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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

There is little disagreement among scholars that the degree of success experienced by an organization is influenced by the skills of its leaders (Boles, 1977; Greer, 1961; Patchen, 1962). Stories are told of marginally profitable businesses which were transformed into multimillion dollar enterprises through the efforts of a new Vice President for Production or a new Director of Market Research. Logic intimates that highly skilled leadership is particularly important to organizations which are either in their infancies or are expanding into new areas. Since the amounts of available resources—i.e., capital for investments in the business world or personnel in education—are often limited, the necessity of avoiding costly mistakes is both obvious and critical.

Community education is a developing concept (Seay, 1974). As it has become alive, vital, and expansive, many new leadership positions have been created within the profession's realms of operation (p. 8). As a result of community education's vitality, these realms of operation are undergoing changes. Heretofore, the vast majority of community education activities have been centered in the schools and universities. In fact, to this day the term community education is being used in some circles interchangeably with the term community school,
such as in Fitzgerald (1979). The endeavors of community education today, however, are carried out in myriad arenas ranging from high school gymnasiums to neighborhood centers to city government buildings (Cook, 1978). Hence, within the last few years concerted efforts have been made to utilize non-school-based settings for providing community education services (These non-school-based settings are hereafter called expanding community education settings).

In tandem with the development of community education in expanding settings, an increasing number of community educators trained at the graduate level (and particularly those earning doctoral degrees) are securing positions in settings other than those affiliated with traditional school-based community education institutions (K-12 school districts, colleges, and universities). For example, of the 53 doctoral graduates in community education from Western Michigan University between 1968 and 1976, only one individual accepted a placement in an expanding community education setting. However, of the 11 doctoral graduates since 1976, five are currently working in expanding community education settings (Listing of Doctoral Graduates, 1978). Resultantly, the fields of business, industry, public health, religion, and government presently have community education doctoral graduates in their employ.

A question may be raised as to whether or not the skills required of community education leaders (hereafter used synonymously with community educators or doctoral level community educators) in expanding settings differ from those required of community education leaders in traditional school-based settings. Unfortunately, there are presently
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no data to assist in answering this question. Stogdill (1974) may have alluded to a possible answer, however, when he stated: "The evidence suggests that leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations" (p. 64). Moreover, Stogdill concluded that there are at least 15 studies which indicate that the qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he or she is to function as a leader (p. 62). In applying this conclusion to the thrust of this study it becomes important to know if the situations in expanding community education settings differ from the situations in traditional community education settings. If the answer to this question is discovered to be yes, it would seem to suggest that the skill practices of community educators may differ, depending upon the conditions present in the settings in which they function. Following this line of thought, it would then appear to be beneficial to both the community education profession and to the individuals who work within it to begin to determine what the different skill requirements are perceived to be for the differing community education settings. Again, this task is complicated by the fact that there are no data which specify differences and similarities in perceived skill requirements for community education leaders in expanding community education settings.
Assumptions

The problem which this study investigated was formulated based upon the following assumptions.

1. An increasing number of graduates in community education at the doctoral level are accepting positions in expanding community education settings.

2. It is generally agreed that there are three areas of skill required of leaders, including community education leaders: technical, human, and conceptual.

3. Specific technical, human, and conceptual skills deemed potentially capable of being successfully implemented (hereafter called practicable) have not been identified.

4. Due to the importance assigned by leaders to the area of human skills, it is important to determine the extent to which selected human skills are perceived to be practicable by community educators in expanding settings.

5. The extent to which community educators perceive selected human skills to be practicable will be influenced by environmental factors perceived to be present in their job settings.

6. Environmental factors which are perceived as influencing the practicability of selected human skills by community educators in expanding settings have not been identified.
The Problem

The problem which this study addressed was twofold:

1. The extents to which selected human skills are perceived as practicable by community education leaders in expanding community education settings have not been determined.

2. The environmental factors which are perceived by community education leaders in expanding community education settings as either facilitating or impeding the practicability of those human skills have not been identified.

Conceptual Framework

As was mentioned as part of the assumptions for this study, it is generally agreed that there are (at least) three areas of skill necessary for carrying out the process of management: technical, human, and conceptual (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). While the amount of technical and conceptual skills needed at different levels of management varies, the common denominator that appears to be crucial at all levels is human skill—the ability to work with and through people in achieving organizational goals (p. 7). This finding seems to hold true for leaders as well as managers.

Katz (1955, 1974) spoke of leadership skills as being classified according to technical, human, and conceptual. Numerous other students of leadership have likewise classified the skills of leaders (Butler, 1978). Agreement appears to exist among leadership scholars that there are similarities in functions and similarities in actions.
generally taken by leaders in fulfilling their roles, including those related to human skills (Krech, Crutchfield, & Bellachy, 1962).

In his factor analysis of leadership characteristics itemized among 52 studies conducted between 1945 and 1973, Stogdill (1974) determined that factors related to social and interpersonal skills—herein considered to be synonymous with human skills—of leaders appeared with the second highest frequency of 26 factors. Moreover, according to a report by the American Management Association, an overwhelming majority of the 200 managers who participated in a survey agreed that the most important single skill of an executive is his or her ability to get along with people. In this survey, management rated this ability more vital than intelligence, decisiveness, knowledge, or job skills (Bergen & Haney, 1966). While few, if any, definitive conclusions can be made based upon these findings, they do suggest that researchers and practitioners alike acknowledge the importance that human skills play in leadership performance.

In relating human skills for leaders to the field of community education we find that Weaver (1972) surveyed leaders of community education in secondary and higher education positions throughout the United States. Drawing from the work of Katz (1955), he divided skill requirements for what at that time consisted solely of school-based community educators into technical, human, and conceptual skill areas. Johnson (1973) attempted to delineate descriptor categories of human skill possession of community educators functioning in K-12 school districts. Kliminski (1974) further refined 15 of those descriptors when he surveyed K-12 community education directors in southwest
Michigan.

In a discussion of the extent to which human skills are perceived to be practicable it seems reasonable to also ask what phenomena may influence the perceptions of the individual; in other words, what factors potentially impact upon the perceptions one holds of the practicability of specific human skills. It becomes apparent rather quickly that there may be many factors which could come into play. A person with only a perfunctory knowledge of the literature could quite likely list some of the variables: leadership style, personal orientation, skill level, environmental factors surrounding the work setting, degree of self-concept development, goals of the organization, and untold others. Certainly an investigation which would consider all of these variables would be an enormous undertaking, if in fact such a study could be adequately managed at all. It is the belief of many that it is better to begin somewhere than it is to not begin at all. Therefore, this study investigated, along with the perceived practicability of selected human skills, one of these variables: the environmental factors which were perceived to either facilitate or impede the practicability of selected human skills of community educators in expanding community education settings.

There is a great deal of research which concludes that the behavior of members of an organization is influenced by the environment in which members of the organization function (Filley, 1976). Environment is generally defined as the aggregate of surrounding things, conditions, or influences which affect the existence or development of someone or something (Castetter, 1976). While terminology may vary
among authors—Rogers and Agawarla-Ragers (1976), for example, state that the environment is outside the organization and it is the organizational structure that is within the system; Hall (1972) states that the environment is within the organization—it appears that there is at least consensus that environmental factors are both intrinsic and extrinsic to organizational settings.

While empirical data relating to the environments surrounding expanding community education settings has not been gathered, scholars in related disciplines have addressed the issue, at least in generalities. Hall (1972) formulated a taxonomy of environmental conditions which influence behaviors in educational institutions. Additionally, he delineated conditions based upon those considerations which are specific to the organization and those which are general to most organizations. Owens (1970) undertook a similar strategy of discussing what he called the climate surrounding the organization.

**Research Questions**

This study was designed to seek answers to the following research questions:

1. What human skills do community educators in expanding community education settings perceive to be generally practicable in their job settings?

2. What human skills do community educators in expanding community education settings perceive to be not generally practicable in their job settings?
3. What environmental factors do community educators in expanding community education settings perceive to facilitate the practicability of the human skills?

4. What environmental factors do community educators in expanding community education settings perceive to impede the practicability of the human skills?

Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To develop a list of descriptors of human skills for community education leaders through: (a) the engagement of a panel of experts in a Delphi Technique (Weaver, 1971) assigned to generate and refine a list of human skill descriptors for community education leaders, and (b) the integration of the list developed by the panel and a list of human skill areas drawn from the literature.

2. To identify specific human skills which community educators in expanding community education settings perceive to be generally practicable in their job settings.

3. To identify specific human skills which community educators in expanding community education settings perceive to be generally not practicable in their job settings.

4. To identify environmental factors which are perceived by community educators in expanding community education settings as facilitating the practicability of human skills in their job settings.

5. To identify environmental factors which are perceived by community educators in expanding community education settings as
impeding the practicability of human skills in their job settings.

**Definitions**

After consulting with several educational researchers, a decision was made to approach the issue of definitions of terms in a somewhat unusual, but expectedly productive, manner. Rather than relying upon dictionary definitions throughout this study, terms which needed additional clarification are discussed in Chapter II of the work. Those terms which appeared to require specific explanations beyond the discussion they received in Chapter II are included in the Appendix of the study.

**Importance of the Study**

In their work in determining guidelines for research and development proposals Cuba and Clark (1967) suggested that the significance of a research problem may be concluded according to the answers given to some general questions. Four of their questions ask the following: (a) What is the heuristic value of investigating the problem? (b) What is the practical value of investigating the problem? (c) What is the scientific value of investigating the problem? (d) What is the interest value of investigating the problem?

Thoughtful deliberation has led to the belief that responding to these questions specifically might well serve the ultimate goals of this study.
Heuristics Value

As was mentioned previously, the emphasis of community education has historically been focused upon school-based operations. However, as more and more community educators move outside of the schools for their professional employment, professional interest in gaining additional information about their circumstances will logically increase. In addition, conscientious training institutions will become concerned about the extent to which their respective programs meet the needs of their trainees who function in a diversity of settings. It seemed to follow then, that by investigating environmental factors and skill practicabilities in a new arena of community education—expanding settings—this study may stimulate other forms of scientific inquiry which may ultimately benefit community education at all levels and in all settings.

Practical Value

This study derived much of its importance from the contribution it can make to community educators in the field. First, by developing practical frameworks for inquiry which are presently and sorely missing—namely, of human skill descriptors and perceived environmental factors—this study provided a basis from which evaluative and developmental efforts related to leadership training programs for community educators can occur. Second, the results of this study provided community educators with new information related to their own day to day behaviors and the factors they perceive to influence those
behaviors. This opportunity for professional self-appraisal, then, should have very real, albeit presently indeterminable, benefits for community educators.

Scientific Value

At the present time, the doctoral level community educator who functions outside of traditional community education settings is virtually a nonentity as far as the field of community education research is concerned. Given that there is a relatively small amount of data related to skill requirements for traditional community educators (Miller, 1977; Mullarney, 1977; Weaver, 1972; Zemlo, 1977), there is even less information related specifically to human skills and community education (Johnson, 1973; Kliminski, 1974). Therefore, a large part of the scientific value of this study lies in that it commenced the process of assembling a body of knowledge related to a little researched function—human skills—of a new population of community education leaders—those individuals in expanding community education settings.

Interest Value

There is presently disagreement among some scholars concerning the worth of investigating human skills as an individual category of leadership skills. While there has been a large body of research which used the Katz (1955) model (skills can be divided into areas of technical, human, and conceptual) over the past two decades, there are also those who maintain that the technical, human, and conceptual
aspects of leader performance are so intertwined as to be divisible only on paper and not in actuality. While the voices of these critics have been raised informally heretofore, the interest value of this study seems in some part to be related to a further investigation of the Katz model, vis-à-vis the perceptions of community educators in expanding settings concerning the perceived practicability of human skills. While this is not to suggest that any additional research which might use the Katz framework would be helpful in resolving the above question, it is to say that the nature of this study—the flexibility of responses allowed through the research design—hopefully allowed at least intimations of the prudence of speaking of human skills in a manner isolated from other areas of leader behavior.

The personal interest of this researcher in this study stemmed from numerous experiences gained while serving in the capacities of student, teacher, and administrator. These experiences led this researcher to conclude that it is insufficient to simply accept philosophically the importance of human skill development and practice. Additionally, it was believed that the extent to which these skills can actually or potentially be implemented can and should be determined, so that the professional and personal growth of educational leaders in general and community education leaders in particular may be enhanced. This study has intended to move those leaders closer to that enhancement.

The next chapter of this study presents a rationale for the conduct of this research. Four major subjects are discussed, all at some length: leadership, community education, skills and particularly
human skills, and environmental factors. All these subjects, as is noticeable, are directly related to the intent of this project. For the sake of reading ease, subject areas have been subdivided whenever appropriate.
CHAPTER II

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Introduction

Support for and statements of the rationale for this study need to be presented. This chapter is intended to articulate such a rationale.

This chapter is devoted to considering the primary subject components by which this study has been affected. The relationship of related literature and the intentions of this study are discussed. Definitions related to the major subject areas which were employed in the conducting of this research are also included.

When possible, the discussions of the subject areas have, because of their length, been subdivided for reading ease.

What Is Leadership and What Is a Leader?

There are differences and disputes among scholars which make answering the questions "What is leadership and what is a leader?" quite risky. One might be almost led to conclude that no matter what position concerning particular definitions one assumes, a strong counter-argument can probably be made. In fact, Boles (1978) said: "There is a surging tide of literature about 'leadership' that threatens to inundate both the academic and professional worlds, yet few persons are agreed on what the concept means" (Preface, p. ii).
In a review of the literature related to leadership, Stogdill (1974) stated that leadership has been defined according to as many as 11 perspectives. He concluded that leadership can be related to:

1. A function of group process
2. A personality or effects of personality
3. The art of inducing compliance
4. The exercise of influence
5. A form of persuasion
6. A set of acts or behaviors
7. A power relationship
8. An instrument of goal achievement
9. An effect of interaction
10. A differentiated role
11. The initiation of structure. (p. 7)

Cartwright and Zander (1960) also concluded that leadership can be defined in a number of different ways, depending upon the situation in which leadership is applied. Their position has, in fact, been held by a number of scholars who have espoused a theory that leadership is situational (Bass, 1960; Cattell, 1951; Fiedler, 1972; Likert, 1961). To provide a further point of reference, Lassey and Fernandez (1976) offered an excellent synopsis of the evolution of investigations of the meaning of leadership. They stated:

Early definitions of what characterizes leadership were based largely on "traits" by which leaders or leadership behavior could be identified. However, such definitions proved frustrating because each student of leadership came up with different definitions based on selected sets of traits. Few characteristics could be universally identified as necessary for performance of leadership
behavior . . . definitions of what constitutes leadership vary widely depending on circumstance. Therefore, analysis in the most recent decades has concentrated on examination of leadership behavior in various contexts. (p. 10)

Support for the accuracy of Lassey and Fernandez' (1976) synopsis can be found in the writings of a number of researchers. Regarding the frustration involved in pursuing the "traits" of leaders, Gibb (1954) stated: "A review of the literature using this trait approach to leadership has revealed few significant or consistent findings" (p. 51). Jennings (1961) went even further when he concluded: "Fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used to discriminate leaders and nonleaders" (p. 62). Similarly, Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1959) cited the work of Myers (1954) who analyzed more than 200 studies of leadership conducted over the first 50 years of this century. Myers also concluded that no significant difference could be found between the traits of leaders and nonleaders.

The Evolution of Situational Leadership

As Lassey and Fernandez (1976) summarized, the felt inadequacy of addressing leadership in terms of traits possessed by an individual brought forth a new approach to investigating leadership. This innovation was based upon the hypothesis that leadership is a dynamic process, varying from one situation to another. There were two key elements introduced in the situational approach to leadership. First, according to the theory, leadership is not viewed as a one-time occurrence; rather it is a dynamic process which is constantly, although
to varying degrees, changing to adapt to a particular circumstance. Second, leadership cannot be viewed only in terms of the individual doing the leading; equally important are the variables related to the idiosyncrasies of the situation at hand. These variables may concern the characteristics of the followers, the structure of the organization, the goals of the system, or any number of other considerations. For the purposes of this study, these variables have been placed under the rubric of the organization's climate and environment, and will be discussed at a later point in this chapter.

An excellent illustration of the situational nature of leadership was provided by Shaw (1971). Following earlier scholars, he too noted that relationships between the individual traits of leaders may tend to be specific, but they also are weak. He then went on to say:

The leader must have the abilities that are relevant to the situation in which he finds himself. A person who has great ability with respect to building bridges would have a better chance of becoming an effective leader of a bridge-building crew than one without such skills, but his chances of becoming the leader of a chemical research team might be very low indeed. (p. 275)

One of the first researchers to posit a specific theory of situational leadership was Fiedler (1967, 1972) whose books have become landmark writings in the study of leadership. Fiedler (1967) stated that three major situational variables seem to determine whether or not an individual will be able to lead others (or what he called a favorable situation to leaders):

1. His [the leader's] personal relations with the members of the group (leader-member relations).

2. The degree of structure in the task that the group has been assigned to perform (task structure).
3. The power and authority that his position provides (positional power). (p. 14)

Fiedler (1972) also reported that it makes little sense to speak of either a "good" leader or a "bad" leader. Instead, he stated: "There are only leaders who will perform well in one situation but not well in another" (p. 26). Bennis (1969) reached a similar conclusion:

Accepted theory and conventional wisdom concerning leadership have a lot in common. Both seem to be saying that the success of a leader depends on the leader, the led, and the unique situation. This formulation—abstract and majestically useless—is the best that can be gleaned from over 100 years of research on "leadership." (p. 45)

Task and Relationship Orientations of Leaders

Another aspect of leadership, which has been scrutinized by Fiedler and numerous other scholars, concerns the leader's concern for the task at hand as compared to his or her concern for the individuals who are participating in the achievement of the task. Several of the most renowned leadership scholars in the last few decades have attempted to provide explanations regarding this issue, and while the particular terminology may vary from one scholar's work to the next, the basic tenets appear universal. Studies in the early 1950s at the University of Michigan, for example, referred to leaders' employee (relationship) orientation and their "production orientation" (tasks); Cartwright and Zander (1960) spoke of leaders' orientations toward "group maintenance" (relationships) and "goal achievement" (tasks); Blake and Mouton (1960) referred to "concern for people" as compared to "concern for production"; Fiedler (1967) elaborated upon leaders...
being "relationship oriented" and "task oriented"; Reddin (1970) spoke of the "relationships dimension" and the "task dimension" of leadership. Many of these scholars also articulated the different combinations and degrees of task versus relationship orientations which leaders assume. To illustrate, Hersey and Blanchard (1977) stated that four basic leader behavior quadrants can be identified; leaders who are either high task-low relationship, high task-high relationship, high relationship-low task, or low task-low relationship (p. 104).

The task dimension of leadership refers to the leader's orientation to completing the job. The production and technical aspects of the situation are viewed as extremely important, as are such functions as attempting to establish well defined roles for the leaders and followers, specific communication channels, and precisely stated procedures and regulations.

The relationship dimension of leadership, on the other hand, focuses upon the individual needs of all those involved in the organization. The personalities and contribution of the individual followers are recognized, and the emphasis is placed upon the development of friendships, mutual trust, and caring for one another.

The general conclusion which can be drawn from the literature on task and relationship oriented leader behavior seems to indicate, as would be expected, that the most successful leaders are those who either can match their degrees of task and/or relationship orientation to the requirements of the situation in which they operate, or have high degrees of both orientations in all situations.
Leadership in Social Systems

Still another element in the discussion of leadership must be introduced. The advocates of situational leadership has undoubtedly made a tremendous contribution to the body of knowledge surrounding leadership. It was not long after the situational theory attained a degree of scientific acceptance (the 1950s) until a subsequent and very important concomitant of situational leadership emerged. That issue centered upon when and where situational leadership takes place. It appeared to follow that to state that leadership is situational without offering any parameters concerning the situations themselves presented a rather obvious shortcoming in the situational theory of leadership.

In the late 1950s, Getzels and Guba (1957) presented a social systems approach to leadership. Their efforts fostered a new belief among students of leadership that the functions of leadership occur within social systems. A social system was defined as a group of people who work together to foster the needs of both the organization (called the institutional goals) and of the members of the organization (called the individual goals). They further posited that three types of leadership occur within social systems: nomothetic leadership, idiographic leadership, and synthetic leadership. Nomothetic leadership is involved with roles and expectations which define dimensions of normal behaviors and activities. Idiographic leadership is concerned with individual needs and dispositions of members which define the personal dimensions of the systems' activities. Synthetic
leadership attempts to reconcile the conflicting demands which come about from the contrasting groups within the systems.

During the last 20 years, the idea that leadership occurs with social systems has been both expanded upon and refined. Boles (1977) offered a more recent definition of a social system, describing it as a group of people with (a) a unity of purpose and (b) an interdependence of parts. Additionally, he posited that social systems, like all other systems, are comprised of inputs, processes, and outputs. He likewise concluded that leaders serve in the capacity of initiators in order to satisfy wants and to introduce innovation, and in the capacity of maintainers in order to maintain the social system and bring about production.

The point made by Getzels and Guba (1957) and by many other leadership scholars such as Boles (1977) is basically the same; that is, leadership occurs within social systems, and social systems can be viewed as parametric entities.

A number of other orientations for investigating the phenomenon of leadership have been undertaken over the years. Scholars have developed theories related to the respective inputs and outputs of the leadership process, related to the "styles" of leader behavior, related to the sources of power and authority of leaders, related to the functions which leaders perform and oversee, and related to many additional dimensions of leading. Yet it is not necessary to discuss those differing dimensions here. Rather, a general review of the literature on leadership has led to the conclusion that two quotations will suffice for the needs and intent of this study. Hersey
and Blanchard (1977) defined leadership by saying: "A review of other writers reveals that . . . writers agree that leadership is a process of influencing the activities of another individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (p. 84). Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) expanded upon this definition:

The successful leader is one who is keenly aware of those forces which are most relevant to his behavior at any given time. He accurately understands himself, the individuals and the group he is dealing with, and the company and broader social environment in which he operates.

But this sensitivity or understanding is not enough. . . . The successful leader is one who is able to behave appropriately in the light of these perceptions. If direction is in order, he is able to direct; if considerable participative freedom is called for, he is able to provide such freedom. (p. 101)

Lassey and Fernandez (1976) mentioned that Tannenbaum and Schmidt stated in a 1973 issue of the Harvard Business Review that while societetal changes since the time of the original article (written 17 years earlier) may call for some updating and reconsideration, "The article's continued popularity attests to its essential validity" (p. 39).

Conclusions Regarding Leaders and Leadership

In concluding a discussion of the definition of a leader, several additional observations should be included.

First, library shelves throughout the United States are lined with theories, hypotheses, and studies which relate to leadership and leaders. While cases can perhaps be made for the bulk of these writings, it is apparent to even the most casual reviewer of the literature on leadership that definitions and vocabulary often get in the
way of continuity—what one individual terms leadership, another may
deeem management; what one scholar calls behavior, another may view as
an activity; and on and on. It thus becomes at least expedient, and
hopefully productive, for one to select a particular definition after
some deliberation, and to then utilize it until such time as the def-
inition's obsolescence or inappropriateness may be discovered. It
was from this posture that the definition of leadership promoted by
Hersey and Blanchard (1977) was selected for and continued to be
adhered to in this study: "Leadership is a process of influencing
the activities of an individual or group in efforts toward goal
achievement in a given situation" (p. 84).

Second, stalwart students of the concept of leading occasionally
have felt the need to make copious distinctions between the terms
leadership and leading. Historically, such distinctions have resulted
in research thrusts toward either personality traits and personal
orientations when scrutinizing the nature of a leader, or toward the
skill processes, or activities involved in providing leadership. It
does not appear that the intent of this study would be sufficiently
advanced by making such lengthy distinctions to warrant their inclu-
sion. Hence, it seems sufficient to state that the term leadership
refers to the process of moving people toward a predetermined goal,
and the term leader refers to the individual who assumes the primary
role in this process.
What Is Community Education?

The concept of community education is, like the concept of leadership, a rather difficult entity with which to come to grips. There are, in fact, myriad definitions of community education, however, they all seem to satisfy only a minority of interested scholars, professionals, and lay persons. One who participates in the community education profession often hears, on the one hand, a cacophony for one unequivocal and catholic definition. On the other hand, the continued failure within the field to achieve consensus of thought concerning a definition seems to have caused many community educators to avoid the topic of definitions altogether. Some individuals within the profession have even voiced their belief that definitions may not even be needed. Many of these advocates present the argument that defining community education would place parameters on how the concept is operationalized, and they maintain, it is the absence of parameters which makes community education so unique and appealing. West (1977) paraphrased this line of thinking when he posited: "To . . . others community education is a concept which defies definition; for to define it is to constrain it, to package it, and to limit both its effectiveness and proselytizing attractiveness" (p. 67).

In other words, some maintain that the ability to define how community education will be actualized are questions of definitions which are best determined from one situation to another. Olsen and Clark (1976) provided an extremely realistic appraisal of the definitional dilemma encompassing community education when they stated:
"Community education is difficult to define or even describe, and there exists today a plethora of attempted definitions and descriptions" (p. 88). Clark (1977) expanded upon this thought when he asserted: "Any attempt to define a comprehensive concept such as community education risks the likelihood of generating a variety of misconceptions" (p. 5).

Yet in spite of articulations to the contrary, such as those mentioned above, the felt need to define community education continues among many community educators. One of the most graphic statements to this effect can be found in the Official By-Laws of the National Community Education Association. The association, founded in 1966, recently undertook the task of revising its original by-laws and completed that task in late 1978. Thousands of hours of work were invested, and hundreds of individuals had input into the revised document. It is interesting to note that under Article II (Statement of Purpose) of the final version the following statement is made:

"[One of] the purpose(s) of the National Community Education Association shall be to . . . define, affirm and advocate a concept of community education nationally" (p. 2). Moreover, the March 1979 meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Community Education Association was oriented toward a futuristic look at the major issues which may face the community education profession over the next 5 years. The issue which surfaced within a matter of minutes was the question of "What community education is all about." More specifically, group discussion centered upon questions of defining the community education constituency, vehicles for dissemination of the concept, and
whether the idea of citizen empowerment has relevance to community education.

The Difficulties of Forming One Definition

The two situations previously mentioned suggest the degree of difficulty involved in attempting to reach agreement on the definition of community education. As the above-stated discussion describes, the only national association for community education is yet to formulate a definition of the concept—and that association has been in operation for more than 12 years. It should be noted at this point, however, that this illustration is in no way intended to be an indictment of those involved in this, or any other, community education association or endeavor; rather, it is offered as a representation of the difficulty of the task of defining community education to the satisfaction of the majority of interested individuals.

One possible explanation for this condition may have been provided by Ernest O. Melby, one of the deans of the community education movement. In citing him, Olsen and Clark (1976) stated:

Ernest Melby once remarked that "Community education is such a simple idea that it is hard to talk about." He later commented that he often received requests to define community education. He responded: "Define community education? I can't define community education. It can't be defined. It can only be described." (p. 88)

Indeed, numerous authors have, to one degree or another, apparently concurred with Melby. An excellent illustration of this can be found in Kerensky (1972). In an article which appeared in Phi Delta Kappan, he first said:
The basic ideas that underpin community education seem to be the following:

1. Community education is not a product. It is not a series of packages. It is a process that attempts to educate and mobilize everyone in the development of educational goals for a community.

2. Community education is a new form that requires new administration and new assumptions in terms of accountability and control.

3. Community education is an alternative organizational form to decentralize and "debureaucratize" the American schools.

4. Community education strives to mobilize the vast array of human and physical resources that are available in each community but often work in an independent, self-serving manner. (pp. 159-160)

It is easily noted that Kerensky, like many others, has offered a description of what community education desires to be, rather than what it actually is. Baillie (1976) concluded:

There is often some confusion when referring to community education. There appear to be some significant differences between the concept of community education and its practice. Since a concept is supposed to help us understand the idea expressed, community education's lack of conceptual clarity often makes it difficult to understand what it represents. (p. 1)

Criteria for a Definition

While the previous discussion does lead one to conclude that there is, at present, no singular definition of community education, it is not to suggest that common criteria are absent when attempts are made to specify the meaning of the concept. In fact, definitions of community education which have been reached are usually very logical outcomes of the frames of reference in which the definitions were
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formulated, or more precisely, of the manner in which certain fundamental questions were answered. In attempting to formulate a definition of community education several principal approaches have been followed. Two of the most often used methods are:

1. To individually define the two constructs inherent in community education—namely, community and education—and to then define community education as approximately being the sum of the definitions of these two constructs.

2. To scrutinize the major variables which relate to the manner in which the community education concept is presently being operationalized, and to subsequently assemble a definition which is congruent with the positions held regarding those major variables.

The major proponents of the first method—defining the two constructs inherent in community education—can be represented by Minzey and LeTarte (1972). In the well-known book Community Education: From Program to Process, these two authors stated: "In order to define community education, one should first look at the meaning of the words which make up the term" (p. 13). At the time the Minzey and LeTarte book was written, the term community was viewed almost without exception as pertaining to a geographic location where an aggregate of people resided. Moreover, this geographic location was usually thought to be delineated according to the boundaries of the local public school district. By 1976, however, Weaver stated the following:

Much of the literature in Community Education, as well as much of the practice, is based upon the assumption that "community" is a physical aggregate of individuals in a
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particular place. Such a definition of community is a convenient one for the community educator inasmuch as it delineates clearly the constituency he/she is to serve. 

... Aside from the convenience, however, the concept of community as a place is probably of little use to the community educator in most American towns and cities today, for there appears to be little relationship between where one lives and the "communities" with which he or she is associated. (pp. 2-3)

However, in 1976, and again in 1979, Weaver stated that:

Most students of community appear to agree that there are three ways to identify community.

1. People holding things in common—property, ideas, beliefs, customs, norms, sentiments, or activities.

2. People operating within certain social-systems and sub-systems where if one part behaves in a certain way other parts will be affected in a predictable manner [For example, the board of education, central office staff, teachers' union, staff and student body of a particular school].

3. People occupying particular land or territory. (pp. 118-119)

Bailie (1976) supported this position when she concluded:

From reading community education literature, one might envision that the characteristics of the "community" being referred to might be any or all of the following:

1. A geographically defined area such as a neighborhood, village, town or city.

2. Individuals sharing the same public facilities.

3. Persons sharing common problems.

4. A group of individuals who share common goals and aspirations and common procedures for resolving issues. (pp. 4-5)

The second construct inherent in community education—education—has very obviously been addressed definitionally by thousands of scholars. Three authors represent the efforts which have
been put forth in this regard by community educators. Minzey and LeTarte (1972), upon undertaking the assignment of investigating the construct of education, concluded:

To properly fulfill the complete analysis of the term community education, we must also give scrutiny to the word education. Dictionary definitions tend to place education in a very structured, traditional setting of a combination of teaching and learning. Such a limited definition, however, does not display the potential of the term in bringing about change. A more relevant definition by H. G. Wells states that, "Education is the preparation of the individual for the community" or by John Dewey, who defines education as "that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience." (pp. 14-15)

Wood (1979) said that:

Whether a process or the result of a process, "education" refers to the teaching-learning that goes on among people, and therefore, education occurs every moment of the day in every corner of the community—in formal classes, apprenticeships, real-life problems being solved, advice being given, examples being set, human relationships being worked out, and so forth. (p. 18)

Certainly one can take issue with the positions taken by Minzey and LeTarte, or Wood, or virtually any other advocates of defining education in a particular way. The point to be made here, however, is not one of advocacy, but one of illustration. It can be readily observed that scores of different permutations involving definitions of the concepts of community and of education can be reached, all dependent upon the individual definitions of the concepts one ascribes to. Thus, it is evident that the method of defining community education as approximately being the sum of the definitions of community and of education would logically result, and in fact has resulted, in a number of varying definitions.
The second aforementioned method of defining community education is one of looking at the differing manners in which community education has been implemented. Weaver (1972a) focused upon these differing manners according to what he called elements of the definition. He described these elements according to whether community education relates to being

1. [A] program vs. process?
2. School-based vs. community-based?
3. Education-oriented or social problem-oriented?
4. Community education within a hierarchical organization vs. community education as a social system? (pp. 155-156)

**Programmatic Versus Process Oriented Community Education**

Perhaps the most widely debated question relating to the purpose of community education concerns whether the concept should be the locus for a series of programs—after school avocational activities for children, adult leisure time, recreational, and skill development classes, senior citizens programs, and the like—offered for community members—or whether the concept should specify a process whereby local citizens are continuously educated how to identify and attend to their own needs and problems, become involved in their community, and benefit from the improved delivery and coordination of community services.

Ault (1979) made another useful distinction between a program and a process in stating that programs are typically viewed as having a definite beginning and end, while processes are continuous, closed.
looped, and never ending. Seay (1974) reviewed many of the major efforts toward community education which took place in the United States from the 1930s to the 1950s. Virtually all of these efforts, while highly visible and functional for varying periods of time, "served their purposes and died." These efforts were, de facto, very programmatically focused, as were almost all of the earlier attempts at implementing the community education concept.

Advocates of the programmatic posture of community education (Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; Totten & Mauley, 1969; Whitt, 1971) based their position on the belief that specific programs are required in order to both meet some of the more perfunctory needs of community members and to introduce local citizens to the idea of a community education process. Many further believe that once community members become involved in programs, they can subsequently be integrated into a more "meaningful and substantive" community process. Olsen and Clark (1976), however, spoke to the outcome of implementing community education from a purely programmatic posture which often times occurs:

Some community education leaders become so consumed by the actual organization and administration of recreational, enrichment, adult education, academic and other such programs that they fail to provide the necessary leadership for continued growth and application of community education to all facets and possibilities of the community's educational endeavors. (p. 87)

Proponents of the process of community education believe that the role of community education is to engage local citizens in a continuous process of identifying community needs, marshaling community resources (physical, human, and financial), and utilizing these resources to continually alleviate these community needs. Many of
those who endorse community education as a process also feel, as do Olsen and Clark (1976), that most communities have not been successful in moving to a process of community participation and problem solving, and that, therefore, the initial and on-going efforts of community educators must be to directly foster the process.

There is little doubt that consensus is lacking regarding whether community education should be primarily a series of programs or a continuous process. Seay (1976) seemed to suggest that this state of disagreement within the field is to be expected, as he stated:

Since community education is a developing concept, portions of its earlier forms continue to make up part of the total form presented to the world today. For example, the idea of a process which leads to a comprehensive, coordinated educational program for all the people of a community developed from the community and adult programs conducted by the community schools of an earlier period. Therefore, many comprehensive programs now struggle to free themselves from the limitations imposed by the lingering image of community education as only a unit in the public school program which offers those educational activities that fill the gaps. (Appendix p. xii)

He went on to say that the apparent dichotomy concerning the role of community education is actually representative of the current status of community education when he determined that: "Such a double view is, in fact, an accurate view of the current stage in the development of the community education concept" (Appendix, p. xii).

A 1976 report on community education prepared by the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) added support for Seay's position: "Some practitioners maintain that community education must be programmatic and coordinated by the schools. Others contend that it is a process and open to any organizational
School Based Versus Other Based Community Education

The second question raised by Weaver (1972a) is touched upon in the above-mentioned NASBE report: whether community education must be school based alone or whether it can also be based in other sectors of the community. Implicit in this question is whether community education as a concept encompasses more than the community schools concept. Palm (1973) said that typically, "it is assumed that the public school is the initiator of community education, the caretaker and coordinator" (p. 53). Minzey and LeTarte (1972) may have intimated the essence of this second question even more precisely. They said:

It is probably appropriate to point out the relationship between "community school" and "community education." Community education is the educational concept; community school is the vehicle by which many services of community education are delivered. (p. 11)

It should be noted that Minzey and LeTarte stated that the community school is the vehicle for community education. What many individuals in the field are discussing is whether the community school is the only vehicle for community education. Weaver (1972a) described the situation in this way:

There are those who argue that since it is the school who can reach nearly every individual within the neighborhood, community education should be school based and administered by the local board of education. . . . However, increasing public criticism of the schools and their alleged inability to relate to the community has caused many to seek alternate models such as those involving joint sponsorship by the school and other governmental and/or social agencies, and those in which the community education program is based
entirely outside the school. (pp. 156-157)

Olsen and Clark (1976) offered that many persons in the field of community education impede their own growth:

Others are greatly limited by their own narrow perception of what community education really means. To them, it is not authentic unless it is achieved through a community school staff. . . . This blindness contributes . . . to the many mistaken notions of what community education is and is not. (pp. 87-88)

Again in 1979, this issue was raised:

Granted that there are still many areas of America and other developed countries which look to the school as the locus of community services, there are a growing number of areas in which people seek "community" outside the local neighborhood. (Schmidt & Weaver, 1979, p. 9)

One might then ask what other bases within a community are appropriate for the implementation of the community education concept.

Udell and Nance (1975) said that "the responsibility for implementing community education is not the prerogative of any one agency or institution. Leadership, financing, and resources should be shared in initiating a community education program" (p. 27). Melby (1977) added credence to the position of Udell and Nance:

As a result of our experiences with community education, we can now account for many educational disappointments. We have talked and acted traditionally as if everything can be done in a school house. . . . If we are serious about lifelong education [community education] it must include all of living and learning in home, school, community, business or profession. (p. 41)

Melby continued: "It is a paradox that one of the most promising aspects of community education has been the slowest to get underway. This is the use of business and professional groups in the community as educational resources" (p. 42). In responding to Packard's (1972)
book, *A Nation of Strangers*, this researcher wrote:

It would seem almost impossible to argue that a sense of community can be (re)achieved in a locale if business and industry are excluded from involvement. Placing all political beliefs aside, there is little question that in a capitalistic society such as our own, business and industry are entities which community educators must reckon with. The task which confronts us is to devise strategies for bringing about a win-win, community-business, situation. In other words, we must convince business and industry that community homogeneity can be literally profitable. (McMahon, 1978)

Indeed, business and industry are seeming to find increasing benefit in the community education concept. West (1977) said that "The businessman, too, appears to have donned the mantle of community leadership" (p. 68).

In January of 1979, Dr. Richard Ault presented an address at Western Michigan University. Ault spoke of one example of the role of business and industry in community education, the Quality of Work Life program at General Motors. He talked of the data that General Motors has assembled which indicate that the investment of business and industry in community is approaching being cost-effective, as well as being extremely beneficial to GM employees and their communities as a whole. He also noted that one of the interesting ancillary benefits of business trying to improve the quality of life for its own employees is that these corporate efforts seem to have a spin-off effect. Workers who have become the beneficiaries of increased attention by industry to their needs seem to become more involved in their local communities; employees are joining civic organizations in increasing numbers, they are running for public office, and in general, appear to have a greater feeling of "ownership" in their cities,
schools, and neighborhoods. In concluding his remarks, Ault, who provides training to General Motors executives in implementing the Quality of Work Life program and also has an extensive background in public education and community education, asserted very loudly: "I am a community educator, and I defy anyone who tells me that I am not!"

In all likelihood, many current community educators would not be inclined to disagree with Ault, with the opinion that business and industry is a viable setting, and perhaps potential bastion, for community education. Perhaps the best representation of this sentiment can be found in the 1978 Annual Report of the National Community Education Association. In that document, the current president of the association stated that "The Association will . . . be taking concrete initial steps during 1979 toward . . . developing a long-range plan toward active involvement of the private sector in community education" (p. 17).

Thus, it seems that in the future, business and industry will play an increasingly important role in the dissemination of the community education concept.

Wood (1979) may have struck a chord concerning which and how other community settings may be appropriate for acting upon the community education philosophy: "The question for each system is how broadly and how intensively it will 'participate in' community education; that is, how relatively 'open' its operation will be" (p. 25). Strikingly enough, Wood's comment may have its greatest applicability for those individuals comprising the ranks of community educators at
the present time. The term system, as he used it, might be referred to the system of community education practitioners, for it appears that the greatest degree of reticence to "expand" the operations and settings of community education may come from those within the profession who possess either a history in or a mind set toward viewing community education in only the most traditional of frameworks.

Moreover, a case might be potentially made that the philosophy of community education is being implemented in a number of nontraditional settings and manners, in spite of the reluctance of some school-based community educators to acknowledge this expansion. The involvement of business and industry in community education has already been discussed, however, there appear to be other settings and institutions which are now fostering the concept of community education, at least as community education might be defined in a generic sense. For example, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, long the most ardent financial and philosophical supporter of community education, has recently modified its posture concerning its participation in the community education movement. Whereas the foundation historically involved itself in the dissemination of the community education concept through facilitation of community schools, it now seems to be acknowledging its belief that settings other than school buildings may be legitimate settings for community education development.

In a recent article in which she explained this apparent modification in focus, Edwards (1978) said:

This then becomes the bottom line for future direction in the Foundation's funding of community education; to cultivate partnerships between communities and schools and other
Mario Fantini (1978), one of America's best-known educational reformers, may have articulated a rationale similar to that held by the Mott Foundation and many community educators. He explained:

Thus education is viewed as the process of responding to community needs to the end that constructive growth takes place. This means, in part, that all the people in the community can be served by education... and parents, social and cultural groups, business and industry, the clergy, the human service agencies, etc., are all integral parts of the educational system. They participate in two ways; as consumers with needs that can be addressed by educational services, and as producers who contribute directly to the education of others. Consequently, in community education the entire community and its resources... are orchestrated to expand learning for all.

While there has by no means been a dearth of writings dealing with the community agencies specifically mentioned by Fantini, a few authors on community education have referred to these groups. Gordon, Lang, Nixon, Rockwood, and Wilson (1972) did say this about the relationship between health services and community education:

Indispensable to a healthy society is the dispensing to all of medical knowledge and service as a part of our changing value system.... The goals, then, of community education are to provide... extended medical services, and enact an instructional system for health and physical education aimed at the achievement and maintenance of healthful living. (pp. 179-180)

Cwik, King and VanVorhees (1976), after compiling areas studied and areas needing research within community education, concluded that research related to role delineations among community agencies concerning health services needed not even additional, but rather
preliminary, study. That recommendation perhaps speaks to the degree of attention being provided by those practicing within the traditional community education profession. However, this does not mean that no one is dealing with how health education and services can be disseminated to local communities. The Kalamazoo County Health Department in Michigan, for example, has a full-time staff person who is responsible for disseminating information concerning health-related matters to local community members. Additionally, this awareness within the health field of the need to educate the community is by no means limited to Kalamazoo County or even to the State of Michigan, as similar functions are being acted upon throughout the country.

Regarding the role of the clergy in community education, Piotrowski (1978) argued that churches and organized religion are essential to the implementation of community education, as he maintained that the individual and the community must be educated and developed simultaneously if community education is to ever reach its potential. Others have taken this belief and put it into operation; selected churches in at least two states (Tennessee and Michigan) have been adopted by local citizens to serve as the centers for local community education programs. Given that these efforts are by their nature rather grass-root in their orientation and operation, they have received almost no publicity on a wide scale. However, it seems reasonably safe to assume that community members in states aside from those mentioned have elected to use religious settings for the bases of local community education centers.
It therefore seems reasonable to surmise that while the question of whether community education should be solely school-based may be important in the assignment of particular definitions of community education, it has little bearing upon the efforts of local communities to educate themselves. Settings within the areas of business and industry, health, religion, and undoubtedly many others, are presently being utilized to operationalize what many individuals deem to be appropriate definitions of community education.

**Education Oriented Versus Social Problem Oriented Community Education**

The third element of community education addressed by Weaver (1972a) is whether community education should be education oriented or social problem oriented. In discussing this issue, Weaver stated:

> Those who develop community education theory must decide whether or not the community education process is to be organized to deal with current social issues. If not, how is the distinction to be made between those issues considered "social" and those defined as "educational"? (p. 156)

As much as this dilemma has arisen from a philosophical base, the question of the extent to which community educators involve themselves in social problems has come about through experience. In their efforts to implement not only community education programs, but also a community education process, some practitioners in the field have become enveloped in the realities of social problems which impact upon their communities. Often times this awareness of social issues has in turn produced the realization that a great need exists for varying forms of community leadership. The question of where to
draw the line relative to his/her own involvement has then surfaced which has caused the practitioner to react in one of the following ways:

1. He/she has been unable to determine the appropriate extent of his/her involvement, and thus has vacillated between the roles of traditional educator and social activist.

2. He/she has elected to move into the arena of directly dealing with social problems.

3. He/she has elected to move into the arena of indirectly dealing with social problems.

4. He/she has elected not to move into the arena of directly or indirectly dealing with social problems.

Perhaps an illustration will provide additional clarity. Assume that in a given community, the community education director has previously been involved in primarily programmatic areas. Recently, however, he/she has increasingly become exposed to the local decision-making process. Through his/her involvement with members of the community, it has become apparent to the director that a certain section of the community—the area where the poorer people live—is badly in need of a new sewer system. These poorer citizens realize their need, and are begging the director for assistance, since they don't know where else to go for help. Community members who don't live in the poorer section of town, however, are stating very clearly to the director that the sewer system "on the other side of town" does not need replacement, since a new system would bring about an increase in taxes.
Community educators, seemingly without exception, are confronted with similar questions relating to how "education" should be interfaced with current social issues—whether or not community education necessitates becoming involved in community development, in community organizing, in the community political structure.

As might be expected, individual community education professionals respond to this dilemma in varying fashions. Resultantly, several schools of thought pertaining to both the appropriate roles for community education practitioners and ultimate goal of community education exist among those in the field. These schools of thought range from those who maintain that community education practitioners should restrict themselves to providing leadership in only those matters directly related to traditionally defined educational realms, to those who maintain that it is incumbent upon community educators to do whatever they can, if improvements in the community may result. These latter roles may include providing leadership in the physical improvements of a community, organizing the local citizenry, to counter the existing power structure or training lay persons how to empower themselves.

While the social issues that are most frequently discussed by professionals in community education are those that affect local communities, debate is not limited exclusively to local issues. On the national community education front, current societal issues are being raised. With members in all 50 states, the National Community Education Association (NCEA) is often the locus for discussion of social questions. Recently, the question of equal involvement for
minorities within the association itself has been raised. Pursuantly, a task force was assembled last year to draft policies and procedures for an Affirmative Action Plan for NCEA. That draft, which includes provisions for ethnic and racial minorities, women, and the handicapped, is being discussed by the association's Board of Directors, with Board action expected to take place later this year.

A topic related to affirmative action which the association has addressed is NCEA's involvement toward ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). Within the association's membership a vocal contingent is advocating that future NCEA national conventions not be held in any state whose legislature has not voted affirmatively on the ERA. While such a boycott has heretofore not occurred, the vociferousness of some members does suggest a desire on their part to have an association-wide position taken on a contemporary societal and political issue.

Equally significant to NCEA's courtship with the Equal Rights Amendment was the organization last year of the Black Alliance of Community Educators. The alliance was ostensibly formed out of a feeling on the part of some minority members of the association that NCEA either could not or was not adequately addressing the needs of black people throughout the country. The Black Alliance therefore has chosen to deal with minority related social issues on its own, while at the same time continues to maintain an affiliate relationship with NCEA. Moreover, since the formation of the Black Alliance, some individuals in NCEA have cried out, albeit in a somewhat stifled fashion, for the organization of Chicanos who are involved in the
community education movement.

In summarizing this discussion of community education affiliation with social issues, at least one point is quite obvious: There is a group, albeit a group whose size has not been determined, within the membership of community educators who advocate a social activist role for community educators. As far removed as this stance may be from the earlier days when the community educator was involved in activities which approached being solely program oriented, the debate over social activism's place in the community education philosophy is at hand, and without question will garner increasing attention in the future.

Citizen Advisement Versus Citizen Empowerment in Community Education

The final element discussed by Weaver (1972a) concerned the implementation and operation of community education within a hierarchical organization vs. community education as a social system. The thrust of this discussion was the degree to which the day to day functions of community education should be funneled through a formal institutional structure. Weaver went on to ask whether the rather rigid set of role expectations which inherently are present in a hierarchical organization are facilitative to the implementation of the community education philosophy.

Since the time of the Weaver article, little attention, at least in print, appears to have been given to this question. One possible explanation for this void is that individual community educators have
in some way answered this question for themselves and have thus ignored the matter beyond the point of personal resolution. However, another question related to the essence of community education has recently been heatedly contested, and this question may well have had its roots in Weaver's question. That question relates to the degree of local citizen participation and involvement which community educators should collectively espouse. Parson (1979) approached this issue when he posited:

The literature of community education has always placed abundant emphasis on community involvement. The philosophy of the movement has always been based on the concept of people becoming involved in a process of identifying their own problems, and then bringing the resources of the community to bear on these problems in a coordinated fashion. (p. 155)

In continuing, however, Parson maintained:

Article after article has been published about the means to achieve community involvement through community advisory councils, community surveys, public hearings, and many more. However, after all the rhetoric about community involvement, community educators admit privately that community involvement really is not happening in their communities. They are usually quick to add that they are working on it and soon people in their community will be meaningfully involved. (p. 155)

The query which can be immediately and readily extracted from Parson's discussion is what constitutes citizens being "meaningfully involved" and who decides this constitution. Kaplan and Tune (1978) described what they saw as five levels of citizen participation in education. At the first level, which they labeled citizen support, citizens provide support for decisions made by professionals, and donate their time for the carrying out of these professionally reached decisions. This level of support rarely involves making decisions or
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determining policy.

The second level of involvement, which Kaplan and Tune called citizen advisement, takes place when citizens go beyond tacit support to voice their own feelings and positions to the actual decision makers. However, at this second level citizens do not make final decisions.

At level three, citizen sharing in certain decisions, citizens share responsibility with professionals for certain, but not all, decisions. It is important to note that even though participation occurs regarding some issues, citizens may not be involved at all in other questions.

Kaplan and Tune described level four as citizens sharing in all decisions. As implied in the label, citizens involved at level four are not limited in the issues they address. Equally important, citizens have the same power as professional educators at this level.

Level five, citizen control, takes place when citizens have final authority for decision making, while the professional staff have responsibility for implementing those decisions.

Davies (1973) discussed the general framework for citizen participation as consisting of (a) governing boards, which have legal authority for programs, budget, and personnel; (b) decision-making groups, which have authority only in specific decision-making areas; and (c) advisory committees, which simply advise the professionals.

Arnstein (1971) described citizen participation as occurring at eight possible levels. Similar to the levels presented by Kaplan and Tune, and in fact a precursor to their work, Arnstein stated that
community members become involved in decision making in ways that primarily encompass (a) manipulation, (b) therapy, (c) informing, (d) consultation, (e) placation, (f) partnership, (g) delegated power, or (h) citizen control. In elaborating, however, Arnstein concluded:

The bottom rungs of the ladder are (1) Manipulation and (2) Therapy. These two rungs describe levels of "nonparticipation" that have been contrived by some to substitute for genuine participation. Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable powerholders to "educate" or "cure" the participants. Rungs 3 and 4 progress to levels of "tokenism" that allow the have-nots to hear and have a voice: (3) Informing and (4) Consultation. (pp. 72-73)

She continued:

Rung (5), Placation, is simply a higher level of tokenism because the groundrules allow have-nots to advise, but retain for the powerholders the continued right to decide. . . . Citizens can enter into a (6) Partnership that enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional powerholders. At the topmost rungs, (7) Delegated Power and (8) Citizen Control, have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power. (p. 73)

Thus, it can be seen that the terms citizen involvement, citizen participation, citizen control, and citizen empowerment are not static; they can represent a broad range of citizen input, from the support or advisement of professionals to control over those same professionals.

Without question, many professionals in community education have endorsed the philosophy of citizen participation. While documentation of these endorsements is abundant, the following represents the thoughts of many community educators. In an article entitled "Community Involvement: Cornerstone of Community Education," VanNess (1975) said:
Each person must decide what is enriching or growth facilitating for himself or herself. But establishing community involvement through councils, task forces, or individual volunteer efforts is the essence of community education as well as the backbone of a vibrant democracy. (p. 6)

Weaver (1972b) offered that: "If developmental community education is nothing else, it is the informed participation of community residents in the events which determine the quality of their lives" (p. 11). There are those, however, who argue that historically community educators have on the whole fostered only the most superficial of forms of community involvement. Fried (1978) maintained that:

Community educators have in recent years placed growing emphasis on citizen participation as a cornerstone to the creation of successful community education programs. But there's been an unfortunate tendency, at times, to see citizen participation as some sort of commodity, as part of a community education "check off" list, along with a logo and a letter of support from the school board. (p. 10)

Cwik et al. (1977) raised a similar point:

On the one hand, community educators advocate community involvement in decision making, a stand that is likely to incur the wrath of the power elite. Yet, on the other hand, can community education ever really exist without real community involvement in the decision process? The danger is that the community educator will be co-opted into believing the community is involved when in reality, it is not. (p. 44)

It seems reasonably safe to state that most community educators have, historically, equated community involvement with citizen support for or advisement to professionals, or at the very most, with citizens participating in certain decisions. In other words, the degree of community involvement which has transpired within the purview of the community education concept has not gone beyond level three of Kaplan and Tune's (1978) paradigm. While these degrees of
involvement have appeared to have satisfied the practical and moral dilemmas of community practitioners heretofore, there is a segment within the rank and file of community educators today who are asserting that community involvement in community education must move citizens toward empowering themselves. While the highly emotional pitch of this position has apparently prevented these proponents of citizen control from publically asserting their positions, this researcher has heard several highly-respected community educators advocate "community unions" which would strive for the total autonomy of community groups and neighborhoods. It therefore appears that while there are those in the community education profession who maintain as did Melby (1977) that: "Experience with community control has not been impressive, but community involvement seems to give us the advantages originally hoped for from community control, and at the same time to avoid some of its difficulties" (pp. 41-43). There are also those within the profession who believe that citizen empowerment, not involvement, is what community education should operationally seek to bring about.

Conclusion

Thus, the previous discussion illustrates the difficulty of defining the concept of community education. Still, there appears to be a need to develop a definition, if only to facilitate the undertaking of this study. What then is community education? As defined here, it is a process of facilitating the growth and fulfillment of members of a community by structuring for the optimal use of available resources through appropriate planning, organizing, implementing,
controlling, and evaluating. For the purposes of this study, a community is defined as a group of individuals, sufficiently small in number that each member is theoretically capable of engaging in sufficiently frequent and intense interaction with the majority of other members, which is bonded together by common needs, wants, goals, values, interests, geography, or resources.

Community education is implemented under the auspices of a leadership body which: (a) is recognized by the majority of community members as being legitimate; (b) has an acceptable degree of organizational structure so that it is capable of reflecting the needs, desires, culture, and mores of the community; (c) is capable of securing and managing necessary resources; and (d) is unlikely to be co-opted by either its own or a community subgroup's special interests.

What Is the Relationship Between Leadership and Community Education?

Earlier discussion of leadership defined that concept as the process of moving members of a social system toward a goal or goals. A social system was defined as a group of individuals who are bound together by some unity of purpose and interdependence with one another.

Previous discussion of community education defined that concept as the process of facilitating the growth and fulfillment of members of a community by structuring for the optimal use of available resources through appropriate planning, organizing, implementing, controlling, and evaluating. It was also stated that the concept of
community education can be and has been implemented through the involvement of many segments of the community: the educational sector, the private sector, the religious sector, and the human service sector, to name a few.

One can now ask if leadership has any relationship to community education; the answer, as obvious as it might be, is a resounding yes. Many authors within the field of community education have expounded upon this subject, and four of them are included here. In 1972, McClusky wrote:

Basic to any discussion of leadership are the questions, who leads whom, in what functions, by what authority, and for what purposes? For community education, the answers are multiple and pluralistic. Leadership in community education is many things, belongs to many agencies, and may be expected at different levels in the local-national continuum. (p. 163)

In 1974, Weaver and Seay, in a book by Seay and Associates, succinctly said: "Implementation and dissemination of the community education concept requires leaders" (p. 119). Kimbrough (1977) asserted that: "Central to the developing concept of community education is that educators must furnish leadership for the education of all people in concert with the leaders of other institutions of the society" (p. 25). In 1978, Clark and Stefurak stated:

All educational endeavors necessitate leadership but never has the particular leadership approach been so crucial as when trying to bring about the consistent, productive dialogue necessary for establishing community education. (p. 128)

Yet this year, Schmitt and Weaver (1979) maintained that:

The core of the successful practice of community education lies within the quality of leadership that implements that practice . . . and that . . . it is our belief that the
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The training of leaders in community education is the most important function required to insure continuation of viable community education programs and processes. (Introduction, pp. xiv-xv)

As McClusky suggested, leadership in community education means many things. In responding to the question who leads whom, one must say that it depends. At the local level, who leads whom depends upon the level of citizen involvement which exists. Depending upon the level of this citizen involvement, the citizens may be leading themselves, making all of their own decisions, and may be utilizing professional staff only in the implementation of those decisions. It may be the professionals in a different community who are making all the decisions. In other communities, varying levels of leadership along the citizen-professional continuum may be occurring, such as shared authority and responsibility between the two groups. Also at the local level, leadership may be exerted by coalitions consisting of representatives of agencies and other institutions involved in the delivery of services and representatives of lay citizens. Again, the authority and sophistication of such coalitions varies from community to community.

At the state and regional level, leadership in community education is provided to local decision makers largely through the efforts of three groups: State Departments of Education, Centers for Community Education affiliated with state colleges or universities, and State Community Education Associations. These institutions are often times most involved in the providing of technical assistance to local communities.
Nationally, leadership is provided to local and state community education agencies primarily through two bodies: the National Community Education Association and, on a selected project basis, by the U. S. Office of Education. The former is a membership organization which provides assistance to its constituents who occupy positions as lay citizens or as local practitioners, or as professionals working for State Departments of Education or colleges or universities. The latter is involved in the coordination of financial support by the federal government for local, state, or regional level community education projects.

**What Is a Leadership Skill?**

The term skill, as it has been applied to the scrutinization of leadership, is a rather recent phenomenon. The methodology of investigating the performance of leadership according to the skills exhibited by an individual began to achieve its popularity in the 1950s. Scholars of leadership who had previously been steeped in the tradition of studying leadership traits came to realize that the all pervasiveness of investigating what leaders are (in other words, their traits) had resulted in a rather serious void, as the delineation of leaders' traits did not appear to explain the totality of the concept of leadership.

In 1955, Robert L. Katz wrote what has become a watershed work in the field of leadership, an article entitled "Skills of an Effective Administrator." In the early pages of that article, Katz offered what he felt might be an alternate manner for studying
leadership. He stated:

It is the purpose of this article to suggest what may be a more useful approach to the selection and development of administrators. This approach is based not on what good executives are (their innate traits and characteristics), but rather on what they do (the kinds of skills which they exhibit in carrying out their jobs effectively). (p. 90)

In continuing, Katz (1955) said:

As used here, a skill implies an ability which can be developed, not necessarily inborn, and which is manifested in performance, not merely in potential. So the principle criterion of skillfulness must be effective action under varying conditions. (p. 90)

Over the last 25 years, the investigation of the skills of leaders has assumed an important role in the study of leadership. While the Katz article was written within the profession of business and management, its logic was adopted by those in other professions as well, including those in the field of educational administration. However, a general review of studies of leader skills produces some rather interesting observations.

In spite of Katz' articulation that a skill is manifest in performance and action, not merely in potential, scholars have with some regularity been indiscriminate in their definition of skills. Items which, at least according to Katz' definition, might be more closely aligned with personality traits, personal attitudes, or individual goals, have nevertheless been described as skills by a variety of researchers. For example, "being trustworthy" and "being caring" have been labeled as skills by several authors. The result of such indiscrimination has been the introduction of a degree of confusion and inconsistency into the collection of literature pertaining to the
skills of leaders.

Based upon the intent of the original definition provided by Katz, the concept of a skill has two major components. Boles (1979) has identified these as (a) a knowledge component and (b) an execution component. He offered the illustration of the skill required in playing the piano. In order to produce some form of melody, one must both understand the theory and techniques of musical arrangement, keeping time, chordal sounds, and the like, and must also have the dexterity to move one's fingers along the keyboard in an acceptable fashion. Hence, it is not enough to understand music theory, nor is it enough to be able to move one's fingers in a particular way; one must have both the knowledge and the ability to execute if one is to possess the skill of piano playing. This same logic, as ascribed to by Katz and Boles, may be applied to any other skill.

A number of definitions of the term skill are available; however, the definition which seems most consistent with the intent of Katz can be found in Webster's Dictionary (Seventh Edition): "the ability to use one's knowledge effectively and readily in execution or performance" (p. 815). This definition was adopted for this study.

What Is a Leadership Skill Area?

A second major contribution made by Katz (1955) was to divide the skills required of leaders into three major areas: technical, human, and conceptual. While he stated that it would undoubtedly be unrealistic to assert that skills falling under the various areas are not interrelated, he did believe, as have scores of other researchers
subsequently, that there is merit in examining each skill area separately and developing each area independently.

Katz defined technical skills as those skills which are needed in a specific kind of activity, particularly those involving procedure, method, and process. Of the three skill areas, technical skills are the most widely recognized and utilized.

Conceptual skills were defined as those which involve the ability to see the totality of an enterprise or situation; they include recognizing the interdependence of various organizational functions, and also how a particular organization fits into the larger scheme of things, such as how an individual business relates to the industrial, community, political, social, and economic forces of the nation.

The third area, human skills were defined as the ability to work effectively as a member of a group, and to build cooperation among members of an organization. Katz said that as technical skills focus primarily upon working with "things," such as physical objects or organizational processes, human skills are primarily concerned with working with people. Katz went on to say that:

The person with highly developed human skill is aware of his own attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs about other individuals and groups; he is able to see the usefulness and limitations of these feelings. By accepting the existence of viewpoints, perceptions, and beliefs which are different from his own, he is skilled in understanding what others really mean by their words and behavior. He is equally skillful in communicating to others, in their own contexts, what he means by his behavior. (p. 91)

Elsewhere he said: "This [human] skill is demonstrated in the way the individual perceives (and recognizes the perceptions of) his superiors, equals, and subordinates, and in the way he behaves.
subsequently" (p. 91).

Hersey and Blanchard (1977) provided a more succinct definition of a human skill. They defined it as "the ability and judgment in working with and through people" (p. 7). Therefore, while there is no significant difficulty with Katz' definition, it is the Hersey and Blanchard definition which has been utilized during the course of this study.

What Is the Current Status of Leadership Skills and Community Education?

One of the earliest attempts to identify the specific skills required of leaders in community education was undertaken by the Mott Inter-University Leadership Training Program located in Flint, Michigan. This program, which brought together resources from seven universities in Michigan from 1964 to 1974, sought to provide training to individuals working toward master's and doctoral degrees in community education. Using the Katz (1955) typology as its framework, the Leadership Training Program delineated five technical skills, eight conceptual skills, and 12 human skills which were thought to be needed by community educators (Mott Leadership Center, 1970). It is necessary to point out, however, that the listing of requisite skills—or at least the listing of human skills—was developed rather arbitrarily. Indeed, if a shortcoming of many of the studies concerned with descriptors of human skills for community educators were to be voiced, that disquiet might well relate to the rather serendipitous manner in which many of those skill listings have been developed. Personal
perceptions alone have been used rather frequently to justify the contents of human skill listings, and only occasionally have these listings been subjected to any form of substantive and scientific rigor.

The first significant research investigation of the leadership skills of community educators was commenced by Weaver (1972c). In a national study of community educators (primarily) in higher education positions, he utilized the Katz typology to identify the perceptions of his population concerning general areas of skills. Subsequent to those initial efforts by the Mott Training Program (1970) and by Weaver (1972c), other scholars began studying skills for community educators. As Zemlo (1977) said: "A number of investigators have included discussions in the skills inherent in the community educators' role in their work: Lisicich, 1976; Kliminski, 1974; Johnson, 1973; Weaver, 1972; and Becker, 1972" (p. 20).

Prout (1978), Zemlo and Belcher (1978), and Zemlo (1977) can be added to that litany. The commonality among the studies conducted by the above mentioned researchers is that all focused upon populations of individuals affiliated with school based community education programs or processes. As was previously mentioned in this study, it appears that any form of scientific inquiry concerning skills for community educators in non-school-based programs or processes has heretofore not been undertaken.

Lisicich (1976) surveyed Directors of Regional Centers for Community Education, community education directors in K-12 school districts, and community school principals in California. The purpose
of the study was to determine both the skills and training components which should be included in training programs for community educators.

Kliminski (1974) attempted to assess the skills of successful directors of community K-12 schools in Michigan. Although the primary intent of this study was to determine if the skill levels of successful community education directors differed significantly from the skill levels of other directors in similar positions, the study also served as one of the earlier efforts to delimit specific technical, conceptual, and human skills for community educators from the larger skill areas. For example, the following were identified by Kliminski (1974) as constituting human skills for a community educator:

1. He deals with others with whom he works so as to be perceived as patient, understanding, considerate and courteous.

2. He encourages staff suggestions and criticisms.

3. He delineates clearly the expectations held for members of groups he works with.

4. He criticizes ideas of group members without being perceived as criticizing the person himself.

5. In leading a group he is able to maintain a balanced concern for the task at hand and group morale.

6. He demonstrates initiative and persistence in goal attainment.

7. He takes calculated "risks" in his job.

8. He delegates responsibility.

9. He demonstrates in-depth knowledge of the field of Community Education.

10. He maintains personal composure and control in the face of conflict and frustration.
11. He is able to lead groups comprised of members over whom he exerts no real authority.

12. He conveys empathy and concern for others.

13. He is able to resolve misunderstandings and conflicts between groups/persons with whom he works.

14. He is able to get people to work together.

15. He is able to work with people who have different degrees of authority. (pp. 139-140)

Kliminski's (1974) study provides an excellent example of the fashion in which human skills for community educators both have been and continue to be approached by researchers. First, it should be noted that the Kliminski study made a noteworthy contribution to the body of knowledge pertaining to community education. The study's efforts to either pull together existing information on skills for community educators or, when necessary, to further delimit skill areas, called attention to the need for some specificity when speaking of leadership skills. Moreover, the Kliminski (1974) study continues to be one of the most significant studies of human skills for community educators, albeit school-based community educators, yet conducted.

On the other hand, the methodology used in the Kliminski (1974) study to identify specific human skills was not articulated. Thus the listing itself, in spite of the overall merit of the study, might be held suspect by some researchers. This possible shortcoming is further magnified, in that the Kliminski listing of human skills has been utilized by several researchers who have conducted studies of leadership skills for community educators.
Johnson (1973) developed a leadership training model for community education directors in local school districts. That model focused upon 12 leadership functions, of which each function involved a mix of technical, conceptual, and human skills required of the leader.

Pursuant to Weaver's (1972c) interviews with community educators throughout the country, he determined that the particular requirements of leaders in community education depend to a great extent upon the nature of the community in which the leader functions. Weaver posited that two models of community education exist. Model one, the "conventional" model, assumed a stable community in which a school-based, program-oriented concept of community education is implemented. The "emerging" model, on the other hand, assumed an unstable community, in which widespread dissatisfaction, disorganization, and general societal malaise is present. Weaver maintained that it is the latter model which is becoming predominant at the present time. Additionally, he maintained that while a charismatic and loyal leader was often required in communities aligned with the "conventional" model, leaders in emerging models will need even greater skill levels in the technical and conceptual areas, in order to identify and work in dissatisfied and disorganized communities. In speaking to the need for human skills, however, Weaver (1974) suggested:

Components which could be considered necessary to the development of human skill are (a) communications, theory and practice, (b) public relations, (c) group process participation and analysis, (d) social problem analysis, and (e) personality theory development. (p. 134)
Prout (1978) surveyed graduates of Western Michigan University's doctoral program in community education. Respondents rated what they perceived to be their skill levels at four points in their careers: before they began the doctoral program, their expected skill level after completing the program, their actual skill level upon completing their doctoral degree, and their current skill level. Fifty items were included in the questionnaire, however, the items were not delineated according to individual skill areas.

Hickey, Boulas, and Ray (1978), as part of a federal project intended to develop a model for utilizing the elementary school principal in the implementation of community school programs, also developed a subjective list of skills required of the principal. Skills in the three areas were stated and were divided according to specific functions and activities in which a community school principal might engage. Zemlo and Belcher (1978) undertook a similar project, in which they identified selected skills required of school based community educators in rural settings.

Leadership Skills Versus Leadership Competencies in Community Education

In order to adequately discuss the current status of leadership skills in community education, still another term must be introduced: that term is competencies. As Cookingham (1979) said:

There is a trend toward viewing training for developing community from the perspective of enumerating key competencies and designing training programs to assist trainers in attaining specific levels for them (Arkava and Brennen, 1976; Ball State University, 1976; Casale, 1977; Farquar, 1977; Flores, 1975; Foelber, 1976; Grigsby, 1974; Johnson,

As one peruses this listing of studies, the temptation arises to ask whether or not competencies and skills are different. Unfortunately, it is difficult to resolve this question with a great deal of precision, as no community education scholars could be located who expressly dealt with this query. A review of the literature does suggest, however, that researchers in the field of community education who have studied needed leader competencies have made little, if any, distinction between competencies and skills. Many illustrations of this point can be found, although it is not necessary to include them all. One example is the paper produced by Ball State University (1976) which Cookingham referred to entitled Community Educator Competencies. This paper stated that "A trained community educator must possess a wide range of competencies to be effective" and that competencies represent "a specific capability to rise to the needs of a problem with a sufficient amount of skill or expertise for success."

At a later point in the paper, however, it emphasized that "It is intended that course participants will use this competencies/skills assessment instrument in . . . a critical analysis of person competencies/skills already possessed" (pp. 1-2).

An equally interchangeable use of the concepts of the terms competencies and skills can be found in Mullarney (1977). In several places in this work, the author either substituted the word "competencies" for "skills" when quoting other authors, or placed the word competencies in parentheses, following the use of the word skills.
The following quotation taken from the report may serve as an illustration of this occurrence: "Leadership skills (competencies) should be classified into three broad areas: technical, conceptual, and human relations" (p. 7). At another point in the study, Mullarney (1977) referred to Kliminski's (1974) "identification and separation of competencies . . ." (p. 14). Actually, Kliminski used the word "skills" to refer to the subject of his own work. As a point of clarification, and as was the case in another section of this study, the illustration of such discrepancies is in no way intended to be a criticism of the above-cited studies; rather it is intended only to illustrate that the terms competencies and skills are often used interchangeably by community education researchers, and therefore no apparent need is felt by many scholars to differentiate between the two terms.

Miller (1977) did speak to what might be the conceptual framework generally adhered to by scholars of community education competencies. He concluded:

In the literature competency is defined as "the presence of characteristics or the absence of disabilities which render a person fit, or qualified, to perform a specified task or to assume a defined role" (McCleary and Brown, 1974). This definition emphasizes two concepts: (1) the specification of defined tasks, and (2) indication of knowledge or skill needed to perform the tasks. (pp. 4-5)

Moreover, Miller (1977) further spelled out the conceptualization of a competency when he said:

A competency statement is written in molar form so that it can be broken down into technical, conceptual, and human components and the level of competence (familiarity, understanding, and application) can be specified. (p. 6)
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Mullarney (1977), in quoting two well-known authors on the subject of competencies, offered that: "Brown and McCleary (1974) describe a process of identifying and defining leadership competencies, delineating them into the previously mentioned components: technical, human, and conceptual" (p. 7).

It should parenthetically be stated that Miller (1977) and Mullarney (1977) were the project directors of two of the largest and most detailed studies conducted within the community education profession during the past two years. Hence, it seems somewhat reasonable to posit that the Katz (1955) typology of technical, conceptual, and human skill areas has been deemed equally applicable to studies of leadership competencies in community education. This further suggests that, for the most part, no significant distinction between the respective definitions of competencies and skills has been made by community education researchers.

The one distinction which does appear worthy of some mention relates to the levels of competence referred to by Miller (1977) and others (Brown & McCleary, 1974; Feldvebel, 1974). While it was previously mentioned that some agreement seems to exist that there are two components inherent in a skill—a knowledge component and an execution or dexterity component—Miller (1977) stated that there appear to be three levels of competence. He stated:

These levels were defined as follows:

Familiarity: Knows about the procedures and methods implied by the statement; can discuss it intelligently and follow explanations or analyses without having to be taught about it.
Understanding: Can explain, analyze methods and procedures used and exercise judgment about adequacy of procedures and judgments implied by the statement. Can teach others about it.

Application: Can apply or actually carry out the procedures and judgments implied by the statement; can directly demonstrate to and supervise others in performing procedures and making judgments. (p. 26)

These explanations do lead to the formation of the following opinion: Although it does not appear that researchers of community education have made any significant distinction between leadership skills and leadership competencies, actual differences may exist. While it seems that a leader's basic familiarity with the procedures and methods implied in a given situation is alone sufficient to deem that person as possessing a certain level of competence, the same cannot be said in relation to his or her skills. Although knowledge alone may serve as an adequate criterion of competence, knowledge alone is not an adequate criterion of skill, as both knowledge and execution together are inherent in the latter. Therefore, it may be concluded that if one has proficiency on all three levels spoken of by Miller (1977)--familiarity, understanding, and application--that person may also be said to possess skills. On the other hand, if one has proficiency on only the levels of familiarity or understanding, or both, that person, while not possessing skills, may be said to have certain competencies.

In spite of the fact that this study focused upon skills, given the brotherhood, if not Siamese twinship, which appears to exist in the literature between skills and competencies, certain studies of leadership competencies for community educators should also be
As was mentioned, Miller (1977) and Mullarney (1977) undertook two of the most involved studies of community education leadership competencies yet conducted. In the Miller study, profiles of real and ideal competency levels were identified for professionals in four positions: school superintendents, school principals, district coordinators of community education, and building level community education directors. Individuals from each of these positions participated in the study, and it is interesting to note that all four groups expressed a need for strengthening their competencies in certain areas of what may be called human skills: the superintendents in strategies for conflict management, human relations skills, and effective communication methods and channels; the principals in role clarification; the district coordinators in human relations skills; and the building directors in staff development.

The Mullarney (1977) study sought to identify a priority listing of leadership competencies which community residents perceive as being important to persons identified as community leaders. Thirty-nine articulated competencies for leaders were presented to 679 community members. All of the respondents resided in the Northeastern section of the United States, approximately one-half in urban areas and the other half in rural areas. The results of the study indicated that community residents succeeded in placing the 39 competencies into nine cluster areas. These cluster areas were then ranked by the respondents according to their perceived importance for community leaders. Additionally, the study indicated that urban and rural
community members do not differ in their respective opinions concerning the importance of the individual leadership competencies.

Foelber (1976) polled community education directors, building principals, and members of community advisory councils, the intent of this polling being to determine the competencies required of community education directors. For the purposes of the study, competencies were divided into technical, conceptual, and human/personal skill areas. The results of the study indicated that human/personal competencies were rated by the respondents as being more important than either technical or conceptual competencies. The following human/personal competencies were ranked among the highest: has high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn if adequate opportunity is had; is accessible; is a person of honesty and high integrity. As a point of interest, however, the Lisicich (1976) study, which utilized a very similar methodology and population to Foelber's (1976) study, revealed that conceptual competencies appear most important, followed by human and then technical competencies.

What Is the Relationship Between Environmental Factors and Leadership?

The environment of organizations is a critical factor in understanding what goes on in and about an organization (Hall, 1972). Moreover, the point has already been made that the environment is extremely important to the leader's determination of how to best go about guiding his or her followers (hereafter the term environment refers to the environment of an organization or social system.)
While research can be found relating to the marriage of environmental factors and leadership behaviors, much of this research is mildly ambiguous at best. The handling of the phrase "environmental factors" itself has been undertaken in a number of manners. Some scholars have maintained that the environment of an organization refers to phenomena outside of the organization's own purview. Rogers and Agarwala-Rogers (1976), for example, offered the following definition: "The environment is the totality of physical and social factors external to a system's boundary that are directly taken into consideration in the decision-making behavior of individuals in the system" (p. 61). Castetter (1976), on the other hand, said in speaking of educational systems that: "Environmental influences that shape the existence and development of school systems are both internal and external" (p. 25). In continuing, he summarized discussions of the definition of organizational environments in the following way: "Environment is generally defined as the aggregate of surrounding things, conditions, or influences which affect the existence or development of someone or something" (p. 25). Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (1967) presented an extremely similar definition: "environment: the aggregate of social and cultural conditions that influence the life of an individual or community" (p. 278).

In spite of the merit of defining the organizational environment as an aggregation, however, it does not appear adequate to stop at this point. It seems that before meaningful discussion of the concept can take place, it is necessary to provide some specificity as to what things, conditions, or influences actually constitute the
environment. In his effort to address this need, Hall (1972) sug-
gested:

To approach the topic [the environment of organizations] somewhat systematically, let us divide environmental con-
ditions into two categories. The first contains those general conditions that must be of concern to all organi-
zations—the economy, demographic changes, and so on. . . . The second category contains specific environmental influ-
ences on the organization, such as other organizations with which it interacts or particular individuals who are crucial to it. (p. 303)

He then went on to state that the following general conditions affect virtually all organizations: technological conditions, legal conditions, political conditions, economic conditions, demographic conditions, ecological conditions (including physical location), and cultural conditions. Castetter (1976) included these same conditions as part of what he called the external environment of an organization, and for the purposes of this study, this taxonomy is sufficiently self-explanatory as to require no further delineation.

In attempting to focus upon those factors internal to the organi-
zation which affect the behaviors of its leaders and followers, some disagreement concerning vocabulary often emerges. The term "culture" is used by some scholars to describe these internal factors. Other researchers employ the term "climate" to refer to these same factors. Still others utilize the phrase "internal environment" in referring to those conditions which exist within the organization and affect its behavior. Rogers and Agarwala-Rogers (1976) posited:

We have defined an organizational environment as lying entirely outside of the system's boundary. But there are physical and social factors somewhat akin to an environ-
ment which are located within the boundary of the organi-
zation; most scholars refer to these as the "climate" of
the organization in order to avoid semantic confusion with the concept of "environment." (p. 73)

Unfortunately, this distinction between "environment" and "climate" does not appear to be as clear-cut as the quotation stated above suggests. Therefore, in this study the term "environment" has been implemented to include phenomena either intrinsic or extrinsic to the organization.

It does seem reasonable to conclude that the factors within the organization have not benefitted from as much specificity as have those outside of the organization. Huse (1974), in using the term, "climate" to refer to the internal environment of an organization, cited two scholars who had reviewed a number of studies relating to organizational climate. The following paragraph is taken from Huse's (1974) work to offer an example of the present body of knowledge concerning the internal environments of organizations:

Hellriegel and Slocum [1974] critically reviewed 31 studies on a number of different dimensions of climate. . . . Their basic findings were that climate is an important factor in human behavior, but that most research has not been very rigorous and really has not contributed much to our overall knowledge about organizational climate. They suggest that although the concept of climate has "considerable potential for describing and understanding behavior of individuals within organizations . . . the movement from the conceptual to the (actual) measurement level has posed a number of problems and ambiguities which remain to be resolved." (p. 77)

Conceptually, it does appear that five major dimensions may be used to represent the internal environment or climate of an organization. They are: the purpose of the organization, the task dimension, the technology dimension, the structural dimension, and the people involved in the organization. One can see that if the purpose of an
organization is to make money, the behavior of the members of that organization might be quite different than if the purpose of that organization was philanthropic. Similarly, if the nature of the tasks which an organization undertakes are highly specialized, the behavior of the members might be considerably different than if the organization's tasks are extremely routine. If the technology of an organization is such that the plans and procedures are clearly and frequently spelled out, it might be expected that the members of the organization will function somewhat differently than they would if few plans and procedures existed within the organization. Likewise, if the system is structured so that authority is highly centralized in the organization, people's actions might be very different than if authority is structured in a highly decentralized manner. The people dimension of the internal environment was well spoken to by Zaleznik (1964), when he said:

The way the individual engages his environment at work . . . reflects his total developmental experience and the outcomes of the intra-psychic conflicts inherent in his development. We can say, therefore, that the environment imposes developmental conditions that become internalized and divorced from the environment. But the means by which an individual engages his environment—including persons, events, and settings—reflects the outcomes of the internalization process. (pp. 217-218)

Hersey and Blanchard (1976) presented a parallel perspective. They determined that the way people behave in the organization depends upon two factors: their own personal style of behaving and the expectations for appropriate behavior which they hold. The suggestion is that individuals are constantly comparing the expectations they hold for themselves and the expectations they perceive others in the
organization hold for them, with their own style of behaving. Consequently, the individual's actual behavior is the outcome of the considerations attached to their style and expectations.

Thus, it appears that the environment of an organization consists of numerous dimensions. Allowing for discrepancies in vocabulary, the organization's environment is influenced by factors both within and outside of the organization itself. The environment is comprised of technological, legal, political, economic, demographic, ecological, cultural, structural, interpersonal, task-related, and personal considerations which impact upon the styles and expectations individuals hold which define appropriate behavior in the organization or social system.

**Summary**

Several points, essential to determining the merit of this study, need to be made at this juncture. It is anticipated that the validity of these points, rather than being solely dependent upon personal biases, can be seen as a result of the literature reviewed in this chapter. Specifically, these points are:

1. Community education is an entity which requires leadership.
2. Although community education as a concept has historically been implemented in school based settings, there is evidence that the community education philosophy has lately been expanded to settings outside of school bases.
3. The population of individuals who are implementing community education in settings aside from schools has not been previously
researched in any way.

4. While efforts have been made to delineate leadership skills, a variety of definitions concerning the concept of skills has produced a rather large degree of inconsistency, confusion, and even contradiction within the research.

5. The area of human skills remains pristine relative to the quantity of research yet conducted, as the vast majority of discussion of human skills has been but a component of much larger discussion of either community education or leadership in general.

A study which addresses these five points is worthy of being conducted; this study fits such a categorization.

The next chapter is devoted to discussing the actual methodology used in the conducting of this study. The development of the HSDQ instrument is detailed, characteristics of the population are noted, and both the originally intended format and the modified format ultimately utilized in interviews with the subjects are presented.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Review of Purpose

The foci of this study were on the following:

1. A determination of selected human skills which community educators in expanding community education settings either perceive to be or perceive not to be generally practicable in their settings.

2. An identification of environmental factors which are perceived by community educators in expanding settings as either facilitating or as impeding the practicability of human skills.

Design of the Study

The investigation of the above mentioned foci was undertaken from two perspectives. The determination of selected human skills was approached through the development of a listing of descriptors related to human skills. The listing, in general terms, elicited from the respondent his or her perceptions of the practicabilities of the skills represented by the descriptors. A seven point scale was utilized in order to determine the respondent's perceptions of the degree of practicabilities of the skills.

The original design of the study called for environmental factors perceived by the interviewees to influence human skills practicability in the respective position to be identified through the use
of the Critical Incidents Technique (Flanagan, 1954). Those perceived environmental factors were then to be used to formulate categories of perceived factors facilitating human skills and perceived factors impeding human skills. That portion of the research design was revised as a result of an occurrence during the interview with the first respondent. An explanation of both the revised design for generating environmental factors and of that interview occurrence is included at a later point in this chapter.

Identification of the Population

The intent of this study was to address that population of community educators who are doctoral graduates of community education from Western Michigan University and have placed themselves in leadership positions in expanding community education settings. While it was originally thought that these six individuals would be identified by name and specific position, one of the respondents requested anonymity during the interview; therefore, the decision was made to leave all of the interviewees unnamed in the interest of continuity. It can be said, however, that the members of the population hold the following positions:

1. Division Director in charge of educational functions at the world headquarters of a denominational Christian church centered in a medium size city in the central United States.

2. Executive Director of a national, not for profit educational association centered in a large city in the southeastern United States.
3. Management Consultant in a specialized area of training for an extremely large, worldwide corporation headquartered in the Midwest.

4. Project Manager in the Division of Corporate Personnel for a large corporation centered in a medium-size Midwestern city.

5. Director of Training for a large corporation also centered in a medium-size city in the Midwest.


**Development of the Instrument**

It was previously determined that existing instruments which deal with human skills for community educators were not sufficiently applicable to this study to warrant their usage. It therefore became necessary to construct an instrument (listing) specifically oriented to the nature and intent of this study. It was decided that the development of a listing of human skills descriptors for community educators would best be approached by interfacing both a deductive and an inductive procedure for this task.

The writings of a number of scholars in the fields of educational leadership, communication arts, psychology, counseling, management, sociology, and community education were reviewed (Appendix A). A preliminary list of human skills which potentially applied to community education was drawn from the literature relating to the above-mentioned disciplines. One hundred and twenty-five items were collected in all. Assignment of particular descriptors to the preliminary
list was made subjectively; any descriptor which obviously either applied or did not apply, however, was given the benefit of the doubt and was initially included. These procedures comprised the deductive portion of the instrument development.

The inductive portion of the listing development involved the input of a panel of experts. The panel consisted of Dr. Donald Weaver, Director of the Community Leadership Training Center at Western Michigan University; Dr. Lee Vaught, Associate Director of the Center; Frank Cookingham, Brian Moroney, and Sesta Peekstock, all second year Mott Fellows at the Center; as well as doctoral candidates in educational leadership and community education at Western Michigan University. These individuals possess a wide range of professional experiences, extending from educational administration (Weaver) to English (Vaught) to educational research (Cookingham) to sociology (Moroney) to communication arts and sciences (Peekstock). Additionally, all are familiar with the field of community education and are attuned to the skill practices of doctoral level community educators. They were therefore well qualified to give input into the development of the listing of human skills descriptors.

The panel was convened for five sessions. The total length of time for the sessions was less than eight hours. The overall task of the panel was to produce a listing (arbitrarily named the Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire, or HSDQ) comprised of selected human skills descriptors for doctoral level community educators in expanding community education settings.
Session 1 took place on November 6, 1978. The panel was initially provided with a handout (Appendix A) which offered a listing of the definitions which were used throughout the sessions. The panel was also given a brief oral presentation of the conceptual framework which was subsequently followed by the group. The remainder of Session 1 was spent "brainstorming" (Stech & Ratliffe, 1976) as many potential descriptors of human skills as could be accomplished. To facilitate the brainstorming, the panel was provided with Boles' (1977) taxonomy for leadership. The panel utilized the taxonomy for approximately 15 minutes, then chose to disregard it. As the purpose for the taxonomy was only to stimulate the "brainstorming" process, the panel's decision was deemed acceptable.

Following Session 1 the descriptors generated in Session 1 were compared to those descriptors deduced from the literature. The outcome was that 51 newly identified descriptors were generated.

Session 2 was held on November 13, 1978. Again the session was commenced with the distribution of a handout (Appendix A). This handout was intended to address the issues raised in Session 1, particularly concerning definitions. The panel was next asked to review both the descriptors found in the literature and those generated in Session 1, and to voice whether or not the respective terms related more closely to specific human skills as opposed to individual personality traits, attitudes, or motivations. Consensus (three or more of the five panel members) of opinion was used as the criterion for retaining the respective items. The result was that 114 selected terms were retained by the panel.
In Session 3, which occurred on November 16, 1978, the panel was asked to refine the 114 terms retained after Session 2. An overview was presented orally which related to the panel's task of breaking down the skill items from Session 2 into, when possible, related sub-skills or component skills. The panel was then asked to refine the skill items for the remainder of the session. Thirty-six of the items were refined during the session, resulting in 88 sub-skills being generated. (Hereafter the 88 sub-skills will be called the first set of skill descriptors, or set 1).

Following Session 3, each panel member was provided with a written list of the 88 sub-skills generated in Session 3. The member was asked to rate each of the sub-skills on a four point scale, where:

1 = a poor descriptor of a human skill
2 = a fair descriptor of a human skill
3 = a good descriptor of a human skill
4 = a very good descriptor of a human skill

The panel members returned their ratings of the first set of sub-skills prior to Session 4. The mean score (of the scores of the five panel members) for each sub-skill was calculated, and was provided to the panel at the end of Session 4.

Session 4 was held on November 26, 1978. At that time the panel completed three tasks. The first assignment was to break down the remainder of the 114 skill items not refined in the previous session. The group had increased in expertise and readily defined 55 new sub-skills related to the remainder of the 114 skill items. (These 55 new sub-skills will be called the second set of skill descriptors, or set
2). The second task of the panel was to review the individual items comprising the first set of skill descriptors which they had rated between Sessions 3 and 4, and to formulate any changes in wording or syntax which they felt might improve the clarity of a particular descriptor. Whether or not a particular change was actually made was decided by the informal consensus of the group. The final portion of Session 4 was spent discussing individual items from the first set of descriptors. Panel members were provided with mean ratings for the descriptors, and were encouraged to offer their individual perspectives concerning any item or its mean rating.

Following Session 4 the panel members were provided with the second set of skill descriptors refined in the previous session and were asked to rate each descriptor in the same manner in which they had rated the first set. Panel members were instructed to bring their completed ratings to Session 5.

Session 5 took place on November 28, 1978. In this session the panel was asked to engage in the process of rewording items in the second set of descriptors, just as they had done for items in the first set during Session 4. Changes in wording or syntax were suggested by the panel for some descriptors, and those suggestions which received informal consensus were duly made.

The next portion of Session 5 was used to discuss any of the items of either the first or second sets. Suggestions for ratings changes were made by consensus.

The final portion of Session 5 was spent in thanking the individual panel members for their contributions of both time and expertise.
throughout the Delphi Process. Handwritten thank you letters were also provided to the respective panel members the following day.

Upon the completion of Session 5 the panel members were asked to rate both the first and second sets of skill descriptors a second time. Mean ratings were then computed for each skill descriptor. The decision was then made to establish a minimum mean rating of 3.0—which equates to a designation of at least a "good" descriptor—as requisite for a particular descriptor to be included in the final listing. This decision resulted in 92 descriptors being retained for the final listing (Appendix C). It should be noted that four additional descriptors were generated in Session 5. They were therefore subject to only one rating by the panel. The mean rating for those items was high (above 3.2) however. Given that a review of the variations in rating from the panel's first to second rating appeared, on the whole, to be small, a subjective decision was made to retain those four items for the final listing. At a later time a check was made for duplications of items. Resultantly, a final version of the HSDQ was comprised of only 90 items.

Conclusions Regarding the Instrument

A review of the data shows some intriguing results. One hundred and fourteen potential skill descriptors were induced from the literature and presented to the panel of experts in Session 1. Seventy-seven items potentially representing human skills were generated in that first session, 51 of which were not found in the literature. Resultantly, 164 potential items were identified. From that number, 113
items gained the consensus (at least three of the five panel members, or 60% of the members) of the group as being directly related to human skills as opposed to being related to other factors (personality traits, personal beliefs or values, personal attitudes or motivations).

In Sessions 3 and 4 the 113 items deemed as directly related to human skills were edited and expanded, resulting in 143 specific human skills descriptors (Appendix B). Following the sessions, the specific descriptors were rated by the panel; the rating scale ranged from:

1 = a poor descriptor of a human skill
2 = a fair descriptor of a human skill
3 = a good descriptor of a human skill
4 = a very good descriptor of a human skill

Means were calculated for the panel's responses, with the following results:

44 of 143 items (30.7%) received a mean rating of 3.5 or more
93 of 143 items (65.0%) received a mean rating of 3.0 or more
116 of 143 items (81.0%) received a mean rating of 2.5 or more
139 of 143 items (97.2%) received a mean rating of 2.0 or more

The second rating by the panel produced the following results:

43 of 143 items (30.1%) received a mean rating of 3.5 or more
92 of 143 items (64.3%) received a mean rating of 3.0 or more
122 of 143 items (85.3%) received a mean rating of 3.5 or more
140 of 143 items (97.9%) received a mean rating of 2.0 or more

It is also interesting to note that the mean of the mean ratings for all 143 items which the panel rated the first time was 3.097. The mean of the mean ratings for all 143 items which the panel rated the
second time was 3.088. In other words, the average rating assigned by the panel after Session 4 differed from the average rating assigned by the panel after Session 5 was less than .01.

Another point of interest is that of the 113 skill descriptors which initially received consensus, 64 came from the literature and 49 from the "brainstorming" session. While no definitive conclusion can be reached based upon this finding, it does suggest that some differences exist between what the literature as opposed to what a panel of experts define as constituting human skills. This conclusion is not considered to be very startling however, as an informal analysis showed quite clearly that differences in delineations of human skills exist within the literature itself.

Another view of the results seem to support the previous conclusion. Of the 114 potential skill descriptors drawn from the literature, only 64, or 56%, received the consensus of the panel as describing human skills. As might be expected—since the items were their own work—of the 60 items (expanded from the original 51 items) generated by the panel in the early sessions, 49, or 82%, received the consensus of the panel.

**Administration of the Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire (HSDQ)**

The Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire (HSDQ) was administered to the members of the population of community education leaders in expanding community education. The HSDQ consisted of 90 descriptors of human skills (Appendix C). The listing was laid out in such
a way that the respondents rated on a seven point scale the extent to
which they perceive that the practicabilities of the respective skills
are facilitated in their job settings.

Prior to responding to the skills described in the HSDQ, the
respondent was provided with a written handout which provided him or
her with background information and a conceptual framework from which
to rate the human skills (Appendix D). The interviewee was allowed
sufficient time to read and digest the content of the handout. Once
this task was completed, the respondent was asked to reread the last
paragraph of the handout (which discussed the definition of the term
practicability). This was done because of the rather technical nature
of the term. Lastly, the subject was asked if the instructions were
clear, and when they were not, any questions he or she had were
answered until both the interviewee and the interviewer were confident
that the task was understood.

Another set of instructions was printed directly on the HSDQ.
The respondent was asked to read these before beginning to rate the
items on the instrument, and to ask questions of clarification if
needed. The subject then completed the ratings of the items without
interruption.

The original design of the study stated that after the member of
the population responded to the HSDQ, the 10 skills which received
the highest ratings from the respondent and the 10 skills which
received the lowest ratings from the respondent were to be considered
separately from the remainder of the listing. In the event that the
ratings produced more than 10 skills with the highest ratings—for
example, if seven skills received the highest rating and six skills received the second highest rating, making a total of 13 rather than 10—the respondent was to have been asked to rank those 13 (or however many more than 10) skills so that only 10 skills remained. A corresponding ranking procedure was to have been followed if more than 10 skills were to have received the lowest ratings.

During the interview with the first respondent, however, the subject rated 62 of the 90 skills on the HSDQ as very practicable (the highest possible rating) in his position and the remaining 28 skills as quite practicable (the second highest rating). As the possibility of this distribution of ratings did not appear in the piloting of the instrument (the HSDQ was piloted with two individuals with a relatively normal distribution of skill practicability ratings), this occurrence was quite unexpected. The respondent was then asked if he felt it realistic for him to select approximately 10 skills he deemed most practicable and approximately 10 others he felt were least practicable in his position. He replied that such a procedure would be a rather artificial exercise and that his ratings on the HSDQ were quite representative of the actual practicability of the respective human skills. Therefore, the original intent of the study, vis-à-vis the generation of the most and least practicable human skills, became obsolete.

Generation of Critical Environmental Factors

Given that the data collection phase of the study was actually in session when the occurrence regarding the first interview took
place, there was little time to conceptualize a new methodology concerning the generation of environmental factors perceived by the respondent to affect the practice of human skills. In spite of the immediacy of the problem, however, it was readily apparent for several reasons that the feasibility of utilizing the Critical Incident Technique was highly questionable. First, to ask the respondent to generate, in this case, 62 critical incidents would require more time than he had available, and in all likelihood, more time than he could use productively prior to reaching exhaustion. Second, were the Critical Incident Technique to be implemented under the circumstance, the amount of data generated would undoubtedly surpass the limits of manageability and would, therefore, present serious difficulties in analysis.

Rather than adhering strictly to the Critical Incident Technique, the respondent was, therefore, asked to, in approximately one to two minutes each, discuss directly his perceptions of those factors in his work setting or position which caused him to rate some of the individual skills on the HSDQ as very practicable.

Upon completion of the first interview, the decision was made to continue this strategy for evoking environmental factors in the remaining interviews, and when applicable, to also elicit the respondents' comments on any skills they rated as impracticable in any way. This procedure was, in fact, implemented in the other five interviews with few difficulties. Moreover, every attempt was made to have the interviewer avoid interjecting comments during the interview sessions. This was done in the interests of both continuity among interviews
and in order to avoid, as much as possible, biasing the types of responses given by the six subjects. Consequently, input was given by the interviewer during the interview sessions only on those few occasions when either clarification of a statement appeared needed or when the respondent had digressed in his or her remarks for an extended period of time; in the latter case, the restatement of the purpose of the interview was reiterated.

Analyzing the Data

The interviews with the six respondents ranged in length from approximately one and a half to three and a half hours. In beginning the process of analysis, individual tape recordings of the interviews were replayed. As the format of the interviews required the subjects to address selected human skills on the HSDQ, it was possible to note particular remarks, according to the numbers of the items on the instrument to which the statements corresponded. The corresponding numbers of significant remarks were then listed, in order to be reviewed at a later time. Following this initial screening of the tapes, the recordings were listened to again. At this point, significant statements were then transcribed from the tapes onto 4" by 6" note cards; all statements were copied verbatim.

It should be mentioned that certain criteria, however subjective, were utilized in determining the significance of a remark made by a respondent. The first criterion was that the comment had to focus upon the particular position which the interviewee occupied, rather than upon the nature of things for any person in the
organization. Secondly, the response had to address the characteristics of the position itself, rather than the belief system of the respondent. Thirdly, the response had to be specific; there was a tendency at times, for the interviewee to remark, "Yes, that skill is important in my job" without providing any additional explanation. Such responses were considered not significant for the purposes of this study.

The second phase of the analysis involved studying the content of the respondents' remarks. Key words or phrases in the individual remarks were located, and categories of statements were then created by placing related note cards into individual piles. Cards were rearranged and manipulated until specific categories of the interviewees' statements appeared to emerge.

Individual cards which had been placed in particular categories were then further scrutinized. This was done to determine whether the orientation of the cards centered upon the environments of the organizations in which the respondents function, or upon the specific human skill which the comments referred to. A taxonomy was therefore developed in which categories of remarks fell under the headings of either environmental factors or selected human skills.

The cards in the categories were finally assembled according to the format outlined at the beginning of the next chapter, and reports on the six individual interviews were developed. An effort was made to have the content of those reports consist, as much as possible, of the comments made by the respondents themselves.
The next chapter of this study, Chapter IV, presents the reporting of the interviews held with the six members of the population of doctoral level community educators in expanding community education settings.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter is intended to present discussions of the data obtained during interviews with the six members of the population. Each of the interviews are discussed in such a way that both environmental factors perceived by the interviewees as influencing the practicability of human skills in their respective positions are included, as are highlights of specific human skills deemed either particularly practicable or particularly impracticable.

Each discussion is arranged so that cited environmental factors are included first, followed by the noting of selected skills, and finally, a summary of the discussion.

The First Respondent

The first respondent, a male, was interviewed on April 6, 1979. He holds the position of Director of the Division of Program Services at the world headquarters of a denominational Christian church. The headquarters is located in a medium size city in the central United States. The interviewee stated that in his position, which is in the second highest echelon of the church, he reports directly to the three-person Presidency of the organization. He described the Division of Program Services which he directs as being comprised of three
commissions: the Commission on Communications, the Outreach Commission, and the Commission for Pastoral Services. The first commission, on Communications, coordinates the church's efforts in producing radio and television broadcasts, graphics, and audio-visual programs. The second commission, on Outreach, focuses upon the church's missionary efforts and upon establishing church-community relationships. The third commission, on Pastoral Services, works in the areas of Christian education, adult and campus ministry, church leadership, worship, and music. All three commissions, each headed by its own commissioner who reports to the respondent, are involved in the producing of resources for the church in North America. The Director also stated that there are two other divisions in the church's hierarchy, although the division which he heads is the largest, with approximately 60 employees.

In responding to the descriptors on the HSDQ, the respondent rated 62 of the human skills as very practicable in his position and the remaining 28 skills as quite practicable. None of the skills were in any way perceived by the interviewee to be impracticable in his position.

The results of the interview with the Director suggest that several factors present in his work environment may influence the practicability of the human skills which were discussed. In describing his position in the church, the respondent offered an insight into the nature of his situation. He said:

I am not in a situation where I've got somebody looking over my shoulder every moment, and it gives me the freedom to do a lot of those kinds of things [human skills]
if I'm aware of them and if I choose to do them.

Through this comment, the interviewee was suggesting that he has sufficient authority and status in the church's power structure to control his own destiny. At a later point in the interview, he spoke to his division's responsibility for producing materials for the general membership of the church. In stating the philosophical basis from which decisions are made concerning the types of materials developed, he said:

We're not going to be talking about a bunch of . . . hokus pokus [in our publications]; we're going to be writing about how you get over a divorce when it hits your life, . . . how do you do good parenting, how do you treat people with love and respect and how does that relate to the community, how do you live out your life in response . . . and we're going to be putting out resources to push [those types of issues].

It thus appears that the Director's division assumes a very social problems orientation in trying to relate the publications it creates to the doctrine of the church.

Another point should be made concerning the nature of the discussion provided by the Director. Several times prior to and during the interview, the respondent was instructed that his remarks should center upon the environmental factors he perceived to be extant in his position. On many occasions, however, the interviewee's comments concerning specific human skills seemed to focus more upon his own leadership orientation and personal beliefs. For example, in response to several skills, he stated something to the effect of "I think I am pretty good at that," or "I believe it is important that I do that." Rather than being voiced as a shortcoming in the interviewee's
responses, this observation is being made as a point of interest and, perhaps, explanation. After reviewing the tape recordings of the Director's remarks, the plausibility of one reason why the interviewee might have responded as he did seems increased. Some of the comments he made during the interview suggest that the importance of human skills is so ingrained in both the values system of the respondent and of the leadership and staff of the church that the skills' practicabilities are simply taken for granted by all concerned. Resultantly, the interviewee seemed unable to distinguish between the skills' practicabilities in his position and their worth according to his own beliefs. Several illustrations of this point can be made. Early in the interview, the Director said: "These skills are so mundane as to be every day, every day, stuff." He also stated: "These [human skills] seem very similar and in a pattern to me . . . I think all those [skills] you have [on the HSDQ] are interconnected and I could interconnect in the same way." At a later time, the interviewee offered a remark which illustrates the importance of human skills held by all of the leaders of his church:

We have objectives within the church that are very healthy and based upon this same kind of stuff [human skills] . . . We had six basic goals over the last 10 years and one of them is to express and accept the worth of persons.

He also applied this point to his staff:

There aren't the petty jealousies with my staff [that often times exist in other situations]. A lot of our people believe in this basic [humanistic] psychology. . . . They're very positive . . . and they understand that everybody needs strokes. . . . They're ministers and they're in the business of giving strokes.
The congruence of beliefs systems among the members of the respondent's staff therefore appears to produce both an acceptance of the value of human skills and, in fact, an expectation on the parts of most staff members that they both exemplify their own human skills and that they be on the receiving end of these skills. Consequently, they expect the Director to demonstrate human skills as well.

On numerous occasions during the interview, the Director spoke of his perception of the competence and commitment of his staff. He noted that positions in his division are highly sought after, and therefore his staff consists of extremely capable people. As examples, the interviewee stated that several of his staff possess Ph.D.'s from such institutions as Cornell University and the Menninger Clinic, and that a large number of the other employees hold graduate degrees. He summed up his feelings concerning his staff two ways. He first stated:

I do not work for an old . . . a lot of people think that when you're a minister, you're a stuffy old jerk . . . but I work in a [world] headquarters with very open and capable people that are very joking and very fun.

He also spoke to his need to respond to these staff members appropriately:

These guys aren't duds, they're very competent, . . . highly educated, . . . capable people, and if I can't treat them with professionalism and respect . . . I will be ineffective as their supervisor . . . and I think we would have a morale problem.

Elsewhere, the interviewee noted that all staff receive 1 year of higher education paid for by the church when they are hired in, in order to further advance the members' personal and professional growth.
Another factor which the Director addressed is the relationship between a task orientation and a relationship orientation within his division. He presented an overview of the production requirements which befall him in this fashion:

We're production oriented. . . . We do 200 significant projects in a 2-year time—that's 100 a year, and we've got 180 working days [per year]—so every 2 days you've got a major think coming across your desk that you're dealing with.

This production orientation seemed manifest in the comments made by the respondent about the tremendous importance placed upon planning and evaluation in the church. Numerous times during the interview, he referred to his involvement in goal setting sessions, needs assessment exercises, evaluation instruments, and the like. Yet, in spite of the emphasis placed upon production, there appeared to be little doubt but that a deep human concern undergirded this emphasis. Perhaps the most succinct illustration of this phenomenon was offered through this statement:

We have to set goals and we have to produce resources, we have to do evaluation, . . . but a part of all that is the human conceptuality. . . . See, when you're in the ministry, even though you have production deadlines and stuff, you're still dealing so much with the human aspect of life.

There did appear to be little doubt, that for both the interviewee and for the members of his division, their roles as ministers of the church are integral to their performances as an administrator and as subordinates, respectively. In fact, the respondent said quite unequivocally that, "I'm a minister. I get to preach whenever I want to and wherever I want to, just about." Other comments made during the interview seemed to reinforce this position.
Three other statements by the Director alluded to his services as a minister in his job. In discussing some of the expectations which the church hierarchy holds for the occupant of his position, he noted as an aside that, "I would be found less acceptable as a minister in our church if I drank." He also offered:

When I go out working some part of the country, [I'm] the big shot from the central area, and you've got to be kind of careful because some young women do get crushes on you—even if you're bald and fat—because you represent something in their minds.

Decorum, then, appears to be an intrinsic requirement for the holder of the Director's position, and largely because of his role as a minister of the church.

On other occasions, the interviewee spoke of the ministering he does with his own staff. He referred to the counseling he does with members who are either experiencing personal difficulties or are trying to make career-related decisions. In speaking to his involvement with them, he noted: "When [staff members] come to me, I am in a position where I can make decisions which affect their work and their lives, [so] it's important that we can talk honestly . . . and straightforward." Thus, it seems that the Director's personal commitment and involvement in the lives of his employees is both expected and valued by his staff.

Specific human skills appeared to have particular practicability in the respondent's position, largely because of the environmental factors just discussed which seem to surround the Director. It is unnecessary to address all of these skills at this time, however the inclusion of some of those highlighted by the interviewee may be
Certainly one area in which the practicability of select human skills has particular import is in the respondent's attempts at evaluation and planning. Five skills, all rated very practicable on the HSDQ, were spoken of in terms of their necessity in successful evaluation and planning efforts. In response to skill number 1, "the ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others," the Director noted:

We do needs assessment of people in our church who we write for. . . . I think I'm pretty astute at identifying the needs of people, and my . . . immediate subordinates are good at that. If somebody is having a real need, word will get to me some way.

Skill number 28, "the ability to understand the priorities of others," was also perceived as practicable in the contexts of evaluation and planning:

This [skill] comes out partially when we do planning, [however] we don't have a formal system for [doing this] other than when they [staff] are wanting to take in workshops, or do media, or something like that, because people sometimes have personal agendas that I have to step on because it gets in the way of their jobs.

The Director also viewed skill number 37, "the ability to recognize the accomplishments of others," and skill number 59, "the ability to foster a climate in which evaluation is both valued and utilized," as very practicable. He summarized:

Every resource we produce, we build in an evaluation and how it [the evaluation] is going to be used. . . . Each person [under me] knows the projects they are going to be working on 2 years in advance; they know the deadlines, the date lines, the key times, and it's very easy to evaluate that kind of stuff. . . . [Staff] are constantly under evaluation, but it's not constantly a negative thing.
Lastly, the respondent remarked, in relation to skill number 9, "the ability to synthesize a variety of inputs," that, "Sometimes when we're making out projections for the next couple-year period, there will be several projections [which I need to synthesize]." This skill, then, seems to have particular practicability for the Director in a planning sense.

Human skills related to the Director's efforts at encouraging interactions among members of his staff were viewed as important, for both their professional and personal development. The interviewee made this remark relative to skill number 18, "the ability to structure interactions":

I can call meetings any time that I want... I can structure various forms of interaction, and I have the freedom to... reach into my [own] staff or to reach across division lines... and it helps the cross-fertilization of ideas.

The respondent also commented on skill number 32, "the ability to stimulate positive interaction": "I believe that's what helps create morale, and sometimes I put people in situations who don't normally work together so that they can... interact together... but I don't do it against their will." Human skills related to stimulating interactions among subordinates, then, are used by the Director to both improve productivity and to foster intra-staff relations.

Three other human skills were addressed by the interviewee regarding his attempts at making the workers in his division more effective. Those skills concerned the abilities to "recognize the strengths of others," "demonstrate respect for the opinions of others," and "persuade others of their freedom to take risks and be creative"
(skills number 16, 80, and 22, on the HSDQ, respectively). In response to the first skill concerning recognizing others' skills, he noted:

I can see that [in my staff in] the ability to write, the ability to meet with people, the ability to do workshops. . . . Some of my best writers are poor "workshoppers," some of my best "workshoppers" are poor media people. . . . I know their work because they are in everything they produce.

With regard to the second skill of respecting others' opinions, he remarked:

I have pass over my desk every week . . . seven or eight magazine articles, books, or papers for which I am final editor. . . . When I check things off and call them unacceptable for publication . . . I do this with the idea that the opinions of the people aren't so bad [as opposed to] the way they're saying it or communicating it may have problems. I have to respect their opinions.

The last skill concerning risk taking and being creative was spoken to in this fashion:

I want them [my staff] to be very creative in what they do. . . . I want them to use various forms of media . . . I encourage them to take risks within the realms of what I perceive to be acceptable to the Presidency of the church and to the target population.

It thus appears that the Director's staff, while being encouraged to be creative, must at the same time function within certain specified parameters. Likewise it seems that particular human skills are important to the respondent when he communicates these parameters to division members.

The role of selected human skills in building and maintaining rapport with members of his division was also cited by the respondent. The Director mentioned several skills in particular as being very
practicable in his position. In response to skills number 61, 63, and 88, the abilities to "use humor effectively," "stimulate conversation," and "demonstrate openness," he concluded, "These [skills] are really tools of [my] trade, and relate to promoting basic communication." When discussing skill number 49, "the ability to provide demonstrations of support for others," he noted: "We teach in our materials support for other people. . . . One of the major goals of our church has been to have people sense the worth of others, so this is a natural [skill]." The interviewee also spoke to this sensitivity when he addressed skill number 2, "the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to individuals' needs":

That means [in my position] that if somebody's kids are rebelling or have problems in the family, you might go up and let the guy talk . . . or you might know that somebody needs a pat on the back or needs to take a course in school, and you try to work it out with them.

Seven additional skills would also appear to have particular practicability in the respondent's efforts in showing sensitivity to and building rapport with his subordinates. While these skills were not addressed at great length by the Director, they all were assigned the highest possible ratings on the HSDQ, and their projected importance seems consistent with the tenor of the remarks made by the interviewee concerning other human skills. These skills are "the ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others," "the ability to demonstrate an interest in communicating with others," "the ability to distinguish the feelings of others," and "the ability to demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others" (numbers 1, 11, 42, and 46, respectively); "the ability to project one's self as
"caring," "the ability to recognize the limitations of others," and "the ability to discern changes in the morale of others" (numbers 56, 74, and 77, respectively). At various times during the interview, the respondent referred to the essences of each of these skills and, hence, their practicability for someone in the Director's position seems virtually certain.

A concluding note should be made with regard to the 28 skills rated by the interviewee as being quite practicable (rather than very practicable) in his position. Although the particular reasons cited by the respondent as to why these respective skills were not assigned the highest possible ratings varied from each skill to the next, two common denominators were mentioned: the individual skill's frequency of use and the time required to implement the skill.

The former reason was given, in that the Director saw these 28 skills as practicable, but did not view them as being required as often as are the skills he rated very practicable. Regarding the time factor, the respondent stated his rationale best when he said: "These number 2's [skills rated quite practicable] are time things, and sometimes you don't do them quite so readily [as the very practicable skills]." Thus, it appears that those human skills rated quite practicable by the Director are perceived as being important, but also as requiring more time to implement and as not being needed as often as those skills deemed very practicable.
Summary

Sixty-two of the 90 human skills described on the HSDQ were viewed as very practicable by the Division Director, and the remaining 28 skills were rated as quite practicable for someone in his position. None of the skills were perceived by the interviewee to be impracticable in any way. Like the other interviewees, the respondent saw certain environmental factors in his job setting as influencing the practicability of human skills.

The prevailing attitude of the church hierarchy, and the mission statement of the church itself appears to be one such environmental factor. On at least two occasions during the interview, the respondent spoke of a major goal of the church being to propagate a belief among its membership in the individual worth of people. Consequently, human skills related to promoting the inherent value of individuals, along with identifying and acting upon others' personal strengths and weaknesses, appear very practicable for the holder of the respondent's position.

A second environmental factor relates to the characteristics of the Director's subordinates. Since all of the staff members are, in fact, a part of a religious institution, they all appear to view themselves as ministers of the church, in addition to whatever other roles they may play. The interviewee noted that this phenomenon results in an almost universal expectation among staff that all of the workers in the division will "minister" to one another. This attitude has particular significance for the Director, since as the division chief,
the staff members expect him in particular to demonstrate the skills of the ministry. Given the orientation of the church which was already noted, many of these skills expected of the Director by his staff are, in fact, human skills. More specifically, human skills related to demonstrating awareness of and sensitivity to the needs--both personal and professional--of his staff are viewed by the respondent as having great practicability in this regard.

The process of attempting to make the evaluation and planning efforts of the staff more positive is another area which seems to require a number of human skills on the part of the Director. The interviewee stated that evaluation and planning procedures have become very routinized in his division, and as a result, human skills related to becoming cognizant of the needs, sentiments, priorities, and accomplishments of his staff, as well as being able to foster a healthy climate for evaluation and planning, appear to be very important for someone in his position.

The respondent also spoke of the practicability of human skills concerning structuring for positive interactions among members of his staff. He concluded that the implementation of such skills produces a payoff in both a personal and a professional sense; workers often times seem to feel better about themselves and their productivity and creativity are frequently enhanced as a result of positive structured interactions with co-workers. As superordinate in his division, the interviewee viewed these human skills as having a high degree of practicability for the holder of his position.
Still another important consideration for the practicability of human skills in the Director's position concerns the benefit of specific skills in developing stronger interpersonal relations with members of his staff. While a number of individual skills were referred to by the respondent in this light, the majority cited concerned what the interviewee saw as basic communication skills, such as using humor, stimulating conversation, and demonstrating openness, as well as skills related to providing support and a caring attitude for employees.

Finally, the respondent noted that those skills on the HSDQ which he perceived as quite practicable instead of very practicable in his position were, generally speaking, rated as such because they are either not required as frequently as the skills deemed very practicable, or because they require more time to be implemented than do the very practicable human skills.

The Second Respondent

The second interview was held on April 7, 1979. The individual interviewed is male and is in the position of Executive Director of a not-for-profit, education-related national association. The association, centered in a large city in the Southeast, is comprised of approximately 2,000 professional educators, lay citizens, and interested administrators in allied professions. The association's primary purposes are to advocate the development of a specific area of education, and to provide information and resource networking among association members throughout the United States and, recently,
Canada. The Executive Director stated that the association is governed by a 13-member Board of Directors who are elected by the membership. His official duties as Director were described as being to manage, supervise, and coordinate the administrative, financial, and professional activities of the association, and to direct the association's professional and support staff. At the present time, there are six full-time employees of the association—two professional and three clerical—and the process through which a third professional will be hired is very near completion.

In responding to the 90 items on the HSDQ, the respondent rated 36 of the skills as very practicable in his position, 36 as quite practicable, 14 as somewhat practicable, and three skills as somewhat impracticable. The interviewee failed to rate one of the skills.

Those factors in the Executive Director's environment which he sees as influencing the practice of human skills were discussed at some length during the interview. The first factor cited relates to the association's heavy dependence on volunteers to carry out its functions nationally. The respondent addressed the involvement of volunteers from several perspectives. He first noted:

The nature of our organization being that you have to rely on volunteers almost totally in order to provide direction to the association . . . makes it essential that you're able to identify the needs and sentiments of volunteers.

He added:

In this kind of work, you're only as successful as the people that you're able to get involved . . . people in the movement, and you have to be able to recognize that certain people have skills that can be utilized, and others don't for a particular role.
The respondent also spoke of the requirements that the voluntary nature of the association places upon him. He first remarked:

It is very important that the Executive Director utilize the strengths of others to move the organization and help it achieve its goals and objectives. You can only do that if you use the strengths of others . . . in group situations and in . . . a one-to-one situation. In other words, you can facilitate the opportunity for people to get together and exchange points of view . . . and because of the interaction that results, you can strengthen the organization.

He further said:

In any volunteer organization, you have to be able to recognize the accomplishments of others, and be willing to provide and facilitate a process so that happens . . . . If people don't feel they are going to be recognized . . . they don't work as hard.

This volunteer orientation on the association's part has other implications for the Executive Director which the interviewee commented upon:

There is a tendency in a lot of organizations for the appointment of committees to solve problems when committees may not be the most appropriate way to resolve a problem. So it's always a challenge to the person in this position to see that . . . if a problem is directed to a committee, the committee in fact follows through and brings it to closure. You have to rely on your committee structure, but you also have to rely on your Board and your President and individuals who take on particular tasks. But closure is so critical to an organization, but especially to an association that relies so heavily on volunteers.

The respondent also spoke of the effect that this reliance has upon the recruitment of leaders for certain ad hoc assignments. He said:

We really have too much of a tendency in the field for people to put people in leadership positions who don't have the strengths . . . . [This has an impact upon me] in terms of a willingness to delegate or not delegate certain
functions. Take, for example, committees. If you get a certain chairperson . . . that you really don't feel can handle the assignment, you're more reluctant to delegate certain responsibilities . . . [but] just to protect the environment of the organization sometimes you have to make a value judgment in this role in terms of delegation or nondelegation.

Consequently, the interviewee felt the need as the association's Executive Director to be somewhat selective in the individuals he elects to work with and, equally important, to utilize human skills in his interactions with these people. Still, he noted that it is not always easy to function effectively, given the nature of the organization.

He concluded:

In this position a lot of people feel that you have to be . . . effective in a variety of situations . . . you almost have to be all things to all people and that's really a difficult part of this role because . . . you have a small staff, and you have such a variety of tasks.

Thus, the emphasis placed on volunteers in tandem with both the large number of demands placed upon the association and the relatively small staff of the organization, seem to impact upon the skills required of the Executive Director.

A second factor which the respondent saw as influencing human skills practicability relates to the leadership he must, as the ranking administrator, provide in all facets of the association's operations. Not surprisingly, the interviewee noted that a need and also an expectation exists for him to model human skills in his position.

He illustrated this point on numerous occasions, and began by saying: "If you're an organization that's supposed to be . . . the 'conscience' of the field . . . and that organization that's providing leadership for all the other parts, then [human skills are] particularly
important." He added as an aside:

You have to know where people are coming from philosophically, intellectually, and I suppose, emotionally. . . . People look to the Executive Director for more leadership and direction . . . and a lot of the reason for that relates to status. There are people who have to talk to the top executive . . . in order to feel that they're having the kind of input they feel is appropriate.

Elsewhere, he offered: "The Executive of an association is expected to be articulate and to speak out on issues and to interact and to be the out-front person in many cases." He added:

A very important part of leadership is to persuade and to motivate, and the only way you can either motivate or persuade is to project enthusiasm. . . . People just expect someone in this role to project a certain image, a certain climate, and enthusiasm is absolutely essential.

Finally, he made two statements regarding his role as one of the association's leaders. He first said:

In any field, there is a tendency to want to do things the way they've always been done, not only in an organizational [operations] sense, but how a concept, such as Community Education is perceived. I think the most difficult change . . . in this field is not organizational change as much as it is philosophical change. An executive has as much responsibility to see that changes are made philosophically when needed, as when organizational change is needed.

Second, he seemed to capture what he saw as the essence of his leadership function when he said: "If you want people to believe in something, you have to believe in it yourself. If you really believe in Community Education, then you have to be able to somehow transmit that to others." It is in that transmission, then, that the practicaibility of human skills appears to come to the fore.

Closely related to the leadership role which the respondent enacts in his position is his perception of how others view the
particular job which he holds. He commented on this several times during the interview, and he first noted: "In this position you're looked upon to do this [encourage others' self-images] a lot . . . I think it is seen as a prestigious position, and therefore, people look to [me] for that kind of support." He concluded by saying:

This relates back to what I've said before--whether it's real or imagined the Executive Director of a national association is perceived as being an important position, and there are naturally people who feel uncomfortable in communicating . . . with someone in that position.

The interviewee then suggested that the esteem which he feels many people in his profession attach to his position necessitates that he be particularly sensitive in his relationships with them. He furthermore intimated that human skills are the vehicles which allow him to demonstrate this sensitivity.

A final factor which the Executive Director cited as influencing human skills practicability relates to the association's involvement in contemporary social issues. Specifically, the interviewee stated that often times there is a lack of agreement among members of the association as what issues the organization should take a stance on and how that stance should be put into effect. He began by saying:

There are such a divergence of opinions and you've got to be able to sort those out in order for you, as well as the organization, to give leadership. For example, legislation . . . there are a lot of ideas or points of view in terms of what should have been included in . . . the new bill. And it's a question of synthesizing those and coming out of that with a direction which you feel represents where the majority of the people [members] are at.

The respondent then identified those groups or individuals who are influential in the association's decision-making process. He
said:

There are both formal and informal groups [that have impact upon the association's operations]. Certainly the Board of Directors is, from the point of view of the Executive [Director], a very important group; state associations, state departments of education, university centers, and then there are groups . . . who are not formally organized . . . and then beyond that there are probably 30 people I could name who are informal leaders . . . but are not a part of those structures.

In attempting to coordinate all of those groups, the interviewee noted what is required of him. He remarked:

In any organization and especially when you're dealing with volatile . . . social issues at the local, as well as state and national level, like we do . . . there comes a time when there is going to have to be confrontation, and its very important that the Executive Director know how to handle that, especially when it comes to the Board of Directors.

The interviewee immediately followed this remark with the following caveat:

One of the real dangers is an Executive Director who, during a period of crisis or confrontation, projects his or her own feelings or attitudes. If there is a differing point of view--especially on the Board--an issue of conflict, it is that individual's role to try to help create the environment to resolve that.

Finally, the Executive Director seemed to summarize his involvement in attempting to manage the conflicts which arise within the association over social issues, when he said: "This position provides a number of vehicles for communication with people about . . . [their] position on issues and matters concerning the field, and you just have to utilize those effectively."

Individual human skills also received the attention of the respondent during the interview. Some of those skills which were
highlighted by the interviewee should be noted. The Executive Director mentioned that many of the skills on the HSDQ are important for him in his attempts to be sensitive and supportive of the people with whom he interacts. For example, the following remarks were made in reference to "the ability to project one's self as caring," "the ability to demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others," and "the ability to compliment others" (skills number 56, 46, and 48, respectively). Regarding the first skill, he noted:

People want to feel that their concerns, their needs, their interests are important. . . . It doesn't matter the kind of relationship, but it's also important in this kind of work, because if you want people to work toward the goals of the organization, they have to feel that someone cares.

In speaking to the second skill, he stated that, "People need to feel wanted and supported if they are going to get involved." The last skill was spoken to in the following way: "This relates to [using physical contact]. We all like to be stroked . . . we all work harder if we feel we're appreciated, and a very effective way of letting people know they're appreciated is through complimenting." At another point, the respondent offered an illustration of the practicability of skill number 49, "the ability to provide demonstrations of support for others." He stated:

Last year at the National Convention when [Congressman Smith] was talking about [our] legislation, he demonstrated his support for me and my efforts, and that was tremendously empowering for me . . . and in that situation I, in turn, complimented [a colleague] for what he had done.

Elsewhere, the interviewee spoke of the importance of a number of other skills in showing sensitivity and support for those with whom he works. Those skills relate to the abilities to "identify the
needs and sentiments of others," "recognize the strengths of others," and "structure interactions" (skills number 1, 16, and 18 on the HSDQ); the abilities to "recognize the accomplishments of others," "utilize physical contact appropriately," and "facilitate individuals and groups in reaching closure" (numbers 37, 41, and 83, respectively).

The practicability of human skills in carrying out the leadership functions of the Executive Director's position was also discussed. While numerous references were made by the respondent, the following four comments are illustrative of the attention given this matter by the interviewee. These comments were made in reference to the abilities to "demonstrate tact and diplomacy," "utilize persuasive techniques," "appreciate the humor of others," and "demonstrate openness" (skills number 15, 68, 60, and 88, respectively). Regarding the first skill, he said:

The inability to demonstrate tact and diplomacy is what probably gets people in my position in more trouble than anything else. People just cannot relate to or support or follow someone who does not come across with tact and diplomacy.

In speaking to the second skill, he noted:

If you're going to lead, you have to be able to persuade. If you're going to be able to persuade, you have to be able to use a variety of techniques--some formal, some informal . . . some are behind the scenes, some are in front of a group, some are arm-twisting, and I think that the most effective are not the arm-twisting, but are the utilization of personal relations skills . . . because that . . . convincing is more long lasting.

The third skill received this comment:

Humor can be a very important leadership technique, tool for getting close to people, developing relationships with people, developing the support of people, and certainly appreciating the humor of others is important in that
process.

The fourth skill was addressed in this way: "In order to believe in an individual and be willing to follow him or her you have to feel that the person is open to new ideas, suggestions, and approaches, and is also open to challenge."

Eight other human skills were deemed very practicable in the interviewee's leadership role. Those skills relate to the abilities to "demonstrate sensitivity to individual needs," "understand the standards of others," "project enthusiasm to others," "demonstrate personal conviction," and "facilitate change when it would be beneficial to others" (skills number 2, 3, 19, 35, and 69, respectively); also the abilities to "express positive attitudes," "assign rewards which will be valued by the recipients," and "determine when silence is appropriate" (skills number 75, 84, and 85, respectively).

In commenting on the divergent postures assumed by some groups within the association concerning current social issues, the respondent cited four specific skills as being important in dealing with those groups. Skills number 9, "the ability to synthesize a variety of inputs"; number 21, "the ability to demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems"; and number 58, "the ability to utilize a variety of methods of self-expression," were mentioned for their practicability in maintaining open communication with divergent groups. Skill number 4, "the ability to present the perspectives of others with respect," was also deemed very practicable in this endeavor and the interviewee seemed to summarize his feelings about these four skills when he said:
That's particularly important in our organization where there are a divergence of opinions and attitudes on any one issue. Take, for example, the Equal Rights Amendment. That's an issue where . . . there is a pretty good split in the membership and it's very important if you want to maintain that leadership role . . . that [those] points of view are respected. And, of course, the Executive Director is the symbol for the expression of those viewpoints.

Resultantly, the Executive Director suggested that, because he is usually the spokesperson for the association on social issues, human skills are very practicable in allowing him to receive input on issues and in assuaging the feelings of socially conscious groups within the field.

The status attached to the position of Executive Director caused the respondent to view three specific human skills as particularly important in putting people with whom he communicates at ease, and also in allowing meaningful dialogue to occur. Those skills concern the abilities to "encourage others' positive self-images," "make others feel comfortable," and "stimulate conversation" (skills number 54, 62, and 63, respectively). As an illustration of this feeling, the respondent remarked in relation to the last skill that:

The Executive Director is in a number of situations that could be awkward—people feel a certain awe, I suppose. It's very important to be able to stimulate conversation, but more importantly, meaningful conversation. Sometimes you have to stimulate small talk in order to get to the meat of a conversation.

It should also be noted that skills number 10, "the ability to elicit the feelings and positions of others," and number 61, "the ability to use humor effectively," were assigned the highest rating of practicability on the HSDQ, and would also seem to be very important to the interviewee in his efforts to communicate with those who may be
somewhat intimidated by the position he holds.

Three of the skills on the HSDQ were rated as somewhat impracticable in the Executive Director's position: number 12, "the ability to project attentiveness to all participants in a communication or interaction"; number 38, "the ability to place one's self in the background when required"; and number 50, "the ability to 'table' one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes when required." In the first case, the interviewee explained:

It's very practicable on a one to one interaction, but . . . for example, at [a] meeting when there are 125 people, [there is] the inability to interact with as many people as you would like on a one to one basis. Sometimes that's misinterpreted too, because you can be seen as aloof, uncaring, and in some cases it's very impracticable.

Concerning the second skill, he said:

It's not always possible. There are a lot of times when you are called upon when it may be more appropriate for someone else to be called upon. . . . I've been some places where I've been asked to comment on something when [the association's] leadership or our President was there, and it could be perceived by others as more appropriate for that individual to [speak].

Finally, he remarked on the third skill: "Someone in my position is expected to have an opinion, belief, attitude, and response for any situation, and since that's expected, sometimes you respond to that expectation. . . . It's almost an involuntary response." The respondent's position, then, does not seem to permit him to interact with as many people as he might like, to assume a low profile, nor to table his own thoughts when he might choose to.
Summary

The Executive Director rated 36 of the 90 human skills on the HSDQ as very practicable in his position, 36 as quite practicable, 14 as somewhat practicable, and three skills as somewhat impracticable. As might be expected, the respondent stated that certain environmental factors influence the practicability of human skills in his job setting.

The first factor cited by the interviewee relates to the heavy dependence his association has on volunteers in order to carry out the various functions of the organization. The respondent stated that, while most volunteers provide essential assistance to the association, they must frequently be provided demonstrations of encouragement and sensitivity by the Executive Director. Moreover, the interviewee noted that the emphasis on voluntary help places an extra requirement upon someone in his position to both appraise the potentials of individual volunteers to make contributions and to monitor the progress of these volunteers in their completion of tasks. The respondent thus stated that human skills related to demonstrating sensitivity to individuals' needs, progress, strengths and weaknesses, and feelings are very practicable in his position.

A second factor mentioned as impacting upon human skills concerns the interviewee's need to provide leadership to association members throughout the country. He mentioned there is a need for the providing of such leadership, and also an expectation on the parts of most association members that, as Executive Director, the respondent will
usually be the individual to carry out these leadership functions. A number of human skills were referred to as very practicable in the interviewee's leadership role, however those dealing with demonstrating tact and enthusiasm, being persuasive, and showing openness received particular attention.

The divergence of opinions among the membership, particularly relating to the association's positions on current social issues, was offered as another factor which influences human skills' practicability. The Executive Director stated that there are several groups within the organization, in addition to the Board of Directors, who provide input as to what and how particular social issues should be addressed. He added that his role must be to attend to the various inputs he receives, to facilitate the working through of whatever problems might arise concerning the issues, and to foster open communication among association members. In this role, the respondent said that human skills which center upon synthesizing numerous inputs, utilizing various methods of self-expression, showing a willingness to confront problems, and modeling respect for all opinions are particularly important.

The final factor identified by the interviewee concerns the impact that the status of his position often has upon those with whom he interacts. He explained that he feels some people are somewhat in awe of the Executive Director of a national association, and for that reason he must make special efforts to relate to members of the association. Human skills focusing upon encouraging others' self-images, making others comfortable, and stimulating conversation were cited as
especially practicable in his position.

Three skills were concluded to be somewhat impracticable for the holder of the respondent's position. Those skills related to projecting attentiveness to all participants in a communication, placing one's self in the background, and withholding one's own opinions and feelings. Regarding the first skill, the interviewee noted that the sheer number of people with whom he comes in contact makes practicing this skill somewhat difficult; the last two skills were seen as somewhat impracticable, as he perceived an unspoken expectation to exist among association members that, due to his position, he should usually be in the limelight and should have an opinion on most every issue.

The Third Respondent

The interview with the third member of the population was held on April 18, 1979. The respondent, a male, is employed by an extremely large corporation, and holds the position of Management Consultant in a specialized area of training in the corporation. This training area focuses upon facilitating upper middle management in improving the quality of work life for their subordinates. The corporation has companies worldwide, and the respondent works on an ad hoc basis with many of the middle managers from the various companies. In describing his areas of responsibility, the interviewee stated that his primary function is in organizational development; that is, in working with the management from various sub-units of the corporation--such as the managers of individual departments or plants--
in attempting to assist these individuals in identifying the needs of both their organizations or sub-units and of the people working in these units. It was deduced from the interview that the respondent is typically involved in a three step organizational development process: a diagnostic phase, in which the management delineates their specific needs; a goal setting phase, in which the eradication of the identified needs is planned; and a basic strategy phase, in which initial plans are laid in order to move the management toward their goal(s). The respondent indicated that the bulk of his time is spent in working with groups of people (as opposed to one on one consultation), and that group sessions are devoted to such activities as diagnostic readings, planning meetings, experiential learning and fantasy exercises, training and skill building workshops, and conflict-management oriented sessions.

In responding to the 90 items on the HSDQ, the interviewee assigned the highest rating of practicability to 71 of the items. Ten items were rated as quite practicable by the respondent, and the remaining nine items were viewed as somewhat practicable. None of the items were rated by the respondent as being impracticable in any way.

In an early phase of the interview, the respondent described the orientation of his position in the following way: "I'm in a people oriented business. My whole business is to help organizations become more people oriented. Therefore I have to be, and that includes being sensitive to the needs and sentiments of others." Likewise he said:
The fundamental value of our whole enterprise is . . . the individual worth of people. We're trying continually to get organizations to recognize that, and to develop organizational approaches that give concrete manifestations of that value. Therefore, as models we have to show that awareness of the individual worth of others.

The respondent continued to speak at length of the nature of his position. As was previously intimated, at one point he concluded, "For the most part, the people I work with would be classed as upper middle management." He did add, however, that "One of the things I have major responsibility for is training the other consultants to do the kind of work that I do." The interviewee went on to say that, in terms of his overall time and energy, "Group process, group dynamics, group behavior . . . we probably work more in that area than any other area." He also indicated:

I'm in a fairly nondirective, facilitating role . . . and generally speaking we're not trying to tell people what to believe and usually not even what they should do. We're trying to help people discover those things for themselves.

In speaking along this same line, he said, in discussing his function in working with groups of managers:

It is a position unlike many other positions, where we are not trying to solve other people's conflicts. We are trying to help them solve their own, and it is characteristic of the kind of consulting business I am in to facilitate and help other people do for themselves. Therefore, what we want to do is as little for people as they need help for.

The interviewee spoke of the bases and goals upon which his position has been designed. For example, he voiced the following statement as representing one of the tenets upon which his position rests:

"In terms of 'authenticity,' one of the values systems on which our business is based is open, straight-forward, honest, and leveling
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kinds of behavior." He continued:

But we're trying to create an openness and a freedom in organizations to be who you are, to be authentically who you are, to voice your opinions whether someone might agree with them or not, and I think it's important we don't start judging people, to not start categorizing people as good guys and bad guys.

At another point in the interview, however, the respondent spoke of the importance of knowing when not to volunteer his beliefs and opinions, stating that a good deal of his credibility as a consultant is dependent upon his success in being perceived as objective by his clients; hence, the voicing of his own opinions and beliefs, in all but the most selective of circumstances, could jeopardize his image among the managers with whom he consults.

The interviewee articulated what might well be the essence of the consulting he performs when he spoke to the skill, "the ability to demonstrate respect for the authority of others (number 7 on the HSDQ):

Certainly it is important to demonstrate respect for the authority of others, but we are trying to help organizations come to a point where the authority resides in the situation and not in some position on the hierarchy; in information . . . that is as close to the problem as possible . . . so to some extent we're anti-authoritarian.

In the course of the interview, the respondent also spoke of the need for specific human skills in the position he holds. Additionally, he spoke of areas of skills that appeared to have particular meaning for someone in his position. Some of those specific skills and skill areas are worth addressing at this point.

On several occasions during the interview, the respondent indicated that the practicability of many of the human skills on the HSDQ
is dependent upon his role as one who seeks to bring about change; that is, change toward a more humanistic attitude on the part of corporate management. In speaking to skill number 69, "the ability to facilitate change when it would be beneficial to others," he stated, "That's the name of the game, that's the business I'm in. . . . I'm a change agent, therefore I need that skill." He also stated in response to skill number 39, "the ability to communicate the benefit of short term sacrifice for the sake of achieving longer term goals," that:

The nature of the kind of change we're trying to get organizations to practice is that they have to put something in— to some extent on faith—up front, and look for a longer term return . . . and there is some cost—sometimes it's financial, but . . . more often in terms of time, energy, giving up old habits . . . and that's costly. The kind of change were talking about is longer term. . . . Sometimes results won't be seen for years.

With regard to skill number 68, "the ability to utilize persuasive techniques," the respondent stated even more succinctly:

Some of what we're involved in is the business of selling; selling ideas, and some of those ideas are not the norm . . . and we're selling change; we're selling innovation, which is often resisted, so we need to be more persuasive.

Likewise, the respondent offered a similar observation in response to skill number 5, "the ability to clearly state one's own feelings and positions": "We're in a position to do some selling and persuading, so it's important to be able to present one's beliefs clearly." More specifically, he stated that in his consulting position he is constantly working to show management that there is benefit in being open and straight-forward with subordinates, and also in permitting subordinates to be open and straight-forward with them. The interviewee
mentioned on numerous occasions that he attempts to encourage these open modes of communication by modeling requisite skills. Through his responses on the HSDQ, in tandem with comments he provided during the interview, it appears that the respondent deems a number of human skills very practicable in attempting to foster openness in communications. In fact, as many as 20 skills from the HSDQ not previously cited which received the highest possible rating of practicability appear to be closely, if not directly, related to modeling and encouraging honest interpersonal communications. While it is unnecessary to list all 20 skills at this point, eight of the most apparent skills can be included to substantiate this position. They are: "the ability to elicit the feelings and positions of others," "the ability to clarify the positions and perspectives of others," "the ability to distinguish the feelings of others," and "the ability to recognize opportunities for self-expression" (numbers 10, 30, 42, and 57 on the HSDQ, respectively); "the ability to receive feedback," "the ability to accept criticism given by others," "the ability to demonstrate respect for the opinions of others," and "the ability to demonstrate openness" (numbers 67, 72, 80, and 88, respectively).

The importance of the respondent being perceived as objective by his clients was enumerated many times during the interview, as he stated that another of his primary responsibilities as an organizational developer in his corporation is to intervene in situations of conflict. While the circumstances surrounding these conflicts vary, the situations, at least generically, usually pertain to conflicts surrounding personnel: staff deployment, superordinate-subordinate
relations, absenteeism, and the like. Toward the completion of the
interview, the respondent spoke to this point when he concluded:
"Seems to me I've said a number of times in one way or another that
third party facilitation is an important set of skills that we need,
because we're always dealing with groups and individuals in conflict."
(This response was offered in relation to skill number 67 on the HSDQ,
"the ability to mediate between opposing individuals or groups.")
Moreover, the following quotations may present a more vivid portrait
of the degree and importance to which conflict management is addressed
by the respondent in his position.

The objective of the Consultant's intervention in situations of
conflict was articulated in this way when he spoke to skill number 23,
"the ability to acknowledge and progress from situations of conflict":
"We are continually trying to get organizations to acknowledge con­
flict and put it up on the table, and then to deal with it and develop
integrative, win-win situations." When he responded to skill number
26, "the ability to provide insights into the nature of a conflict," he said, "We do a lot of third party work . . . and a number of the
intervention strategies we have are designed to do exactly that--to
help people in the conflict get insight as to why that conflict
exists."

The interviewee also raised an excellent point in relation to
skill number 36, "the ability to determine the vulnerabilities of
others." He concluded:

We're trying to get groups to work on a level where they're
open and honest in working through conflict and so forth,
and it's dangerous to assume that everybody can do that
with the same level of comfort, and that it won't be very threatening to some people.

Skill number 4, "the ability to present the perspectives of others with respect," was addressed in this manner: "All the time I'm dealing with resistant people . . . and one of the things you need to be good at in this business is to hear the objections of other people and to present the other person's position with respect."

In responding to the skill "the ability to view individuals and situations non-judgmentally" (number 81 on the HSDQ), the respondent said that the skill is "Really important, really important . . . . We have to work with all kinds of individuals with all kinds of points of view, and many of the individuals' points of view may not be things we like." He added, in response to the skill "the ability to manage one's self in highly emotional situations" (number 86), that, "I get into some situations that are pretty full of feeling."

Thus it seems that skills relating to managing conflict are very practicable in the interviewee's particular position. However, in addition to those human skills already discussed, the following skills received the highest possible ratings from the respondent: "the ability to demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems," "the ability to differentiate between destructive and constructive conflict," and "the ability to differentiate between issues and personalities" (numbers 21, 24, and 25, respectively); "the ability to provide insights into the nature of a conflict," "the ability to discern when intercession or restraint in a conflict is appropriate," and "the ability to discern unspoken cues indicating
the presence of conflict" (numbers 26, 29, and 31, respectively).

Another interesting series of comments was made by the respondent in terms of how one might approach the particular consulting position which he holds. In speaking to skill number 5, "the ability to clearly state one's own feelings and positions," he noted, "The main thing a consultant like me . . . has going for him or herself is himself or herself; the main instrument I have to use is me." In fact, on at least three occasions during the interview the respondent spoke of himself as the main "instrument" or "tool" that he has in his position. In an operational sense, he concluded that, as a consultant, "The more effective I am, the less obtrusive I am . . . and I guess the more obtrusive I get, the more threatening I get." (This response was given when he spoke to skill number 70, "the ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner." )

Another indicator of this consulting posture can be found in relation to the interviewee's remarks concerning skill number 28, "the ability to understand the priorities of others":

We are—and this is like so many others—we need the skill to understand people's priorities, but at least as importantly, we need the ability to help them understand their priorities. . . . We don't lay their priorities on them; we don't tell them what their priorities ought to be.

In concluding this discussion, the most poignant indicator of the perceived practicability of the human skills listed on the HSDQ in the respondent's position might have been an off hand comment made by the interviewee during his completion of the HSDQ. Part way through the rating process, he remarked, "This [the items on the instrument] looks like my job description!" Indeed, his discussion
of the practicability of the respective human skills on the HSDQ seemed to affirm that observation.

Summary

The interviewee perceived a substantial number of the human skills on the HSDQ as being either very or quite practicable in his position as an internal consultant for a large corporation (81 of the 90 items). Moreover, the respondent intimated on innumerable occasions during the interview that, on an operational level, the vast majority of the human skills described on the HSDQ are not only practicable, but are absolutely essential, if the individual in the respondent's position is to perform successfully. There appeared to be several environmental factors which might account for this sentiment.

The first factor seems to relate to the nature of the interviewee's position and the overall charge assigned to the holder of that position. The respondent stated that his primary responsibility is to train upper middle management in his corporation how to improve the quality of work experiences for their subordinates, how to relate to their workers on a more personal basis, and how to deal with personnel problems which confront them in a more sensitive manner; in other words, the task of the interviewee is to teach those managers how to become more humanistic with their employees. Resultantly, there appears to be an almost inherent demand upon the occupant of the respondent's position that he or she be both more humanistically oriented, and also that he or she be able to model this orientation.
to management. It seems to follow quite naturally then that the person in the respondent's position needs to possess and practice a number of human skills.

Other factors which the interviewee perceived to mandate the practicability of the described human skills are, in all likelihood, offshoots of the environmental factor discussed above. For example, as an internal consultant, the interviewee performs a facilitating and usually nondirective role in the corporation. When working with management, therefore, his position requires him to assist managers in identifying and remedying their own needs, rather than to do these things for them. Consequently, human skills related to facilitating groups, and particular human skills which address honest and accurate oral communication, are very practicable in the interviewee's position.

The respondent's job also mandates that he be able to diagnose needs: needs related to the groups with whom he works and needs related to the problems and issues which those groups are addressing. Human skills which deal with eliciting information and perceptions from his clients and with strategizing how to structure group interactions are, resultantly, very important to the interviewee in his position.

Resistant groups or groups in conflict are also clients with whom the respondent frequently works. Third party intervention is an important element in the interviewee's position. Therefore, human skills which focus upon identifying conflict and training corporate managers how to deal with conflict—whether it be their own or their
or their employees'—appear to be essential for the respondent to implement in order for him to function effectively.

A final note should be made regarding the human skills on the HSDQ which were rated only somewhat practicable by the respondent. Nine of the skills were assigned such a rating. While there was no apparent commonality among the thrusts of those skills—they ranged from skills addressing implementing nonverbal behavior to assigning rewards to compensating for others' weaknesses—all of them received these lower ratings for two reasons: first, they are not skills used by the interviewee as frequently as are the other skills, and second, they are not skills which the respondent either worries about or has noticed to have significant impact upon the success he experiences in his position.

The Fourth Respondent

On April 16, 1979, the fourth interview was held. The respondent, a male, holds the position of Project Manager in the Division of Corporate Personnel of a very large company. While the interviewee works out of the corporate headquarters which is located in a medium sized Midwestern city, the company has plants throughout the world.

In his position, the respondent stated that he has primary responsibilities in two major areas: training and internal consulting. His functions in the training area may be summarized as being able to develop individuals from different company plants in how to deal as managers with people. These individuals are either in managerial positions or are in the process of being promoted into these
positions. The specific training programs which the respondent is involved in—as developer, coordinator, or instructor—focus upon theoretical and skill-building exercises related to nontechnical training needs. The respondent also mentioned that in his training responsibilities, he is called upon to provide career counseling to aspiring employees.

The Project Manager's role as an internal consultant has only recently come about, and projections are that this role will take on increasing importance in the future. At the present time, the consulting which the interviewee provides focuses mainly upon identifying training needs of various groups of corporate and first line management. The respondent added that the division in which he works is quite new, and consists of three project-related staff members and an administrative assistant.

In responding to the items on the HSDQ, the Project Manager rated 64 of the 90 skills as very practicable, 11 skills as quite practicable, nine skills as somewhat practicable, and the remaining six skills as somewhat impracticable in his position.

During the interview, the respondent wasted little time in addressing his perceptions of various environmental factors impacting upon the practicability of human skills. Undoubtedly, the perspectives held by many of the corporate managers of the interviewee's division is one such factor. The respondent spoke on numerous occasions during the interview of how he must constantly work to establish credibility with other branches of the corporation. He suggested that since his division provides training in, essentially, human
relations, the benefits of the training are neither quickly nor
directly measurable. Some managers, in turn, are used to seeing tan­
gible results--new products, greater profits, and the like--and con­
sequently feel some disquiet, if not skepticism, toward the training
offered by the interviewee's division. The respondent made several
remarks regarding this factor. He first said:

Since we are subjective sellers we need to be very enthu­
siastic because we really can't demonstrate product effec­
tiveness as you might with a vacuum cleaner. . . . We have
to talk about the future, which isn't something physical.

He added:

Our credibility is only as good as the belief they [other
members of the company] have in our face to face communi­
cations. We're only as good as the expertise we can sell
face to face at any level.

He also said:

In the organization, the real needs of development are met
through divisions and departments, and if we cannot justify
individual development as related to group or overall cor­
porate . . . development, we're not on very firm ground.

The Project Manager stated that his division is considered sus­
pect by some managers who have been highly productive in the past
without being very humane to their subordinates. In speaking to his
efforts to introduce these managers to a more humanistic style of
management, the interviewee remarked:

That [bringing about change] is probably the most difficult
thing we are about . . . and even though we can justify
[our training] as being beneficial, it's hard [for these
managers] to shake loose from past practices that have
been successful.

He stated that in his division's attempts to establish credibility
with managers, it works extremely hard to be responsive to any
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suggestions made by them. He noted: "We change our modes of opera-
tion based upon criticism. It may not be positive criticism, but if
it's collective, or based upon certain authority figures in the organ-
ization, we do change." He concluded: "We are looked upon as people
who must provide positive experiences, and when we provide something
... that is developing [for management] in nature, but isn't posi-
tive, we run into a lot of problems."

The interviewee was actually saying that his division must avoid
implementing training programs whose content might be painful, albeit
developmental, for the recipients. This thought was related by the
respondent to the issue of credibility for his division; hence, human
skills were perceived to be very important in the enhancement of this
credibility.

A second factor perceived by the Project Manager in influencing
the possible implementation of human skills is the political nature
of the company. The respondent noted that the political environment
encompasses such things as the authority structure of the corporation
and the egos of individual upper managers. Consequently, human
skills in appropriately responding to these political considerations
were viewed as absolutely essential in the respondent's position. He
offered several insights related to the impact of politics upon his
position. In terms of reacting respectfully to superordinates, he
said: In a political environment such as industry in which I am
involved, that's almost a given, and one should readily ... realize
that that's the field of battle." He added:
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Probably the quickest road to failure within [my] setting . . . is to approach a problem or a person without tact and diplomacy. It's a given if you're going to exist in my position because . . . you're dealing with subjective development, as far as most product production people are concerned, and as a result you have to be even more diplomatic than those [whose productivity can be measured directly].

The interviewee also addressed the personalities of the members of corporate management with whom he works. He first said that, "Industry is made up of a lot of individualistic kinds of folks, and it's important to understand those personalities." He then added:

There are many strong personalities within a successful organization, and many times you have to feed both the ego and the problem. . . . People are saying, "Well, I'd like to have a training program in this . . . ."
You see that [request] as a personality, rather than a real [need], a lot of times.

The respondent then implied that human skills are required to effectively combat all of these political considerations which surround his position.

It is not surprising, given the political climate of the Project Manager's company, that the interviewee saw organizational conflict as another factor which influences the practicability of human skills. The following remarks were made by the respondent regarding conflict in his position: "Many interactions in industry are conflict in nature--they're superior-subordinate, and peer [centered]--and as a result, [human skills in managing conflict] are highly sought after."
Secondly, he remarked:

In a training session, there may be conflict between members as to what's appropriate in their area, as well as [conflict] in the actual environment. As a manager I have to know [how to deal with conflicts] as they relate to other managers around me.
Conflicts in training and conflicts in the work setting, then, seem to impact upon the respondent's position. This fact, coupled with the interviewee's statement that, "Many times we are called upon as a go-between," led the Project Manager to conclude that conflict-related human skills are very practicable in his position.

Midway through the interview, the respondent began to speak to what his position actually entails. He responded to the flow of his remarks in the first portion of the interview by saying:

I seem to be going [addressing my comments] more and more toward the individual training that we do, although we're trying to get more into organizational development, at least as it pertains to human resources, forecasting organizational needs, and preparing individuals to meet those needs.

The following quotes by the interviewee also help illustrate the roles he plays in the Division of Corporate Personnel: "As a project developer, I'm given projects--put together an experiential training program for the people in product development, for example, would be my project." Stated another way, he said, "Part of my job is to identify individual weaknesses so that they can be retooled or retrained."

Regarding his role in career planning, he explained:

This is . . . the goal of our career planning in the organization--to help individuals identify their strengths and where these strengths could lead them with certain assistance from internal and external sources.

In speaking to the importance of these roles, the interviewee concluded:

People get very emotional in the practical arena--and we do a lot in the practical arena. . . . There are many examples of how they will tell stories that are difficult to deal with, but the main thing is that you're able to manage yourself in the face of that story or
that situation. ... You know, you're talking about someone who is talking about their career, their job ... so they are very sincere and emotional in attempting to develop.

Individual human skills were highlighted by the Project Manager, and it is worthwhile to include some of these highlights in this discussion. The most time was spent by the interviewee in speaking of the practicability of human skills in establishing credibility and in being persuasive. For example, in addressing skill number 68 on the HSDQ, "the ability to utilize persuasive techniques," he concluded: "Because we're not tied to a physical product it becomes necessary to utilize many different persuasive techniques to justify our existence!" With respect to skill number 70, "the ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner," he stated, "That's about the only way we get anything done." In response to the skill, "the ability to 'table' one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes when required" (number 50 on the HSDQ), he surmised: "Being in a staff position you are constantly faced with the need to practice that skill—we're expendable!" Elsewhere, the respondent specifically cited skills related to the abilities to "differentiate between needs related to the task and needs related to the individual or group," "assume the role of devil's advocate," and "demonstrate personal conviction" (numbers 14, 34, and 35, respectively), as well as the abilities to "anticipate others' reaction(s) to a decision," "share one's experiences to the benefit of others," and "recognize one's own limitations" (numbers 53, 64, and 73, respectively), as being very practicable in his position.
Human skills relating to assessing and evaluating needs were also viewed by the interviewee as being very practicable in his position. As an illustration, the respondent made two comments concerning the practicability of the skills, "the ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others" and "the ability to encourage others to use their strengths" (numbers 1 and 17 on the HSDQ, respectively).

Regarding the former skill, he noted:

This is an integral part of my position in developing people—the needs assessment concept. So this [skill] is not only capable of being practiced, it's a necessary skill and is being practiced and will expand in sophistication [in the future].

Concerning the latter skill, he remarked:

In our organization through the process of employee development and career planning and estimates of individual potential, this [skill] is being practiced more and more every day—[through] performance appraisals . . . a fairly rigid system of sitting down with people and looking at their strengths and weaknesses.

The relation of human skills to performance appraisal was talked about many times during the interview. In addition to the two skills previously cited, the respondent specifically stated that seven other skills are important in this regard. Those skills, all rated very practicable on the HSDQ, concern the abilities to "elicit the feelings and positions of others," "recognize the accomplishments of others," "use appropriate timing and technique to promote constructive criticism," and "demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others" (numbers 10, 37, 45, and 46, respectively); and also the abilities to "assist others in clarifying their goals," "receive feedback," and "assist others in determining their needs" (numbers 55, 65, and 89,
respectively). Interestingly enough, however, skill number 59, "the ability to foster a climate in which evaluation is both valued and utilized," was rated only quite practicable by the interviewee and no rationale was given.

Human skills which focus upon demonstrating an interest and competence in communicating with fellow employees of the company were also perceived as being very practicable in the interviewee's job setting. The Project Manager noted in response to skill number 79, "the ability to implement appropriate nonverbal behavior," that:

"We interface with a lot of levels . . . from the Board of Directors to the employees, and they all have . . . different ways of interpreting nonverbal [communications]." He summarized the importance of human communication skills when he addressed skill number 11, "the ability to demonstrate an interest in communicating with others," that:

Not only is it important to be able to survive in industry to . . . understand the communication with others, but [also] they have to understand that you have an interest in listening and responding, and that you're sincerely interested in communicating with them.

Skills number 21 and 27, the abilities to "demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems" and "receive messages accurately," were cited by the respondent as being very practicable for reasons very similar to that for skill number 11.

Finally, human skills related to managing conflict were, with the exception of skill number 26, "the ability to provide insights into the nature of a conflict," viewed as very practicable for the Project Manager. He noted when speaking to the skill, "the ability
to differentiate between destructive and constructive conflict," that:

Given my position, this is something we have to be doing. Although we're on the fringe of conflict [for the most part] because we're in a staff position, we're involved in teaching that ability. . . . Managers are looking for ways to recognize and deal with conflict.

Consequently, the respondent intimated that conflict-related human skills must be modeled by him in his training efforts. Based upon their ratings of very practicable, it also appears that the abilities to "acknowledge and progress from situations of conflict," "differentiate between issues and personalities," "discern when intercession or restraint in a conflict is appropriate," and "discern unspoken cues indicating the presence of conflict" (skills number 23, 25, 29, and 31, respectively), are very important in the respondent's position.

The interviewee rated six skills as being somewhat impracticable in his position. Three of those skills are "the ability to promote open discussion of the emotional needs of others" (number 40), "the ability to encourage others' positive self-image" (number 54), and "the ability to recognize the limitations of others" (number 74). Regarding the first skill, the interviewee said: "I look at that more as a psychological counseling role . . . and we are expressly told not to get into that area. We are position-related, job-related."

In summarizing the practicability of the second skill, he concluded, "That again borders on personal counseling and is not in our job description." Regarding the last skill, he stated:

I look at limitations as being different from job related weaknesses, and also we have to be careful with any subjective evaluation of performance. We can only evaluate
people . . . through objective criteria, so for us to evaluate someone's subjective weaknesses or limitations . . . is recognizing things we shouldn't be recognizing.

Hence, these three skills were viewed as somewhat impracticable, as they all were perceived by the respondent as more related to personal counseling than to job centered abilities.

Skill number 20, "the ability to compensate for the limitations of others," was rated somewhat impracticable. The interviewee said: "In a functional organization each person has to stand on their own abilities . . . and performance . . . so I don't see how . . . they could be compensated for . . . without detriment to the person trying to do the compensating." The Project Manager said, in relation to skill number 41, "the ability to utilize physical contact appropriately": "That is somewhat impracticable, because it's a nonverbal that is not really acceptable behavior in the industrial environment at this point."

Finally, "the ability to demonstrate behaviors whose appropriateness are culturally or ethnically defined" (number 44) was addressed as being somewhat impracticable: "We're not involved in making distinctions in training anymore. We do not have programs for specific cultural groups. . . . Our programs have to stand on their success in developing people, and not specific people."

Summary

The Project Manager rated 64 of the 90 skills on the HSDQ as very practicable, 11 skills as quite practicable, nine skills as somewhat practicable, and six skills as somewhat impracticable in his
position. Several environmental factors were perceived to facilitate the practicability of these skills.

The factor which appeared to be the largest determinate of skills practicability is the attitudes seemingly held by some managers in the company toward the respondent's division. The interviewee noted that these managers are very production-centered and tend to measure successes in quantitative terms. Since the interviewee's division, a human relations training and consulting, cannot quantify the successes of its programs, it seems to be viewed with some suspicion by some corporate managers. Human skills which assist the respondent in establishing credibility with these managers were perceived to be very important in his position.

Another facilitator of human skills practicability is the political environment perceived to exist in the company. The interviewee stated that the organizational hierarchy of the company is considered almost sacred by management. Moreover, many of the individuals who wield power in the company seem to have large egos, are strong willed, and independent thinkers. Human skills related to respecting and dealing with the authorities in the company were therefore deemed very practicable by the respondent.

The Project Manager stated that, while not usually directly involved in managerial conflicts, the majority of human skills which center upon conflict are very practicable in his position. The skills' importance is derived from the training in these skills areas that the respondent is involved in. Consequently, it is important that he model human skills related to managing conflict in the training
he performs.

Fourth, the interviewee noted that in his career planning function with corporate employees, he is working in a sensitive and emotion-laden area. Since his counseling and appraisal can influence the professional futures of these individuals, he perceived it to be critical that he practice human skills related to demonstrating sensitivity and caring to workers participating in career counseling.

Three of the six skills viewed as somewhat impracticable in the Project Manager's position were so rated because they seemed to the respondent to be oriented toward personal counseling, an area the respondent has expressly been instructed to avoid. He noted that there is another division of the company which deals with the personal problems of employees, but were his division to work in this area, its real purpose--job-related training--would be circumvented. The remaining three skills rated somewhat impracticable centered upon compensating for others' weaknesses, utilizing physical contact, and demonstrating culturally defined behaviors. The first two skills were viewed by the respondent as running contrary to established norms of operation in the company; the last skill was considered somewhat impracticable, as accommodations in training for cultural groups are no longer made in the interviewee's position.

The Fifth Respondent

The fifth interview took place on May 8, 1979. It was held with a woman who holds the position of Director of Training for a large corporation in the Midwest. The corporation itself provides a service
to its clients and, therefore, requires sizable staffs for technical, clerical, and sales related functions. The corporation has divided itself into eight regions. The eight regional offices report to the one home office, and in turn, the offices in the field report to their respective regional office. The training of staff in the field is the responsibility of line management, in that the local field managers are held accountable by the home office for the training of employees in their own offices. On the other hand, many of the training materials and instructional programs are provided to the line managers by the home office through the Director of Training. It is also corporate policy that the expertise of local staff be utilized whenever possible in the training of local field employees. The Director of Training is responsible for the implementation of training programs, materials, and human resources corporate wide. More precisely, she defined her four major areas of responsibility as being:

1. To coordinate the training functions throughout the eight regions of the corporation.

2. To communicate with the regional and field management concerning existing programs, materials, and human resources used for training.

3. To plan for the optimum use of existing resources relating to the training of corporate staff.

4. To develop new materials, programs, and training activities when required.

In responding to the items on the HSDQ, the Director of Training rated 62 of the 90 human skills as very practicable in her position, 22 items as quite practicable, five items as somewhat practicable,
one item as of unknown practicability, and one item as somewhat impracticable.

Within the respondent's corporation there appear to be several environmental factors which impact upon the respondent's perceptions of the practicability of human skills. The first area mentioned in the interview concerned the perceptions which field management seems to hold toward regional management and the home office. In capsulizing these perceptions, the respondent concluded: "There is somewhat of a split between regional management and field management. Often the field perceives the region as lording over them . . . or as one higher authority figure that they wish they didn't have." One way in which these feelings seem to be manifest is in the receptivity shown to the Director of Training by the field management. The respondent made this comment in reference to this point: "The ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner is essential. They [field management] simply don't need women Ph.D.'s [from the home office] telling them anything." She added, "You have to make a real effort to make field management feel comfortable as a young woman who, in some instances, has authority over them." Thus, it appears that, in addition to the normally cool reception given to regional and home office management by the field, the Director of Training's job is further complicated by the fact that she is a highly educated female.

This cool reception usually given to upper management by the field seems to translate for the Director of Training into a reticence on the part of field management to facilitate training programs and
activities. The respondent concluded that one possible explanation for this reluctance on the part of field management to either personally participate in or to engage their staffs in training programs may be the single focus of field management's priorities. She said regarding this matter, "The priority of local management is production, their priority is not training . . . and if I miss that perception I'll never get their support."

Another related factor cited by the respondent which she perceives to impact upon the manner in which she must undertake her responsibilities concerns the job-related pressures seemingly felt by employees in all positions and levels within the corporation. In speaking for the need for being supportive of co-workers in the company, the interviewee remarked:

Various staff members are under a lot of pressure. . . . Staff support in our department is very important because there is so much resistance in other areas, if you don't get support from your colleagues you're in trouble.

She also commented on the pressure seemingly felt by field management:

Sometimes local management does not want to admit problems because they think it reflects poorly on their management performance . . . so unless you [the Director of Training] are willing to confront the manager and work through the problem with the manager, the problem may be avoided.

Still another phenomenon within the Director of Training's work setting which influences her perception of the practicability of specific human skills is the extremely high "political" climate of the corporation. The respondent spoke at a later point in the interview of how this political climate causes her to perceive her position as requiring a strategy of making overtures to management, and often
times when met with resistance or redress, pulling back in order to make another attempt at a later date. Given the attitude perceived to be generally held by field management concerning the relative importance of training, and especially training required by the home office, the Director of Training seems to perceive her role as one of "soft peddling" training programs and materials. She mentioned that individuals in the field often view her as an "outsider," and consequently, she cannot afford to push too hard or to use her positional authority indiscriminately lest she succeed in the short run, but perhaps at the expense of longer term credibility. Similarly, she stated that due to her position as Director of Training, she is frequently involved in situations where people are highly emotional. She warned, however, that it is absolutely essential that she keep herself detached from the emotionalism, as people in the field remember any "critical incidents" when the respondent might have reacted emotionally, and it took an extended period of time for her to recoup her credibility with those individuals.

In addition to speaking of factors within the corporation which influence the importance of human skills generally, the interviewee also elaborated upon her feelings concerning the practicability of specific types and areas of human skills. While the inclusion of the respondent's rationale for the importance of every cited human skill is not necessary, it might be in order to offer some illustrations of specific skills mentioned by the respondent with unusually high degrees of either frequency or conviction.
Skills relating to "the ability to project one's self as caring" and "the ability to express positive attitudes" (numbers 56 and 75 on the HSDQ, respectively) seem, for example, to have noteworthy significance for the Director of Training. Regarding the latter skill, the interviewee remarked:

There are many, many times that when you walk into both our own office and into a local office where people are generally "down" . . . maybe it's the weather in Chicago, who knows what it is . . . and the more positive you can generally be, the better.

She continued, "There are so many things to criticize in a large organization that if you spend your time criticizing, you just bring other people along with the negative." In response to the former skill concerning positive attitudes, she declared:

The ability to project one's self as caring never hurts . . . it never hurts . . . it's like honey— if they [regional and field management] perceive you as caring and dedicated and a "person" person, you may feel resistance at some points, but they'll usually open the door for the second try.

The Director of Training also spent considerable time describing the style in which she must interact with field management in order to fulfill her duties. She began the interview by giving this response to skill number 1 on the HSDQ, "the ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others":

A good part of the position that I hold as a training director demands that I be a salesperson. In order to sell somebody on programs, or training period, you have to be aware of what their needs are— because if you don't hit their needs, they have very little use for you.

She elaborated even further on this point in response to skill number 68, "the ability to utilize persuasive techniques," when she said,
"You have to sell everything you want to do [and] . . . the more persuasive you are, the more you can get done and the better things will be." In speaking with still more precision about the need for someone in her position to be persuasive, the respondent stated: "Persuasion is probably even more important when talking about management training and generic kinds of training—like communications training—because people perceive that [type of training] as very soft and nice, but not needed." She went on to describe the extreme efforts she had made to convince a field manager that the extensive work backlog which his office had been experiencing for several years may have been the result of a communications problem among his staff members. Parenthetically, she stated that once the manager relented and allowed his clerical staff to undergo a 3-week training session on communications skills, the work backlog was totally eradicated within 6 months.

Thus it seems that human skills related to being persuasive have particular practicability in the Director of Training's position. More specifically, five human skills on the HSDQ, in addition to those already cited, were assigned the highest possible rating of practicability by the respondent and were either mentioned directly or were intimated to be particularly important in the process of persuading assumed by the interviewer. Those skills are: "the ability to demonstrate tact and diplomacy," "the ability to demonstrate personal conviction," "the ability to facilitate change when it would be beneficial to others" (numbers 15, 35, and 69, respectively); "the ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner," "the ability to interpret nonverbal behavior," and "the ability
to assign rewards which will be valued by the recipient" (numbers 70, 78, and 84, respectively).

The interviewee also indicated at several points during the interview how important it is for her to be clear about the postures from which not only field management, but regional management as well, tend to function. She stated in response to skill number 31, "the ability to discern unspoken cues indicating the presence of conflict," that, "In order to get my job done, I really need to communicate well with management, so I've got to catch every cue I can, spoken or unspoken, so I know where they are." She offered this response to skill number 27, "the ability to receive messages accurately":

Probably the single most difficult and important challenge in my job is communicating with management. If I don't hear what they are saying, I either respond wrongly, or overreact, or underreact, and they they don't feel they got what they asked for.

Additionally, the following seven skills were also rated by the respondent as being very practicable in her position and appear to be closely related to enhancing the types of interpersonal communications referred to by the interviewee. They are: "the ability to elicit the feelings and positions of others," "the ability to demonstrate an interest in communicating with others," "the ability to project attentiveness to all participants in a communication or interaction," "the ability to understand the priorities of others" (numbers 10, 11, 12, and 28, respectively); "the ability to clarify the positions and perspectives of others," "the ability to distinguish the feelings of others," and "the ability to 'table' one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes when required" (numbers 30, 42, and 50,
respectively).

Several times during the interview the respondent mentioned that the practicability of a specific human skill is related to the skill's political importance. For example, in responding to the skill, "the ability to 'table' one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes when required" (number 50 on the HSDQ), the respondent said:

That's a political skill. Some people see things as funny that I don't, but if you can't laugh with them, if you can't do almost everything with them--laugh with them, commiserate with them--they don't perceive you as real, so you don't have the chance to get closer to them so that you can get something done.

In responding to the skill, "the ability to remain silent (number 90), she added that, "You have to be pretty political [in this position] . . . and knowing when to shut your mouth is part of being political."

Therefore, the interviewee's remarks, coupled with their ratings on the HSDQ, seem to suggest that "the ability to use humor effectively" and "the ability to determine when silence is appropriate" (numbers 61 and 85) are, like all of the previously cited human skills, highly practicable in the Director of Training's particular position.

One other factor which appears to impact upon the perceived practicability of human skills for the Director of Training is the personalities of some of the individuals in regional and field management positions. The respondent noted: "You run into some pretty obstinant, sometimes obnoxious, people, and if their personalities get in the way of the issue and you respond because you're reacting to their personality, you've missed the boat and it will later come back to haunt you." (This remark was made in relation to skill number
The respondent stated that the personal egos of certain members of management impact upon the importance of at least three human skills: "the ability to present the perspectives of others with respect," "the ability to differentiate between issues and personalities," and "the ability to discern when intercession or restraint in a conflict is appropriate" (numbers 4, 25, and 29 on the HSDQ, respectively).

As an illustration, the respondent suggested in relation to the last skill, "Sometimes in conflict, a manager's ego might be the reason why he's pushing so hard on something."

A final note should be offered at this point. The one item rated by the respondent as being of unknown practicability (number 47 on the HSDQ, "the ability to project the probable interpretation of complimenting others") was the result of some confusion as to what the item specifically referred. The one item assigned a rating of being somewhat impracticable (number 44, "the ability to demonstrate behaviors common to specific cultural or ethnic situations or groups") came from a feeling on the respondent's part that culturally or ethnically related matters seldom occur in her position, perhaps because of the rather technical level at which her corporation's employees usually function.

**Summary**

The Director of Training perceived the vast majority of human skills identified in the HSDQ to be either very or quite practicable in the position she holds (84 of the 90 descriptors). In other words,
the respondent felt that virtually all of the identified human skills are needed by the person occupying her position. By way of explanation, she seemed to feel that those human skills are important because of the rather sensitive nature of her job. This sensitivity appears to be the result of several environmental factors.

First, as a member of upper management affiliated with the home office of the corporation, the respondent perceived herself to be considered suspect by many of the individuals with whom she works most frequently; namely, the managers of the regional and field offices. This perceived suspicion apparently results from several environmental phenomena:

1. Relations between the home office and regional and field management appear to be rather guarded, at least on the parts of the regional and field offices.

2. The responsibility of the respondent is to oversee the implementation of the corporation's training functions, an area of seemingly low priority among many of the individuals in the regional and field offices.

3. The fact that the respondent is both female and highly educated is apparently perceived by many of the regional and field managers, the bulk of whom are male, as representing a threat to them.

Hence, the respondent felt that a high degree of human skills relating to enhancing her credibility as Director of Training, reducing the possibility of being threatening to regional and field management, and to fostering inter-personal communications between regional and field management and herself is important for someone in her
particular position.

Second, because training is perceived by the respondent as being relatively unimportant to regional and field management, the Director of Training must, on the one hand, build rapport with regional and field management in order to gain entree to their staffs, while on the other hand, must be quite successful in persuading these managers to assign a greater priority to training programs and activities. This ability to be persuasive is apparently complicated by the fact both managers and line employees alike are very concerned about, if not totally preoccupied with, increasing production. Consequently, it appears that many individuals in the regional and field offices either cannot see the benefit of training programs, and especially generic rather than technical training programs, or they feel that in spite of the potential benefit they cannot afford the initial investments of their time and manpower. The Director of Training, therefore, felt a need for a great deal of human skills in order to deal with these attitudes which appear to prevail.

Finally, the importance of human skills for the Director of Training seems to be enhanced by the political requirements for the occupant of her position. There appear to be a number of corporate employees in managerial positions with, as might be expected, relatively large egos. Given the dependence that the Director of Training has upon many of these managers, she felt she must work very hard to make them feel both comfortable and understood. This factor seems further complicated by the informal structure of the corporation itself, which appears to require that all managers, including the
Director of Training, be politically astute. The necessity, then, of possessing human skills which can be utilized in dealing with the personal and political dimensions of interacting with home office, regional, and field management appears to be particularly acute for the individual in the position of Director of Training.

The Sixth Respondent

Interview number six, which took place on May 16, 1979, was held with a division chief of a large human service agency in a medium size Midwestern city. The respondent, a male, described his official job title as Division Chief of (Human Service) Education, Planning, and Public Information for the agency. He also noted that he is at the second level in the organizational hierarchy and, like the three other division chiefs, reports directly to the head of the agency. In describing his functions within the organization, the interviewee elaborated upon the areas of responsibility included in his job title. In terms of the first area, (human service) education, he explained that he is involved in both enhancing the awareness of the members of the community concerning his agency's services, and in fostering preventative human service programs through the use of the city's mass media. The respondent's second area of responsibility, agency planning, requires that he identify outside funding sources and develop proposals for those funds. He mentioned that this grantsmanship responsibility typically involves the implementation of either an organizational needs assessment or formative evaluation. Area number three, public information, involves the interviewee in disseminating
information to both print and electronic media as spokesperson for the agency. Press releases, information updates from the agency, and meetings with reporters all fall under his purview as Division Chief.

On the HSDQ, the respondent rated 71 of the 90 skills as very practicable in his position, 15 skills as quite practicable, and the remaining four skills as somewhat practicable. None of the skills described on the questionnaire were viewed as impracticable in his position in any way.

As with the other respondents, the Chief indicated that numerous factors surrounding his position influence the practicability of human skills. Certainly one of these environmental factors concerns the respondent's attempts to establish credibility with other members of the agency staff. The interviewee stated that, even though he has held his position for almost 2 years, he is yet to be accepted by some agency workers. He mentioned that he finds it particularly difficult to establish rapport with some of the employees who have been with the agency for a number of years. At one point the Chief said:

The traditional people, or the people who have been aboard so long in the agency that they're locked into [routines] . . . recognizing that's where they are . . . allows you to minimize the disruptiveness when you might proffer an idea or implement a change.

He spoke of learning this lesson through trial and error:

Being the newest division chief in the agency, I've had to avoid going too quickly. I've learned the hard way that . . . to come into my job bright eyed and bushy tailed . . . with a graduate degree . . . and an attitude that includes making some significant changes . . . I've met with a lot of resistance.
Elsewhere, the respondent spoke of his attempts to build relationships with co-workers, this time concerning his showing respect for their input:

Showing that I respect other's viewpoint is a constant in my job with some of the people with whom I've had a difficult time building a trust relationship . . . and again it's with people who have been in the agency a lot longer than myself . . . who may to some extent feel that I'm an upstart, an import, and so it's been very critical that I have been able to show them respect . . . although often times it's been viewed with a certain degree of suspicion.

As this quote suggests, the Chief did not have any direct experience with the agency prior to his being placed in his high level position. Consequently, he sees himself as somewhat intimidating to some of the staff. He added at a later point that, "For me to work with them, I've got to minimize any possible threat to them."

The suspicion on the part of co-workers caused the respondent to state that he must show sensitivity to them:

In my job situation I am constantly trying to look at adequately fulfilling personal needs. It's amazing how often an element of insensitivity to what's gone on before or to what the expectations are of a particular person in the agency . . . can disrupt trust or . . . how if I don't read the situation properly I can be . . . losing an alliance.

The suspicious nature of the respondent's environment caused him, therefore, to view the importance of human skills in his position as very real.

The Chief also spoke of environmental factors related to his supervisory responsibilities. He described his staff, which has varied in size from 4 to 14, in this way:

A lot of my staff are hired through federal funds on CETA [a government supported job training program], and so I end up having to start from scratch with a lot of people in
bringing them along to being able to make a contribution.

The interviewee noted that he finds it virtually impossible to meet all of the demands that are held for him and his staff:

My division is a staff support division, and I am to work with [the three] other divisions. Not only my boss has expectations; other divisions have expectations, and too often we're not able to respond to all of them, which creates a lot of problems.

While the respondent suggested that his relations with other division chiefs call for a large number of human skills, his interactions with his boss speaks even more clearly to this need. The interviewee described his boss as a very strong willed individual who drives his subordinates incessantly. In a comment directed toward his dealings with his boss, the respondent said:

It's easy to be overloaded if you've demonstrated a certain degree of competence, and it takes a certain amount of tact to say, "No, I can't handle that," or "you've got to take some time to help me prioritize my tasks."

The interviewee described his boss by saying, "My boss takes a particular amount of pride in not wanting 'yes' people around." The respondent stated that he therefore feels compelled to be candid with the agency's Director. He added an interesting aside, however, as to how his candor is typically received and why he continues to speak in that fashion:

[Yet] in the ultimate sense he [my boss] is a dictator, in that his view will prevail . . . but in order for me to maintain my credibility for future guidance, I have to register my opposition and stand fast, but then comply. That gives future redress for a later time.

Hence, the interviewee feels that he must be straight-forward with his boss, even though his candor does not often result in changes--
or at least visible changes—in his boss's decisions.

The Chief also spoke of the seemingly mixed blessing which his relationship with the agency's Director has produced. On the one hand, the respondent is frequently taken into his boss's confidence, which provides the Chief with insights he would not otherwise have. On the other hand, his relationship with his boss has resulted in his being assigned tasks which place him in the middle of conflicts between the Director and agency staff. For example, the interviewee said:

> When someone has been given a task to accomplish and the Director is unhappy with what they've done . . . it's been proffered to me [to handle the matter]. It's been a very tricky position to be put in the middle on that . . . a lot of resentment comes out of my getting as assignment [of telling staff] that things have not satisfied the Director.

Obviously, well honed human skills are required of the Chief when handling an issue such as this. Moreover, though not surprising, the interviewee added: "There are a significant number of conflicts . . . with other staff members, particularly a group that have resented my coming to the agency and would like to see me go out."

The respondent even mentioned that this group made efforts about a year ago to have the respondent either removed from the agency or transferred to another position within the agency. Hence, conflict seems very prevalent for the Chief and is, therefore, a factor influencing the practicability of human skills.

The interviewee suggested that the nature of the tension among staff in the agency might be the result of a self-defeating cycle of a lack of communication producing conflict and conflict fostering an
unwillingness to communicate. The Chief made two short references to this situation. He first said, "I've talked a lot about group process and the groups I work with . . . and there are all too many impasses." He also stated, "Within the agency, from the central administration on down, there is a lamentable lack of demonstration of an interest in communicating." Thus, the circle of conflict seems to feed itself.

Another area of responsibility which falls upon the occupant of the respondent's position is serving as agency liaison with the other human service organizations in the community. The interviewee intimated that human skills are very practicable in this situation because of the climate surrounding these efforts toward interagency cooperation. On the one hand, the agencies are ostensibly trying to work and be open with one another; however, as the respondent said, "Our agency in particular is faced with the reality of competing [with these other agencies] for ever-dwindling resources." He added, as might be anticipated: "A lot of times . . . dealing with different agencies I don't feel there is an eagerness to be there [together] and that there is a high priority on communication." He continued:

It's hard to dope out where the quiet people are coming from [in interagency meetings], especially on the first go around . . . [for example] are the quiet people holding back because they are suspicious where they are being led [or is it some other reason]?

Resultantly, in speaking for the need for humor at these meetings, the interviewee said, "If it's so bloody serious that no one's relaxed, . . . you're not likely to get people contributing and warming to you to build the trust." Making efforts to assist participants at
interagency meetings to feel relaxed and trusting, then, are impor-
tant for the person in the respondent's position.

The interviewee also spoke of his responsibilities as Chief of
Public Information as influencing the practicability of human skills.

He made this remark:

One significant other that I deal with fairly regularly is
the press, the reporters. Their priorities are to ferret
out the dirt, a sensational story, or a newsworthy item.
When I'm dealing with them, I have to be alert to . . .
my normal willingness to express myself with candor . . .
because that won't work.

At another point, he said:

When I run up against hard [technical] data which I lack as
a public information officer, I make a very hasty referral
to the associate director of the agency who has a degree
[in the related human service area]. There is too much
liability in my job regarding attempting to answer a ques-
tion that I'm not qualified to answer.

Human skills related to providing the media with a balance between
too much and too little information are important, then, in the inter-
viewee's position.

The final environmental factor discussed by the Chief concerned
his dealings with advisory groups. He mentioned that he has responsi-
bility within the agency for working with four advisory committees,
and that human skills have a bearing upon his effectiveness in working
with those groups. He summed up his relationships with these commit-
tees in the following way:

My job is a processor within the agency by its nature. A
lot of that has to do with relinquishing overt control with
advisory groups. I'm responsible as liaison to four dis-
tinct advisory groups, and most of the time, for those
groups to function well . . . my involvement has to be
minimized.
This thought seemed to come from his belief that by virtue of his position, the advisory committee members, and especially those from minority groups who have problems with English, are often intimidated by his presence at meetings unless he assumes a very low profile.

Until this point, discussion has centered upon environmental factors cited by the respondent as influencing his perceptions of the practicability of human skills in his particular position. The interviewee also spoke, however, of the practicability of specific human skills and areas of skills that seem to have relevance for him. All of the references he made will not be included here, however, illustrations will be offered.

In his efforts to establish relationships with other agency staff, the interviewee stated that several specific human skills are required. He mentioned that skills number 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, and 20 on the HSDQ are particularly practicable in this regard. Those skills are, respectively, "the ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others," "the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to individual needs," "the ability to understand the standards of others," "the ability to present the perspectives of others with respect," "the ability to demonstrate tact and diplomacy," and "the ability to compensate for the limitations of others." As was mentioned previously, the practicability of these specific skills results from the high degree of suspicion held by some staff members toward the interviewee. It is, therefore, necessary for him to devote a great deal of attention to these skills. For example, regarding the skill of "the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to individual needs," the respondent
remarked:

It is necessary to be able to show [sensitivity] to individual needs. An example might be [in my position] a major administrative aid who is a single parent. If you don't check in on how it's going with her daughter— at least periodically— there is the feeling that you don't care about her. . . . I have to remind myself to check in and lend some support to her [because] . . . if I don't do that it can create an impediment in our further interactions.

Human skills related to being sensitive to others are very important for the respondent. Therefore, in addition to those skills already cited, a number of other human skills would appear to be very practicable for the respondent. It should be noted that all of these additional skills were assigned the highest possible rating of practicability by the respondent on the HSDQ. Those skills address the respective abilities to "identify underlying group concerns," "elicit the feelings and positions of others," "understand the priorities of others," and "recognize the accomplishments of others" (numbers 8, 10, 28, and 37); the abilities to "distinguish the feelings of others," "demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others," "demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner," and "demonstrate respect for the opinions of others" (numbers 42, 46, 70, and 80).

A second phenomenon in the Chief's position relates to his efforts to develop his staff. In addressing this factor in general, the interviewee spoke of the importance of two specific human skills: "the ability to demonstrate tact and diplomacy" and "the ability to encourage others to use their strengths" (numbers 15 and 17 on the HSDQ). He went on to say that his efforts toward staff development
must involve trying to build a staff team; that is, a feeling of shared responsibility and interdependence among staff members. In addressing skill number 16, "the ability to recognize the strengths of others," he said:

Yea . . . [the skill is very practicable] . . . . The thing that will make my job successful is team building . . . for when team building isn't occurring . . . I'm [my division is] making a relatively small difference in the overall scheme of things.

Skill number 49, "the ability to provide demonstrations of support for others," also had special significance for the Chief in his efforts toward team building: "Very critical to team building is that demonstration of support at all levels; psychological, as well as . . . practical support." He also said, in discussing skill number 89, "the ability to assist others in determining their needs," that:

This whole facilitation thing of helping others . . . is critical in my job from the standpoint of helping [my] staff to overcome some of their personal hangups that . . . are preoccupying them in carrying out their own jobs.

In this same vein, the interviewee stated that "the ability to compensate for one's own limitations" and "the ability to demonstrate openness," (skills number 66 and 88) are particularly practicable for him in team building. Both of these skills seem to be related to his being honest enough to admit that he has limitations and to then identify other members of his staff who can pick up the slack.

Planning is an area of responsibility for the respondent which he viewed as requiring certain human skills. In speaking to skill number 39, "the ability to communicate the benefit of short term
sacrifice for the sake of achieving longer term goals," he remarked:

You pay a price for advanced planning . . . but it's a crucial skill . . . Grant applications is a major area I can think of. Too often we're ending up functioning under very tight deadlines where, with a little advanced planning, we would have had enough room to respond and greater probability of being funded.

He then spoke of his efforts at communicating to others, primarily the Director of the agency and fellow department heads, that an initial effort on their parts might eliminate future problems. He added, however, that he has not had much success in this matter.

The respondent also spoke of human skills as they relate to planning when he focused upon skill number 25, "the ability to differentiate between issues and personalities." He said:

In a planning context it's necessary for me in bringing a group toward closure—for example, in deciding upon the elements . . . of a narrative for a grant application . . . I have to sort out the emotive messages that person is laying out . . . from what they're proffering me that's relevant to the proposal that's being developed.

Hence, it appears that even though agency planning may be typically viewed as requiring technical skills, the interviewee felt that certain human skills are required during the planning process.

The respondent stated that conflict is prevalent in his situation. While not offering a great deal of detail regarding the natures of these conflicts, he did suggest that in addition to the attempts of some employees to remove him from his position, difficulties relate to problems with staff concerning scheduling, training requirements, and the quality of their work. Yet, in spite of this lack of specificity, the interviewee did assign the highest possible ratings of practicability to a number of skills on the HSDQ which address
conflict. Those skills are: "the ability to demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems," "the ability to acknowledge and progress from situations of conflict," "the ability to differentiate between destructive and constructive conflict," and "the ability to provide insights into the nature of a conflict" (numbers 21, 23, 24, and 26, respectively); "the ability to discern when intercession or restraint in a conflict is appropriate," "the ability to discern unspoken cues indicating the presence of conflict," and "the ability to move a group which is experiencing an impasse" (numbers 29, 31, and 52, respectively).

The Chief also spoke of the practicability of particular human skills regarding his functions in disseminating public information. He mentioned that the sensitivity of information which often comes from the agency requires that he constantly be vigilant that he both transmit and receive information appropriately. Regarding skill number 27, "the ability to receive messages accurately," he noted:

In my job when we're talking about messages [we're talking about] the public information function that I serve . . . if I'm not able to render them back so that people can say "He did hear me," I have no credibility.

He also mentioned in response to skill number 82, "the ability to determine when to take risks which may affect others," that, "the kind of risks that I . . . take in my job . . . might even affect communication bases within the agency, so it's important to know how far to go." Finally, with respect to his public information responsibilities, the respondent spoke of the practicability of "the ability to remain silent" (number 90 on the HSDQ): "In my job in particular
there are a lot of ways I can be shot at . . . and learning when not to raise sensitive issues [publicly] is important to my survival."
The interviewee noted that all too frequently community groups misunderstand communiques from his agency; he therefore has found it, on occasion, best to communicate nothing publicly if at all possible.

Finally, the respondent cited three skills which seemed to have particular practicability for someone in his position. These skills, although not specifically related to any group of human skills, are worth noting. In response to skill number 9, "the ability to synthesize a variety of inputs," the Chief said:

If someone in my position doesn't have the ability to discern commonalities of a wide variety of variables or inputs, you're not very likely to come out of a meeting with anything cohesive that you can either report back or act upon.

Given the tremendous number of meetings that the respondent stated he must participate in, this skill indeed does appear to have particular importance.

The respondent, unlike most of the other individuals interviewed for this study, assigned the highest possible rating to skill number 43, "the ability to identify and accept behaviors common to specific cultural or ethnic situations or groups." He remarked: "In my job in particular this relates to advisory groups. One of the advisory councils is related to a genetic disease that mainly affects blacks." He went on to say that one of the best decisions he had made in working with advisory groups was to encourage a group of Chicanos to conduct meetings in Spanish. Interestingly enough, the interviewee viewed the skill, "the ability to demonstrate behaviors common to
specific cultural or ethnic situations or groups" (number 44 on the HSDQ), as only somewhat practicable in his position. He concluded that, "If you do it [the skill] wrong, you can make an ass of yourself!"

Finally, the respondent may well have summed up the attitude the occupant of his position must hold when he commented on skill number 56, "the ability to project one's self as caring." He stated: "In my job one must be caring . . . it can't really be faked . . . caring about staff and their needs, caring about clients . . . caring about the elements of the community."

Summary

The Division Chief viewed 86 of the 90 human skills described on the HSDQ as being either very practicable or quite practicable in his position. Additionally, he did not perceive any of the skills to be impracticable in any way. His ratings of the HSDQ items seem to be based upon his perceptions of certain environmental factors which surround his position in the human service agency.

One major factor which appeared to cause the interviewee to view human skills as very important is the attitude that some staff members within the agency, particularly some employees who have worked for the agency for a number of years, hold for the respondent. He mentioned that since he did not have any work experience with the agency directly prior to being placed in his senior position, some individuals within the organization view him with a great deal of suspicion and resentment. Human skills which facilitate trust building and
opening lines of communication between himself and those individuals therefore seem practicable for the Chief.

A second factor which seems to impact upon the importance of human skills are the interviewee's attempts to develop the competencies of his own staff. The interviewee stated that the majority of his staff are hired on government training funds and, consequently, require a great deal of guidance before they become productive employees. Human skills which assist the respondent in presenting suggestions and criticisms in non-threatening manners thus appear to be required in order to fulfill this responsibility. Additionally, human skills which allow the Chief to identify and act upon the individual needs of his staff seem very practicable and necessary for someone in the respondent's position.

The respondent also mentioned that the uniqueness of his relationship with his superordinate, the Director of the agency, requires a high degree of human skill proficiency. It appears that his second level position in the agency hierarchy has placed him in the position of confidant to the Director and, resultantly, has caused some of his colleagues to view him with even more suspicion. Resultantly, this suspicion seems to have precipitated the number of conflicts which occur between fellow staff members and the Chief. Human skills related to dealing with conflict, therefore, seem to have special practicability for the respondent.

Working with other human service agencies in the community also is a factor influencing the respondent's perceptions of the practicability of human skills. As the agency's liaison with community
agencies, the respondent must concentrate upon building relationships with other agencies' representatives in order to bring about cooperative efforts. The political climate among these agencies—i.e., the inter-agency competition for dwindling financial resources—makes them reticent to accept any apparent attempts at communication at face value. The interviewee felt, therefore, that human skills oriented toward establishing trust and making agency representatives feel more comfortable in inter-agency meetings are especially practicable for him.

The Division Chief also perceived that human skills are important for himself in his role of public information coordinator for the agency. This belief seemed to be rooted in two phenomena. First, the agency often disseminates information which, because of the technical nature of the messages, can be easily misunderstood by the community. Human skills related to the receiving and sending of communications accurately seem very practicable for the respondent. Also, the interviewee is in frequent contact with members of the media. Given the interest of this group in obtaining all the information they can, the respondent felt that human skills which relate to the amounts and types of information he provides are particularly important for him. Specifically, he referred to human skills which address risk-taking and remaining silent as being very practicable in his position.

As one approaches the end of this discussion of the interviews with the six members of the population, it may be helpful to refer the reader to the two tables which conclude this chapter. Both tables are included so that some closure may be brought about in terms of
summarizing the results of the data collection phase of this study. Table 1 presents a matrix which summarizes the major environmental factors cited by two or more of the respondents as influencing their perceptions of the practicability of human skills in their job settings. Table 2 provides individual and mean ratings for each of the 90 skills on the HSDQ given by the six members of the population. It should be mentioned that the latter table has been developed so that the skills are cited according to their relative practicability; the most practicable skills are listed first.

The final chapter of this study is next presented. In Chapter V, conclusions are drawn from the findings reached during the research. Possible implications which this study may produce are also discussed, and lastly, recommendations are offered as to how this study might be well utilized in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent &amp; Setting</th>
<th>Common Environmental Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Church)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (National Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III (Business &amp; Industry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (Business &amp; Industry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (Business &amp; Industry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI (Human Service Agency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Individual and Mean Ratings of Human Skills Given by Respondents on the Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire (HSDQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill No.</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Individual Ratings of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The ability to synthesize a variety of inputs</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate an interest in communicating with others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The ability to recognize the strengths of others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The ability to encourage others to use their strengths</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. HSDQ scale ranges from: 1 = very practicable, 2 = quite practicable, 3 = somewhat practicable, 4 = unknown, 5 = somewhat impracticable, 6 = quite impracticable, to 7 = very impracticable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill No.</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Individual Ratings of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The ability to provide demonstrations of support for others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>The ability to use humor effectively</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The ability to make others feel comfortable</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>The ability to distinguish among the possible, the probable, and the impossible</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>The ability to accept criticism given by others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The ability to express positive attitudes</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The ability to determine when silence is appropriate</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The ability to manage one's self in highly emotional situations</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate openness</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The ability to clearly state one's own feelings and positions</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The ability to elicit the feelings and positions of others</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate tact and diplomacy</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The ability to structure interactions</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The ability to discern when intercession or restraint in a conflict is appropriate</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The ability to stimulate positive interaction</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The ability to recognize the accomplishments of others</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The ability to distinguish the feelings of others</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The ability to compliment others</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>The ability to assist others in clarifying their goals</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The ability to project one's self as caring</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>The ability to appreciate the humor of others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>The ability to utilize persuasive techniques</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>The ability to facilitate change when it would be beneficial to others</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate respect for the opinions of others</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>The ability to facilitate individuals and groups in reaching closure</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>The ability to assist others in determining their needs</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate sensitivity to individuals needs</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ability to present the perspectives of others with respect</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The ability to identify underlying group concerns</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The ability to project enthusiasm to others</td>
<td>2 1 1 2 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The ability to differentiate between destructive and constructive conflict</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The ability to differentiate between issues and personalities</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The ability to understand the priorities of others</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The ability to clarify the positions and perspectives of others</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The ability to discern unspoken cues indicating the presence of conflict</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The ability to help others to identify preferred outcomes</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate personal conviction</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1 2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The ability to use appropriate timing and technique to promote constructive criticism</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>The ability to move a group which is experiencing an impasse</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>The ability to recognize opportunities for self-expression</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>The ability to receive feedback</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>The ability to recognize one's own limitations</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The ability to interpret nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>The ability to determine when to take risks which may affect others</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The ability to understand the standards of others</td>
<td>2 1 2 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The ability to differentiate between needs related to the task and needs related to the individual or group</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The ability to acknowledge and progress from situations of conflict</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The ability to provide insights into the nature of a conflict</td>
<td>2 2 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The ability to receive messages accurately</td>
<td>2 3 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>The ability to manipulate circumstances so that creativity may be enhanced</td>
<td>I 3 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>The ability to utilize a variety of methods of self-expression</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The ability to stimulate conversation</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 3 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>The ability to share one's experiences to the benefit of others</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>The ability to assist others in the problem-solving process</td>
<td>1 3 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The ability to assign rewards which will be valued by the recipient</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 1 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>The ability to remain silent</td>
<td>1 2 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate respect for the authority of others</td>
<td>1 2 1 3 1 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The ability to determine the vulnerabilities of others</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 2 2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The ability to place one's self in the background when required</td>
<td>1 5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The ability to identify and accept behaviors whose appropriateness are culturally or ethnically defined</td>
<td>1 2 1 2 3 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The ability to anticipate others' reaction(s) to a decision</td>
<td>2 2 1 2 2 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>The ability to compensate for one's own limitations</td>
<td>1 3 2 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>The ability to mediate between opposing individuals or groups</td>
<td>1 2 3 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>The ability to implement appropriate nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>1 2 1 3 2 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>The ability to view individuals and situations non-judgmentally</td>
<td>1 3 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The ability to appraise the implications of judgments which significantly affect the lives of others</td>
<td>1 2 3 1 2 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill No.</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Individual Ratings of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The ability to project attentiveness to all participants in a communication or interaction</td>
<td>2 5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The ability to persuade others of their freedom to take risks and be creative</td>
<td>2 2 2 1 2 2</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The ability to communicate the benefit of short term sacrifice for the sake of achieving longer term goals</td>
<td>2 3 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>The ability to &quot;table&quot; one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes when required</td>
<td>2 5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>The ability to encourage others' positive self-image</td>
<td>1 1 5 1 1 2</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>The ability to recognize the limitations of others</td>
<td>1 3 5 1 1 1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>The ability to discern changes in the morale of others</td>
<td>1 2 3 1 2 2</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The ability to stand firm in the face of opposition</td>
<td>2 3 3 2 1 1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill No.</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Individual Ratings of Respondents</td>
<td>Mean of Individual Ratings (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>The ability to foster a climate in which evaluation is both valued and utilized</td>
<td>1 3 2 3 2 1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The ability to project the probable interpretation of complimenting others</td>
<td>1 2 1 3 4 2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The ability to assume the role of &quot;devil's advocate&quot;</td>
<td>2 3 1 3 3 2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The ability to divorce one's self from distractions</td>
<td>2 3 2 3 2 3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The ability to utilize physical contact appropriately</td>
<td>2 1 5 2 3 3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The ability to promote open discussion of the emotional needs of others</td>
<td>2 3 5 2 3 2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The ability to compensate for the limitations of others</td>
<td>2 3 5 3 2 3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate behaviors common to specific cultural or ethnic situations or groups</td>
<td>1 2 3 5 3 5 3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to offer and detail conclusions, implications, and recommendations drawn from this study. In the beginning, the genesis of this research is presented so that the reader may have a better feel for why and how this study was undertaken, and a clearer understanding of the biases of the author which have latently, but continuously, surrounded this research.

The origin of this study occurred more than 6 years ago. At that time the writer was employed as a secondary education teacher in Michigan. During the school year, a graduate level course in Affective Education was offered in the system in which he worked, and the writer enrolled in the class. From that experience, an awareness emerged for the author that it seemed for many people, including himself, the ability to skillfully relate to other people in a "humane" manner is frequently taken for granted in education circles. As a result of that course and many related experiences, it was concluded by the writer that this assumed competence in interpersonal relations can, and often does, serve as an impediment to increased skill development. For example, since one feels that he or she is a capable listener, no need is felt to even consider, much less verify, that opinion.
Over the next few years, the writer became involved as a teacher, administrator, and student of community education. When reflecting upon those experiences, it seemed that those events in which he experienced success were largely due to his success in an interpersonal relationship, and conversely, those experiences which proved less than satisfactory seemed largely related to unsatisfactory interpersonal transactions.

A second observation surfaced as a result of the author's involvement in community education: that was, an apparently universal mind set seemed to be held by those within the profession that if an individual was actively involved in community education, he or she undoubtedly and seemingly automatically possessed finely honed human skills. Moreover, it appeared to be accepted by many that being "nice," in and of itself, was sufficient for one to function well within the profession. While the writer was not categorically in disagreement with these opinions, a feeling of disquiet did persist. Unfortunately, a review of the literature related to interpersonal relations and community education did little to dispel that disquiet, as there appeared to be little, if any, data to either refute or support the hypotheses which seemed extant in the field.

The importance of human skills in community education which was derived from the writer's own experiences, coupled with the apparent void in the literature concerning this subject, led quite naturally to an interest in investigating this topic.

A second area of interest emerged for the writer, this time during the course of his doctoral studies. There seemed to be a division
of opinion among practitioners and scholars concerning whether or not community education is legitimate if it is operationalized in settings other than local schools. This issue seemed even more timely since several doctoral graduates in community education were assuming positions in settings other than public schools. Again, a review of the literature on this subject, in tandem with the writer's own conceptual base, led to the conclusion that expanding settings for community education are frequently bonafide, however, additional attention needed to be focused on the legitimacy of these settings. Consequently, the decision was made to relate the topic of expanding settings for community education to the topic of human skills in community education, and this study was undertaken.

The biases of this researcher which were previously referred to can therefore be summarized as follows:

1. Human skills are essential if one is to succeed in any leadership role in an educational setting, including a community education setting.

2. Many individuals in community education seem to believe that they are extremely competent in human skill areas, although they appear to have refrained from actually seeking to verify their personal levels of competence.

3. Some community educators seem to believe that being a "nice" person is equivalent to possessing human skills. This belief is not totally shared by the writer, as it is felt that while some human skills may generally relate to being pleasant, other human skills have little to do with one's personality.
4. Community education is a concept which is too broad to be limited to school settings alone; the concept can be appropriately implemented in numerous other environments such as business and industry, health and human services, and religious institutions.

Efforts were made throughout this study to divorce these biases from the conduct of this research. In the interest of the integrity of this study, however, they have been included for the reader's information.

Conclusions

In noting the conclusions drawn from this study one should be made aware that, in spite of attempts at control having been made whenever possible, some of the data collected during this research have been subjectively evaluated. This occurrence was expected from the onset of this research, and the decision to utilize the chosen methodology was made over the use of several other more statistical approaches. Hence, no apology is offered for this decision, and readers may review the data assembled in Chapter IV of this study if they feel such a need. The following conclusions, then, have been reached and are based upon the data gathered during this study:

Conclusion 1: Human skills are seen by community educators in expanding settings as being either very practicable or quite practicable in their work settings.

Mean ratings were calculated for each set of responses given by the six members of the population. On the seven point scale of the HSDQ, where a "1" represented very practicable and a "7" indicated
very impracticable, the ratings of all of the 90 items averaged between 1.00 and 2.00 for the six members of the population (This is actually the Grand Means of the ratings). The means for the ratings for each subject are as follows, and in the interest of readability, the setting in which the respective respondent is employed is also included, followed by the average of his or her ratings on the HSDQ; the lower the rating, the greater the perceived practicability: 
Respondent VI, Human Service Agency, X = 1.25; Respondent III, Business and Industry, X = 1.31; Respondent I, Church, X = 1.31; Respondent V, Business and Industry, X = 1.43; Respondent IV, Business and Industry, X = 1.59; and Respondent II, National Association, X = 1.85.
For all of the responses given by all of the respondents the mean rating was 1.43. Each of these mean ratings, then, falls between a score of very practicable and quite practicable on the HSDQ's scale.

Conclusion 2: The need for community educators in expanding settings to develop their staffs is a major influencer of the practicability of human skills in their work settings.

There was a unanimous belief among the six respondents that staff development is a major factor which calls for the implementation of human skills by them in their respective work environments. At one point or another during the interviews, all of the respondents stated that the development of people with whom they work is a responsibility which befalls them. Respondents III, IV, and V said that their respective job descriptions require them to develop programs and activities specifically designed to fostering the professional growth of groups of workers in their organizations. These three members of
the population are all involved in supervising training programs in business and industry. Respondents I, II, and VI, while not directly responsible for providing training, concluded that in their positions of leadership they will not ultimately be successful if efforts are not made by them to encourage the development of the people with whom they work. Human skills which facilitate the six respondents in enhancing staff development are therefore seen as extremely practicable for the occupants of their respective positions.

Conclusion 3: The political environment frequently witnessed in business and industrial settings is a primary influencer of human skills practicability for community educators in those settings.

Respondents III, IV, and V all hold positions in business and industrial settings. Moreover, they are all involved in training functions, as was previously mentioned. Each of these interviewees stated explicitly that they must understand and function within the political climate of their respective companies if they are to survive. In offering what proved to be a common denominator among them, they all stated with an amazing similarity of descriptions that they must interact with upper level management, and that many of these managers appear to have very large and delicate egos. The respondents in business and industry concluded that human skills are therefore very practicable for them in their efforts at relating to these individuals. Such a conclusion was not voiced by any of the other three respondents who hold positions outside of the corporate setting.
Conclusion 4: The need for community educators in business and industrial settings to be persuasive is a major influencer of the practicability of human skills in those settings.

Unlike the three respondents who are not involved in business and industry (Respondents I, II, and VI), interviewees III, IV, and V stated that their work environments typically require them to "sell" whatever activities or ideas they may be working on. More precisely, these three respondents noted that most people in their organizations tend to evaluate an activity's or idea's worth according to its impact upon corporate profits. Since the nature of the training activities which each of the respondents promotes are not directly nor immediately measurable, these members of the population concluded that human skills are very practicable in their positions in attempting to persuade others of the ultimate merit of their training programs.

Conclusion 5: The suspicion held by co-workers toward community educators recently placed in expanding settings is a major influencer of the practicability of human skills in those settings.

Respondents IV, V, and VI have each occupied their positions for less than 18 months. In their responses, they noted that co-workers appear to be quite suspicious of their intentions for a variety of reasons, one of which may be that they possess doctoral degrees. They also stated that having been placed immediately in upper level positions as opposed to having worked their way up the corporate ladder may contribute to their colleagues' suspicions.
The three respondents mentioned that they are constantly working to enhance their credibility among the people with whom they work, and that human skills which enhance their credibility are very practicable in their positions. Similar observations were not made by Respondents I, II, or III, and it is worth noting that the latter three interviewees have been either directly or very closely affiliated with their respective positions for a minimum of 4 years.

Conclusion 6: Human skills which relate to addressing conflict appear to be more practicable for community educators in expanding settings who occupy middle management positions than for those who hold upper management positions.

Respondents III, IV, V, and VI occupy positions which may be classed as middle, or perhaps upper middle, management in business and industry or human services. With very few exceptions, these four members of the population rated conflict-centered human skills as being very practicable in the job settings. Moreover, responses of Respondent VI, who works in human services, were congruent with the three respondents in business and industry in the ratings of virtually every conflict-oriented human skill on the HSDQ. Together, these four individuals spoke emphatically during their interviews of the frequency and intensity of occasions when they are called upon to manage conflicts.

Respondents I and II, on the other hand, typically rated the conflict-centered items on the HSDQ to be quite practicable, rather than very practicable, in their respective positions. They also spent, in comparison to the other four respondents, almost no time
during their interviews discussing the impact of conflict upon the practicability of human skills in their positions. In searching for an explanation as to why this discrepancy between the two groups might exist, only one apparent difference of any significance could be identified; that was, unlike Respondents III, IV, V, and VI, the first two respondents hold positions in the highest echelons of their organizations. Several explanations as to why this difference might influence the respondents' perceptions can be offered. One possibility is that, while the members of the population in middle management positions deal with conflict almost daily, the upper level respondents may be sufficiently insulated from the day to day workings of their organizations so as to be unaware of incidents of conflict. A second explanation, perhaps even more plausible, might be that the upper level respondents have, inherent in their positions, sufficient power and authority to overrule, circumvent, or delegate their involvements in occasions of conflict. The middle level respondents, however, may feel the brunt of conflict since they are the individuals directly immersed in such events.

Conclusion 7: Human skills relating to being supportive of and sensitive to others are very practicable for community educators in expanding settings.

Sixteen skills described on the HSDQ were assigned the highest ratings of practicability by all of the respondents. In reviewing those skills, it appears that 10 of the 16 relate to being supportive of or sensitive to others. Those skills are (the skill's number on the HSDQ is in parentheses): The abilities to, "identify the needs
and sentiments of others" (1); "recognize the strengths of others" (16); "encourage others to use their strengths" (17); "demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others" (46); "provide demonstrations of support for others" (49); "demonstrate an interest in communicating with others" (11); "demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems" (21); "demonstrate openness" (88); "make others feel comfortable" (62); and "express positive attitudes" (75).

The six respondents seemed very much in agreement as to why these skills are so practicable in their positions. They appeared to believe that, as leaders, the successes they achieve in their own job performances are extremely dependent upon the quality of work performed by those with whom they most closely interact. The respondents believe that their success depends upon the success of others in the organization and that others must feel good about themselves and about the respondents in order to be effective. These efforts toward sensitivity and supportiveness seem very practicable in encouraging these feelings among the subjects' colleagues, superiors, and subordinates, and the identified human skills are therefore very important in fostering these positive feelings.

Conclusion 8: Human skills related to using humor, synthesizing inputs, being realistic, accepting criticism, staying calm, and understanding silence are very practicable for community educators in expanding settings.

In addition to the 10 skills previously cited, six other human skills received unanimous ratings of very practicable from the members of the population. Those skills are the abilities to, "use
humor effectively" (61); "synthesize a variety of inputs" (9); "dis­tinguish among the possible, the probable, and the impossible" (71); "accept criticism given by others" (72); "manage one's self in highly emotional situations" (86); and "determine when silence is facilita­tive" (85).

There also appeared to be general agreement among the respond­ents as to why these six human skills are so practicable. Each mem­ber of the population indicated that the individuals with whom he or she work take their jobs and responsibilities very seriously, and are committed to contributing to the successes of their organizations. The respondents also suggested that the fervor held by many of the individuals in their settings sometimes contributes to differences of opinions as to how best to get things done. The respondents therefore felt that human skills relating to using humor to ease tensions or facilitate communications, synthesizing all of the suggestions and viewpoints they receive, being realistic about what can and cannot be accomplished, accepting the criticism they receive from their fellow workers, managing themselves in frequently emotion-laden situations, and knowing when the most constructive thing to do is keep silent, are all very practicable in their respective positions.

Conclusion 9: While not impracticable, human skills relat­ing to demonstrating ethnic behaviors, compensating for others, discussing emotional needs, using physical contact, avoiding distractions, playing "devil's advocate," and interpreting compliments, are less practicable for commu­nity educators in expanding settings than are the other items on the HSDQ.
None of the skills on the HSDQ received mean ratings of any degree of impracticability from the members of the population. Of the 90 items, however, seven skills received an average rating below quite practicable, and of these seven, one earned a mean rating of only somewhat practicable, and another a rating of slightly less than somewhat practicable. The instrument's scale was constructed so that the greater a skill's practicability, the lower the rating assigned to it; a rating of "1" equals very practicable, a "7" equals very impracticable. In ascending order of practicability— the least practicable skill appears first— and with the skill's number on the HSDQ and mean rating in parentheses, the seven skills rated least practicable are the abilities to, "demonstrate behaviors common to specific cultural or ethnic situations or groups" (number 44; X = 3.17); "compensate for the limitations of others" (number 20; X = 3.00); "promote open discussion of the emotional needs of others" (number 40; X = 2.83); "utilize physical contact appropriately" (number 41; X = 2.67); "divorce one's self from distractions" (number 13; X = 2.50); "assume the role of 'devil's advocate'' (number 34; X = 2.33); and "project the probable interpretation of complimenting others" (number 47; X = 2.17).

Based upon the respondents' ratings and comments made by them during the interviews, it seems reasonable to conclude that while human skills are important, they do not compensate for the need for all employees in the respondents' organizations to carry their own loads. Organization members must be dealt with "humanely" by members of the population, but they must also perform adequately in their
jobs.

It also seems that while the respondents' organizations understand the relationship between the personal development and the job-related development of an employee, their fundamental motivation for implementing human skills is to improve the worker's job performance and not his or her personal psyche. Consequently, human skills which are interpreted as bordering too closely to an employee's personal situation--such as discussing his or her emotional problems, or giving him or her a warm hug--are seen by the respondents as being less practicable than other human skills.

Additionally, it appears that distractions are a way of life for community educators in expanding settings. While avoiding distractions may be an important human skill in other circles, the members of this population seemed to view it as less so in their environs. One respondent went so far as to say that what might be a distraction in the short run could well be a critical issue in the future. Avoiding distractions was thus viewed as somewhat less practicable than some of the other skills on the HSDQ.

Nowhere is the temptation to "over-conclude" stronger than in the urge to relate the results of this research to studies of traditional populations of community educators. Indeed, comparisons between the importance of human skills in school based settings versus non-school based settings could reasonably be expected. Unfortunately, a rather extensive review of the results of studies of traditional community education leaders has led to the opinion that few such comparisons are possible.
In gleaning the literature, those studies to which the present research initially seemed most closely related were conducted by Zemlo and Belcher (1978), Miller (1977), Mullarney (1977), Foelber (1976), Lisicich (1976), and Kliminski (1974). However, closer scrutinization of these works disclosed that because of disparities in definitions, conceptual frameworks, and research intents, no comparisons between the results of the present study and those of Miller (1977), Foelber (1976), and Lisicich (1976) could legitimately be made. Moreover, it became quite clear that any comparisons with the results of the other three studies—Zemlo and Belcher (1978), Mullarney (1977), and Kliminski (1974)—could only be based upon inferences. Still, once these comparisons with the latter three studies are acknowledged for what they are, they do offer some intrigue and perhaps food for thought.

Items similar to nine of the 18 human skills rated very practicable in the present research were also highly rated in at least one of the studies conducted either by Mullarney (1977), Zemlo and Belcher (1978), or Kliminski (1974). Table 3 graphically represents this point.

No mention could be found in these or other studies of the remaining skills deemed very practicable in the present research. The absence of such skills in other studies may be due to the specificity of the descriptors used in the HSDQ. Items on this instrument, such as, "encourage others to use their strengths" and "demonstrate openness" may well have been assumed, for example, to be part of the more general category of "communicating" in other studies of human

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Research</th>
<th>Mullarney</th>
<th>Zemlo and Belcher</th>
<th>Kliminski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to manage one's self in highly emotional</td>
<td>Is able to stay calm and keep control in the face of conflict and pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to accept criticism given by others</td>
<td>Accepts criticism in a way that he/she can improve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages staff suggestions and criticisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to demonstrate awareness of the individual</td>
<td>Uses patience, understanding, consideration, and courtesy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worth of others, recognize the strengths of others,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and make others feel comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to demonstrate a willingness to confront</td>
<td>The ability to handle conflict situations and crisis</td>
<td>Demonstrates initiative and persistence in goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and work through problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to demonstrate an interest in communicating</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ability to communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Research</td>
<td>Mullarney</td>
<td>Zemlo and Belcher</td>
<td>Kliminski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to provide demonstrations of support for others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Convey's empathy and concern for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner</td>
<td>Criticizes ideas of a group without anyone thinking that a particular person has been criticized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Criticizes ideas of group members without being perceived as criticizing the person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
skills. Moreover, it seems reasonable that such skills such as the abilities to encourage others to use their strengths, demonstrate openness, express positive attitudes, use humor, synthesize a variety of inputs, be realistic, and understand when silence is facilitative would be practicable in any leadership setting including traditional community education settings. It is therefore the opinion of the writer that those human skills rated very practicable by all of the members of the population of expanding community educators are, in all likelihood, very practicable in traditional community education settings as well, although admittedly there is presently insufficient empirical data to adequately document this conclusion.

Another point needs to be made. It may be noted that, unlike the present research, none of the other studies cited investigated why human skills are important for community educators. Factors in the environments of traditional community educators have not been addressed, for example. Therefore, it is not possible at this time to compare the similarities or dissimilarities among environmental factors in traditional versus expanding community education settings which influence the practicability of human skills in those situations.

**Implications**

Several factors are implied through the findings of this study, related to both the population of expanding community educators and to the practice of human skills.
One of the personal interests of this researcher was to utilize this study to call attention to the expansion of the concept of community education. In the very recent past, community educators were able to function very satisfactorily within the purview of the public schools and colleges alone. More than adequate financial support was available in these educational settings, and the profession of community education had very little incentive to seek the involvement of all community institutions in support of its work. Recently, however, two conditions have surfaced which have confronted the traditional efforts of community educators: The once plentiful supply of dollars for school based community education has, in many cases, declined, and it has become apparent to practitioners that the community education concept cannot ultimately succeed unless all of the institutions of a community band together.

In the former case, trained community educators, confronted with a lack of finances for school based positions, are accepting positions in other institutions in the community—business, industry, human services, and churches, to name a few. In the latter case, many community educators are coming to realize that their survival is dependent upon establishing inter-institutional linkages. Both of these conditions have implicitly expanded the parameters of the community education concept.

As far as the writer can determine, this study is only the second piece of research which substantively addresses non-school settings for community education (Cook, 1978, was the first), and is the first to consider that business and industry can be and must be related to
community education. As expansion of the framework of the community education concept becomes even more essential for the movement's survival, it is expected that considerably more attention will be given to these expanding settings for community education.

Two obvious arenas in which additional attention is likely to occur are in the areas of research and training. If the settings for community education continue to expand, research concerning these settings will undoubtedly be needed and undertaken. Training institutions might also do well to evaluate the extent to which their emphasis and training components suit the needs of community educators moving away from traditional settings.

A second implication of this study relates to the delineation of human skills. It is the opinion of the writer that the items described on the Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire represent the most defensible, comprehensive, and internally consistent listing of specific human skills yet assembled within the community education profession. The utility of the instrument therefore should be tested further. The HSDQ could serve as a basis for self-evaluation, performance appraisal, training curricula development, and further research of both traditional and expanding community education settings. The writer can envision that, with requisite modification, the HSDQ might well serve as a standard for innumerable research and development efforts within the profession.

It would also seem to be particularly valuable for training institutions to further delineate environment factors which impinge upon the skill requirements of community educators, especially those
in traditional settings. The methodology adhered to in the present research could seemingly serve such research well. Moreover, further study of environmental phenomena in traditional settings might allow training institutions to discover not only which human skills are practicable, but also why they are applicable. Parallel studies might also be undertaken concerning technical and conceptual leadership skills in traditional versus expanding settings. Ultimately, such studies might facilitate numerous comparisons of similarities and differences among the various settings for community education and among selected skills as practiced in the respective environs.

Recommendations

Based upon the achievements of the present research, the following recommendations are made:

1. Continued usage of the Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire including field testing, so that a more specific statistical validation of the instrument might be accomplished.

2. Continued investigation of human skills for community education leaders through, (a) a replication of the present research with a population of community educators in traditional settings, and (b) a comprehensive content analysis of existing data concerning human skills for community educators which results in the formulation of common definitions and conceptual frameworks for future research.

3. Continued investigation of environmental factors which influence the practicability of human skills for community educators through a replication of the present research with a population of
community educators in traditional settings.

4. Comparative studies between traditional and expanding community education settings regarding (a) the practicability of human skills, and (b) environmental factors influencing the practicability of human skills.

5. Continued investigation of the characteristics of, parameters for, and benefits of expanding settings for community education.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Instructions, Items, and Ratings Generated by the Delphi Group
November 6, 1978

The following listing of skills required of community education leaders who function in settings other than schools draws from a number of sources. It represents at best an incomplete inventory. Therefore its merit lies in that it is at least a beginning attempt to assemble a list of somewhat elusive behaviors. Undoubtedly the list will be both expanded and edited several times before its final completion.

What this means in layman's terms is, "I ain't done yet, but I am gettin' started!"

Usage

Each of the concepts is listed in alphabetical order (according to the first letter in the word). Following each concept is a number in parentheses. The number refers to the source (text, instrument, dissertation) where the concept was found. A few of the concepts are not followed by a number. The concepts were generated without the assistance of the literature.

Listed below is an index of the sources cited in the list of concepts:

1. Pfeiffer and Haslin; number 22 in the bibliography.
2. Bales; number 3 in the bibliography.
3. Kliminski; number 18 in the bibliography.
4. Pfeiffer and Jones; number 23 in the bibliography.
5. Mullarney; number 20 in the bibliography.
6. Schutz; number 25 in the bibliography.
7. Berelson and Steiner; number 5 in the bibliography.
8. Cattell; number 8 in the bibliography.
9. Sayers; number 24 in the bibliography.
### Concept Descriptors of Human Skills of Community Education Leaders in Expanding Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Non-Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTANCE, SELF (1)</td>
<td>DECISIVENESS (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSERTIVENESS (1)</td>
<td>DOGMATISM (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTION (1)</td>
<td>DEFERENCE (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMODATING (1)</td>
<td>DIFFERENTIATION (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOIDANCE (1)</td>
<td>DOMINANCE (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTIVENESS (1)</td>
<td>DRAMATIC (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITY (2)</td>
<td>DELIBERATE (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEMENT (2)</td>
<td>DESIGNING (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTRUISM (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCENDANCE (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIRATION (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANCE, OTHERS (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENTIVENESS ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE: GROUP AND TASK (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEUITY ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATENESS (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDOR (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFRONTIVENESS (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATIVENESS (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICISM, ACCEPTANCE OF (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCEALMENT (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATIVENESS (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPROMISING (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFORMITY (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVENESS (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN, SHOWS (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURTEOUSNESS (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL, CONSTRUCTIVELY (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSURE (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT, MANAGEMENT (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT, RESOLUTION (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLIMENTARY ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCURRANCE (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLIANCE (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIRMATION (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Good morning!

To help us begin this first session, let me provide you with a few thoughts; hopefully they will make things a little clearer as we move along.

The overall purpose of this session (along with future sessions) is to develop, through a group process, what will be called the Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire (HSDQ). This questionnaire will ultimately be administered to doctoral level community education leaders in non-school settings (expanding settings). During each session we will achieve a task which will prepare us for the following session. All of the tasks are based upon the belief that we can accomplish more as a group (at least with regard to this project) than we can individually. Therefore it is important for you to realize that your contributions will be valued highly; please speak your mind frequently and openly!

To get us going today, let's look at some of the terms we will be using from now on. First, when I speak of a human skill I mean the use of ability and judgment in working with and through people. By the way, this definition comes from the works of Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. You, however, may choose to use different words than I in defining this or other terms we may use. This is fine, so long as the essences of our definitions are not radically different. If you feel that they are, please bring this to my attention, and we will work them out.
Next comes the term skill descriptor. First, I define a skill as the ability to use one's knowledge effectively and readily in execution or performance (Noah Webster defines it the same way!) A descriptor is any identifying sign or symbol. Consequently, I define a skill descriptor as a sign or symbol which identifies one's ability to use knowledge effectively and readily in his or her execution or performance. A human skill descriptor is therefore a sign or symbol which identifies one's ability to use knowledge effectively and readily in his or her execution or performance relating to working with and through people!

Agenda

During this first session we will focus upon the following topics:

1. An overview of the project 10 minutes
2. Questions and answers 5-10 minutes
3. Presentation of conceptual framework 10 minutes
4. Review of "brainstorming" guidelines 5 minutes
5. "Brainstorming" activity 30-45 minutes
6. Review of literature review 0-30 minutes

Thank you-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Good afternoon!

As I mentioned last week, I feel we made an excellent beginning through our first session. You may remember that we "brainstormed" for about 45 minutes and identified some of the human skills needed by doctoral level community educators. You will be pleased to know that the "brainstorming" session generated 51 skill descriptors which we will both synthesize and expand upon in our work today.

There was some discussion last session concerning appropriate ways of categorizing and defining human skill descriptors. The varying perspectives expressed by you are also borne out in the literature. An obvious conclusion one can draw is that there is no single, clear-cut way to view human skills. One can see, however, that in spite of questions of degrees, some concepts related to interpersonal behavior lean more toward actually describing beliefs, attitudes, motivations, catalysts or personality traits, while other concepts lean more toward describing concepts of demonstrable skills. It was from this perspective that our group worked from last week, and it is the perspective from which I encourage us to progress during this session. Should any significant ambiguity remain for us, perhaps a review of the definitions of terms utilized last week might be helpful.

We will begin today from where we left off last session and will then expand into some new tasks. To be more specific, we will address the
following items:

1. Overview and Questions and Answers 10 minutes
2. Review, edit, and identify individual skill descriptors 20-30 minutes
3. Generate selected skills related to respective skill descriptors 45-60 minutes
4. Additional instructions and wrap-up 5-10 minutes
## Concept Descriptors of Human Skills of Community Education Leaders in Expanding Settings

### Inductive Listing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Non-Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing</td>
<td>MANAGING RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Building</td>
<td>MANAGING GROUP MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>MEETING INDIVIDUAL NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to Rules</td>
<td>MAINTAINING MORALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Generalize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Attitudes</td>
<td>NETWORKING INDIVIDUAL NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>NON VERBAL COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying Goals</td>
<td>OPTIMIZING POTENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying Values</td>
<td>ORGANIZING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Atmosphere</td>
<td>PROVIDING CLOSURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Acceptance</td>
<td>PUSHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Building</td>
<td>PERSEVERANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>PREDICTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Creativity</td>
<td>REWARDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Interaction</td>
<td>STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Self Worth</td>
<td>SELF IMAGE BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Self Development</td>
<td>STRENGTHS ORIENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing</td>
<td>SYNTHESIZING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>SELF CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>TIMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressing of Others</td>
<td>TENACITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Inadequacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Concept Descriptors of Human Skills
### Of Community Education Leaders
### In Expanding Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Non-Skill</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Non-Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTANCE, SELF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DECISIVENESS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSERTIVENESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DOGMATISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DEFERENCE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMMODATING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DIFFERENTIATION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOIDANCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DOMINANCE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTIVENESS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRAMATIC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DELIBERATE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DESIGNING</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTRUISM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>EMPATHY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCENDANCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIRATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXPRESSION, SELF</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANCE, OTHERS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ETHICAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENTIVENESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVALUATIVE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE: GROUP &amp; TASK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREVITY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENTERTAINING</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATENESS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EQUALITARIAN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENCOURAGING</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFRONTIVENESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EMOTION, SHOWING</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATIVENESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICISM, ACCEPTANCE OF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EXPRESSION, SELF</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCEALMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ETHICAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATIVENESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVALUATIVE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPROMISING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENTERTAINING</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFORMITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EQUALITARIAN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENCOURAGING</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVENESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMOTION, SHOWING</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN, SHOWS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURTEOUSNESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVALUATIVE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL, CONSTRUCTIVELY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSURE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT, MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT, RESOLUTION</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLIMENTARY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCURRANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIRMATION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EMOTIONALISM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B

Unedited Listing of Human Skills Generated by the Delphi Group
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1 2 3 4 the ability to demonstrate an interest and involvement in communications
1 2 3 4 the ability to project an attentiveness to all participants of a communication or interaction
1 2 3 4 the ability to divorce one's self from extraneous distractions
1 2 3 4 the ability to determine the emphasis required at a given time between task needs and group needs
1 2 3 4 the ability to identify individual needs
1 2 3 4 the ability to identify task needs
1 2 3 4 the ability to demonstrate tact and diplomacy in balancing task and group needs
1 2 3 4 the ability to recognize individual's strengths
1 2 3 4 the ability to encourage others to capitalize upon their own strengths
1 2 3 4 the ability to develop strategies for strengths development and awareness
1 2 3 4 the ability to assist others in the expansion of specific strengths to general applications
1 2 3 4 the ability to structure interactions
1 2 3 4 the ability to discern unspoken consensus
1 2 3 4 the ability to provide group instruction concerning consensus building
1 2 3 4 the ability to determine the criteria for determining consensus
1 2 3 4 the ability to foster circumstances where one's charisma will be recognized
1 2 3 4 the ability to exude enthusiasm and openness
1 2 3 4 the ability to exude a willingness to confront and work through problems
1 2 3 4 the ability to persuade others of their freedom to be creative and take risks
1 2 3 4 the ability to acknowledge and progress from situations of conflict
1 2 3 4 the ability to differentiate between constructive and destructive conflict
1 2 3 4 the ability to differentiate between issues and personalities
1 2 3 4 the ability to provide insight into the nature of conflict
1 2 3 4 the ability to transform negative into positive conflict
1 2 3 4 the ability to formulate messages clearly and concisely
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the ability to transmit messages through appropriate media
the ability to receive messages accurately
the ability to provide examples and illustrations of messages
the ability to decipher the essence of a message
the ability to restate a received message
the ability to write with clarity
the ability to generate conflict when considered necessary
the ability to decipher when intercession or restraint in conflict is appropriate
the ability to clarify individual positions and perspectives
the ability to discern unspoken cues of the presence of conflict
the ability to generate new contexts surrounding an issue
the ability to stimulate positive interaction
the ability to project the consequences of particular events or actions
the ability to facilitate others in identifying preferred outcomes of events or actions
the ability to play the "devil's advocate"
the ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of individual positions
the ability to dissect issues into their component parts
the ability to appropriately implement a variety of clarifying strategies
the ability to demonstrate conviction
the ability to determine the vulnerabilities of others
the ability to identify and accept the framework or conditions within which collaboration can take place
the ability to recognize the contributions of others
the ability to demonstrate self-effacement
the ability to clarify the priorities of others
the ability to reorder priorities
the ability to reorder the sequence of events
the ability to communicate the benefit of short term sacrifice for longer term productivity
1234 the ability to produce an openness of discussion concerning
the emotional needs of individuals
1234 the ability to identify the appropriateness of physical contact
1234 the ability to distinguish the feelings of others
1234 the ability to identify cultural mores concerning courtesy
1234 the ability to demonstrate appropriate signs of courtesy
1234 the ability to analyze and conceptualize in order to provide
constructive criticism
1234 the ability to demonstrate objectivity
1234 the ability to determine appropriate timing, technique, and circum-
stances for constructive criticism
1234 the ability to exude an awareness of the individual worth of others
1234 the ability to project the probable interpretations of compliments
1234 the ability to use a variety of means of complimenting others
1234 the ability to provide demonstrations of support for others
1234 the ability to demonstrate a variety of strategies related to one's
leadership style
1234 the ability to "table" one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes
when required
1234 the ability to provide others with the opportunity for separateness
and detachment
1234 the ability to the ability to communicate excitement to those striving
for creativity
1234 the ability to explain the "creative process"
1234 the ability to manipulate the circumstances so that creativity can
be enhanced
November 28, 1978

To: Dr. Weaver, Dr. Vaught, Brain, Sesta and Frank
From: Pat
Re: Skill Descriptor Ratings

I realize that this is extremely short notice, but I need your input in a hurry. Since we have scheduled tomorrow (Wednesday) morning to meet concerning the HSDQ Questionnaire, we need to have rated this second group of skill descriptors by that time. During the session, we will then discuss any individual items which call for our attention.

Please proceed with the ratings of the attached items in the same way you did with the first group. I am attaching your responses to the first group to serve as a benchmark for you this time; please do not make any changes in the first group however.

Also, any word changes which you feel are appropriate should be made directly on the sheets listing the second group of human skill descriptors. We will take time to discuss these changes in the session.

In order to use our group time wisely, PLEASE BRING YOUR COMPLETED RATING SHEETS (BOTH THE FIRST AND SECOND GROUP) TO OUR SESSION TOMORROW (WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28). We will meet at 9:30 A.M. sharp, in the Ed. Leadership Conference Room.
HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
SKILLS IDENTIFICATION

This second collection of skill descriptors were generated in our Delphi Session of November 27, 1978. Please go through the list and rate each of the descriptors according to how well you feel they represent a human skill (as we have defined a human skill).

Instructions:

Please circle one of the numbers which appear to the left of each skill descriptor according to the following code:

1 = a poor descriptor of a human skill
2 = a fair descriptor of a human skill
3 = a good descriptor of a human skill
4 = a very good descriptor of a human skill

1 2 3 4 the ability to move a group which is experiencing an impasse 89
1 2 3 4 the ability to anticipate group reaction to decisions 90
1 2 3 4 the ability to design settings which encourage constructive group interaction 91
1 2 3 4 the ability to design approaches and methods for the achievement of group goals 92
1 2 3 4 the ability to encourage positive self valuing 93
1 2 3 4 the ability to identify individuals' goals 94
1 2 3 4 the ability to utilize individual assessment tools appropriately 95
1 2 3 4 the ability to project oneself so as to be perceived as caring by others 96
1 2 3 4 the ability to understand oneself 97
1 2 3 4 the ability to clarify the group charge 98
1 2 3 4 the ability to speak with appropriate clarity, precision, and candor 99
1 2 3 4 the ability to recognize opportunities for self expression 100
1 2 3 4 the ability to facilitate others' self expressions 101
1 2 3 4 the ability to utilize a variety of methods of self expression 102
1 2 3 4 the ability to foster a climate in which evaluation will be accepted and utilized by others 103
1 2 3 4 the ability to assist others in setting goals and determining needs 104
1 2 3 4 the ability to identify the specific evaluative process which will best facilitate others 105
1 2 3 4 the ability to appreciate the humor of others 106
1 2 3 4 the ability to use humor 107
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1 2 3 4 the ability to make others feel comfortable
1 2 3 4 the ability to stimulate conversation
1 2 3 4 the ability to share one's experiences to the benefit of others
1 2 3 4 the ability to share one's feelings appropriately
1 2 3 4 the ability to give feedback appropriately
1 2 3 4 the ability to receive feedback
1 2 3 4 the ability to relate similar situations to a given issue
1 2 3 4 the ability to mediate between opposing individuals or groups
1 2 3 4 the ability to discern appropriate persuasive techniques
1 2 3 4 the ability to facilitate change when it would be beneficial to others
1 2 3 4 the ability to impress others of one's expertise
1 2 3 4 the ability to demonstrate one's skills in a non-threatening manner
1 2 3 4 the ability to assess and utilize existing resources
1 2 3 4 the ability to distinguish between changeable and unchangeable circumstances
1 2 3 4 the ability to recognize the need to modify goals
1 2 3 4 the ability to accept criticism given by others
1 2 3 4 the ability to recognize one's limitations and to compensate for them
1 2 3 4 the ability to maintain decorum
1 2 3 4 the ability to observe others and recommend alternate courses of action
1 2 3 4 the ability to exude positive attitudes
1 2 3 4 the ability to find positive avenues of solutions
1 2 3 4 the ability to participate in group tasks enthusiastically
1 2 3 4 the ability to discern changes in the morale of others
1 2 3 4 the ability to observe non-verbal behavior
1 2 3 4 the ability to implement appropriate non-verbal behavior
1 2 3 4 the ability to be perceived as showing respect for the opinions of others
the ability to view situations and individuals non-judgmentally
the ability to foster a feeling of relaxation among others
the ability to devise a variety of techniques for prompting and questioning
the ability to realize one's area(s) of vulnerability
the ability to determine when risk-taking is likely to prove beneficial
the ability to facilitate a group in reaching closure
the ability to match rewards with individuals
the ability to determine when silence is more facilitative than verbalizing
the ability to manage oneself in the throes of high emotion
the ability to understand the implications of judgments which significantly affect the lives of others
## HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
## DELPHI PARTICIPANTS DESCRIPTORS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
DELPHI PARTICIPANTS DESCRIPTORS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST RATING</th>
<th>SECOND RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P  F  L  g  X  ° ^</td>
<td>P  F  L  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  3  2  P</td>
<td>2  4  1  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  4  3  2</td>
<td>2  4  4  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  2  4  4</td>
<td>3  2  4  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  3  2  3</td>
<td>4  3  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  4  2  3</td>
<td>5  4  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  4  2  3</td>
<td>6  4  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  4  2  3</td>
<td>7  4  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  4  2  3</td>
<td>8  4  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  4  2  3</td>
<td>9  4  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4  2  3</td>
<td>10 4  2  3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
### DELPHI PARTICIPANTS DESCRIPTORS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire

**First Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
DELPHI PARTICIPANTS DESCRIPTORS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST RATING</th>
<th>SECOND RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B  D  F  L  S  X</td>
<td>B  D  F  L  S  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/2  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/3  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/4  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/5  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/6  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/7  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/8  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/9  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/10  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/11  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/12  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/13  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/14  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/15  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/16  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/17  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/18  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/19  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/20  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/21  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/22  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/23  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/24  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/25  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/26  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/27  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/28  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/29  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/30  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/31  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/32  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/32  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/33  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/33  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/34  3  4  4  3  9</td>
<td>1/34  3  4  4  3  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
DELPHI PARTICIPANTS DESCRIPTORS RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First Rating</th>
<th>Second Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**THE HUMAN SKILLS DESCRIPTORS QUESTIONNAIRE (HSDQ)**

The HSDQ has been developed to help determine the extent to which you think certain human skills are practicable in your particular position and job situation. The term "practicable" means that the skill can potentially be practiced, regardless of whether or not you or anyone else is actually doing so.

**Instructions**

Circle the number to the left of each item which best represents the extent to which you think that the skill described can potentially be practiced (is practicable) in your position and job situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The ability to identify the needs and sentiments of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate sensitivity to individuals needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The ability to understand the standards of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ability to present the perspectives of others with respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The ability to clearly state one's own feelings and positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The ability to stand firm in the face of opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate respect for the authority of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The ability to identify underlying group concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The ability to synthesize a variety of inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The ability to elicit the feelings and positions of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate an interest in communicating with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The ability to project attentiveness to all participants in a communication or interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to divorce one's self from distractions (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to differentiate between needs related to the task and needs related to the individual or group (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to recognize the strengths of others (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to encourage others to use their strengths (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to structure interactions (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to project enthusiasm to others (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to compensate for the limitations of others (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate a willingness to confront and work through problems (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to persuade others of their freedom to take risks and be creative (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to acknowledge and progress from situations of conflict (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to differentiate between destructive and constructive conflict (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to differentiate between issues and personalities (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to provide insights into the nature of a conflict (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to receive messages accurately (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to understand the priorities of others (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to discern when intercession or restraint in a conflict is appropriate (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to clarify the positions and perspectives of others (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to discern unspoken cues indicating the presence of conflict (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to stimulate positive interaction (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to help others to identify preferred outcomes (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>The ability to assume the role of &quot;devil's advocate&quot; (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to demonstrate personal conviction (35)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to determine the vulnerabilities of others (36)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to recognize the accomplishments of others (37)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to place one's self in the background when required (38)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to communicate the benefit of short term sacrifice for the sake of achieving longer term goals (39)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to promote open discussion of the emotional needs of others (40)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to utilize physical contact appropriately (41)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to distinguish the feelings of others (42)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to identify and accept behaviors whose appropriateness are culturally or ethically defined (43)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to demonstrate behaviors common to specific cultural or ethnic situations or groups (44)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to use appropriate timing and technique to promote constructive criticism (45)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to demonstrate awareness of the individual worth of others (46)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to project the probable interpretation of complimenting others (47)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to compliment others (48)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to provide demonstrations of support for others (49)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to "table" one's emotions, beliefs, and preferred outcomes when required (50)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to manipulate circumstances so that creativity may be enhanced (51)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to move a group which is experiencing an impasse (52)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to anticipate others' reaction(s) to a decision (53)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to encourage others' positive self-image (54)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to assist others in clarifying their goals (55)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to project one's self as caring (56)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to recognize opportunities for self-expression (57)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to utilize a variety of methods of self-expression (58)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to foster a climate in which evaluation is both valued and utilized (59)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to appreciate the humor of others (60)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to use humor effectively (61)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to make others feel comfortable (62)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to stimulate conversation (63)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to share one's experiences to the benefit of others (64)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to receive feedback (65)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to compensate for one's own limitations (66)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to mediate between opposing individuals or groups (67)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to utilize persuasive techniques (68)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to facilitate change when it would be beneficial to others (69)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to demonstrate one's skills and expertise in a non-threatening manner (70)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to distinguish among the possible, the probable, and the impossible (71)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to accept criticism given by others (72)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to recognize one's own limitations (73)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to recognize the limitations of others (74)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to express positive attitudes (75)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to assist others in the problem-solving process (76)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to discern changes in the morale of others (77)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to interpret non-verbal behavior (78)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to implement appropriate non-verbal behavior (79)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to demonstrate respect for the opinions of others (80)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to view individuals and situations non-judgmentally (81)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to determine when to take risks which may affect others (82)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to facilitate individuals and groups in reaching closure (83)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to assign rewards which will be valued by the recipient (84)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to determine when silence is appropriate (85)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to manage one's self in highly emotional situations (86)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to appraise the implications of judgments which significantly affect the lives of others (87)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to demonstrate openness (88)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to assist others in determining their needs (89)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The ability to remain silent (90)
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Appendix D

Instructions and Background Provided to the Respondents
Introduction

There is almost total agreement that all social organizations require leadership. For those interested in studying leadership however, a problem arises: how does one go about looking at what it takes to actually be a leader?

Two conclusions have been produced from research on leadership, and both of them are critical to this project as you will soon see. These conclusions are:

1. Leaders need certain skills.
2. The skills required of leaders may vary from one job situation to another.

One way of analyzing the skills required of leaders it to divide the skills into general areas. Robert Katz developed a widely acclaimed framework when he said that leadership skills fall into one of three areas:

1. Technical skills
2. Conceptual skills
3. Human skills

In this project, we will focus upon what Katz called human skills. For our purposes, a skill will be defined as the ability to use knowledge effectively and readily in execution or performance. The key words here are execution or performance. In other words, it is not enough to know how to do something; you must actually execute or perform.

A human skill will be defined as a skill used in working with or through people. The key word here is people. While examples of human skills may relate to questions of degrees— for example, is showing a new employee who is extremely anxious how to use the Xerox machine a technical skill or a human skill?— we will focus upon skills which tend to relate to interpersonal relations, as opposed to technically or conceptually oriented situations.

The second conclusion is that skills required of leaders may be, at least in part, situational. As applied here, this means that the human skills required of you in your situation— given your position and the environment surrounding your organization— may be different than if you were in a different setting. No doubt, several examples come quickly to mind... and that is precisely what we will try to get at in this project.

The HSDQ

The Human Skills Descriptors Questionnaire has been designed to explore the situational aspects of needed human skills. You will note that approximately 90 different human skills descriptors are listed on the questionnaire. (As an aside, you might possibly disagree whether or not a particular skill descriptor listed is actually a human skill,
however it doesn't matter. Just assume that all items do in fact describe human skills).

In completing the questionnaire, respond to each item (skill descriptor) according to the extent to which you think that the skill described is potentially capable of being practiced (practicable) by you or someone else in your particular position and job setting. Please note that you are not being asked if you actually perform the skill, if you believe that the skill should be practiced, if you possess the skill, or anything else; you are only being asked if the skill has the potential to be generally practiced in your job situation.