.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and organizations. New York: Harper and Row.
- Argyris, C. (1973). The CEO's behavior key to organizational development. Harvard Business Review, 51(2), 22-26.
- Archambeault, W., & Fenwick, W. (1985). Differential effects of police management in a cultural context: Comparative analysis of South Korean, Japanese and American law enforcement. Police Studies, 8(1), 1-12.
- Auten, J. (1984). The supervisor's role in handling complaints and grievances. Law and Order, 32(5), 28.
- Babbie, E. R. (1973). Survey of research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bailey, S. E. (1985). Policing in the United Kingdom. The Police Chief, 52(3), 111-114.
- Balian, E. S. (1982). How to design, analyze, and write doctoral research. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Becker, H. K. (1970). Issues in police administration. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Bennis, W. (1983, April 25). Effective leadership: The exception, not the rule. U.S. News and World Report, p. 64.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper and Row.
- Berg, B. L., Gertz, M. G., & True, E. J. (1984). Police community relations and alienation. The Police Chief, 51(11), 20-23.
- Berkley, G. E. (1981). The craft of public administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bittick, L. C. (1985). Looking ahead to the next five years. The National Sheriff, 36(6), 38.
- Boles, H. W. (1980). Leaders, leading, and leadership. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University.

- Boles, H. W., & Davenport, J. A. (1982). Introduction to educational leadership. Lexington, MA: Ginn.
- Bopp, W. J. (1975). Police history and social consciousness. In W. J. Bopp (Ed.), Police administration: Selected readings (pp. 77-78). Boston, MA: Holbrook Press. (Reprinted from Police personnel administration. Boston: Holbrook Press, 1974)
- Bopp, W. J. (1984). Crisis in police administration. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Bouza, A. V. (1978). Police administration and performance. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Brown, G. E. (1984). The metamorphosis of a police executive: How to climb to the top and not fall off. The Police Chief, 51(11), 28-32.
- Burger, T. (1976). Max Weber's theory of concept formation. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Cauffiel, L. (1985, February). Robert Ficano: Boy sheriff. Michigan Magazine, pp. 8-15.
- Cizancas, V. I., & Hanna, D. G. (1977). Modern police management and organization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Crane, D. P. (1979). The case for participative management. In D. M. Khambata, S. R. Ruth, S. H. Smith, and A. K. Steigerwalt (Eds.), The enlightened manager (pp. 275-280). Lexington, MA: Ginn. (Reprinted from Business Horizons, April 1976, pp. 15-21).
- Dintino, J. J., & Pagano, C. L. (1984). The investigative function: Reassessing the quality of management. The Police Chief, 51(6), 55-58.
- Donald, P. (1986). Tennessee tycoons. Signature, 21(2), 77-79.
- England, G. W. (1967). Organizational goals and expected behavior of American managers. Academy of Management Journal, 10, 107-117.
- Esser, N. J., & Strother, G. B. (1962). Rule interpretations an indicator of style of management. Personnel Psychology, 15, 375-386.
- Farce, R. V., Monge, P. R., & Russell, H. M. (1977). Communicating and organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Favreau, D. F., & Gillespie, J. E. (1978). Modern police administration. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Fay, J. (1981). The security director as a leader. Security Management, 25(7), 104-107.
- Fischer, H. A., & Garret, K. O. (1984). The internal structure. The Police Chief, 51(11), 36-38.
- Fosdick, R. B. (1969). American police systems. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith. (Originally published 1920)
- Gopala, K., & Hafeez, A. (1964). Study of a supervisor's attitude towards employees and production in relation to some personal factors. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 1(2), 78-83.
- Greene, J. F. (1980). Executive summary for the LEAD-Self manual. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.
- Guralnik, D. B. (1984). Webster's new world dictionary. New York: Warner Books.
- Hale, C. D. (1977). Fundamentals of police administration. Boston: Holbrook Press.
- Handberg, R. (1985). Career patterns of sheriffs: A survey overview. The National Sheriff, 37(2), 24-26.
- Hartman, C. (1986). Mainstreet, inc. Inc. Magazine, 8(6), 49-54.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950). Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of superior leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 11-23.
- Hersey, P. (1985). The situational leader. New York: Warner Books.
- Hersey, P. (1981). Leader effectiveness and adaptability description: Feedback on leadership styles and instrument rationale and analysis. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1976). Situational leadership. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Management of organizational behavior (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1983). So you want to know your leadership style? In H. W. Boles (Ed.), Readings in the theory of leadership (pp. 160-181). Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University. (Reprinted from Training and Development Journal, 1974, 28[2], 22-37)

- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1979). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Holden, R. N. (1986). Modern police management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jackson, M. B. (1979). Leadership and change in public organizations: The dilemmas of an urban police chief. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.
- Jermier, J., & Berks, L. J. (1979). Leader behavior in a police command bureaucracy: A closer look at the quasi-military model. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(1), 1-23.
- Kenney, J. P. (1972). Police administration. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Kenney, J. P. (1975). Team policing organization: A theoretical model. In W. J. Bopp (Ed.), Police administration: Selected readings (pp. 260-271). Boston: Holbrook Press. (Reprinted from Police, 1972, 16[12], 17-22)
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundation of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kipnis, D., & Lane, W. P. (1962). Self-confidence and leadership. Journal of Applied Technology, 46, 291-295.
- Kuykendall, J. L., & Unsinger, P. C. (1975). Community police relations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Lawler, E. E. (1984). Leadership in participative organizations. In J. G. Hunt, D. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, & R. Stewart (Eds.), Leaders and managers (pp. 316-324). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1980). Human resource accounting: Building and assessing productive organizations. In D. S. Beach (Ed.), Managing people at work (3rd ed., pp. 393-403). New York: Macmillan. (Reprinted from Personnel, 1973, 50[3], 8-24)
- Litsey, B. T. (1984). A new look for police management. Law and Order, 32(1), 35-36.

- Livingstone, J., & Sylvia, R. D. (1974). Rethinking police organizations. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 7(1), 12-17.
- Luthans, F. (1977). Organizational behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maslow, A. 1970. Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- McClain, W. T. (1985). Focus on quality circles in quest of police productivity. The Police Chief, 52(9), 50-54.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Melancon, D. D. (1984). Quality circles: The shape of things to come? The Police Chief, 51(11), 54.
- More, H. W. (1979). Effective police administration (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West.
- Naisbitt, J. (1982, May). New directions and opportunities in the 1980s for America and its book sellers. Paper presented to the American Book Sellers Convention, Anaheim, CA.
- Nichols, W. (1984). Career development: A blueprint for success. Law and Order, 32(9), 41-46.
- Phillips, R. J., & McKissick, L. (1984). From megatrends to Mustangs. The Police Chief, 51(9), 21-22.
- Pratt, C. E. (1984). A formula for police effectiveness. Law and Order, 32(4), 61-64.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). Task force report: The police. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Pursley, R. D. (1975). Traditional police organizations: A portent of failure? In W. J. Bopp (Ed.), Police administration: Selected readings (pp. 83-85). Boston: Holbrook Press. (Reprinted from Police, 1971, 15[10], 11)
- Reddin, W. (1970). Managerial effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rippy, K. (1984). Police administration: A look into the '80s. Law and Order, 32(3), 55-58.

- Schembri, A. J. (1983). Educating police managers. The Police Chief, 50(11), 36-38.
- Schowengerdt, G. C. (1985). Managing for maximum effectiveness. The Police Chief, 52(4), 24.
- Scott, W. H. (1986). Motivating the right employees. In Business, 8(1), 12.
- Sennewald, C. A. (1985). Effective security management (2nd ed.). Stoneham, ME: Butterworth.
- Sheehan, R., & Cordner, G. W. (1979). Introduction to police administration. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Steinman, M., & Eskridge, C. N. (1985). The rhetoric of police professionalism. The Police Chief, 52(2), 26-29.
- Steele, B., & Nielsen, R. C. (1984). Quality circles: A police experiment. The Police Chief, 51(1), 52-53.
- Stewart, J. K. (1984). Law enforcement in the 21st century. The National Sheriff, 36(5), 19-22.
- Stogdill, R. (1965). Managers, employees, organizations: A study of 27 organizations. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Syme, M. (1986). Supervision: Getting results through people. The National Sheriff, 38(1), 34-36.
- Vanagunas, S., & Elliott, J. F. (1980). Administration of police organizations. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Walsh, W. F. (1983). Leadership: A police perspective. The Police Chief, 50(11), 26-29.
- Washo, B. D. (1984). Effecting planned change within a police department. The Police Chief, 51(11), 33-35.
- Waters, J. R., & McGrath, S. A. (1974). Introduction to law enforcement. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans., T. Parsons, Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whisenand, P. M., & Ferguson, R. F. (1973). The managing of organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wilson, O. W., & McLaren, R. C. (1977). Police administration (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ziglar, Z. (1986). Top performance. Old Tappan, NJ: Revell.