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CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

Over the past several years the concept of community education, defined by Seay (1974) as "the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people...all of the people...of the community (p. 11)," has become more and more prevalent in school districts throughout the United States. In their long-range report, the Mott Foundation (1972), one of the major financial contributors to community education, indicated that in the fiscal year 1967-68, eighty-nine school districts in the United States had community education programs. Five years later in 1971-72, this figure had increased to 480 school districts. Projecting these figures to the year 1977-78, the Mott Foundation predicted that 4071 school districts would be involved in some form of community education programming. Additional impetus to community education was provided by the passage on July 31, 1974 of federal legislation which provided supplemental financial support for community education.

Use of citizen involvement in some manner is not new to education. Over the years, citizen groups have been used to study building needs; to organize millage campaigns; to study curriculum changes and modifications; as part of the requirements for many federally funded educational programs; and now, as part of the concept of community education. A number of authors, Kerensky and Melby (1971),
Minzey and LeTarte (1972), Christopher (1972), Carrillo (1973), and Martin and Seay (1974) have all included establishment of a community education advisory council as an important developmental step necessary to implementing community education. The importance of advisory councils in community education was further emphasized by Woons (1973) who identified some form of community school council as "a vehicle of response to public concern about education and the development of a concept in which the school and the community work closely together (p. 14)."

With community education advisory councils (hereafter referred to as either council or advisory council) playing an important role in the community education concept, the community education director (hereafter referred to as director) must assume an active leadership role in not only establishing the advisory council but in determining appropriate leader behavior to use in working with the advisory council members once the group has been organized. In most instances, assuming a leader style appropriate for this situation is difficult.

The Significance of the Problem

In spite of the increased popularity of community education, two major criticisms that are often heard are first, the lack of research to support many of the claims made by writers and practitioners in community education, and second, the lack of extensive systematic investigation into the various aspects of a community education program. VanVoorhees (1972) stated that "there is currently little research that either supports or denies the effectiveness of community..."
Several decades after its birth as an educational movement, community education is supported not by facts but by the logic of the process (p. 208)." At the same time, Weaver (1972) has indicated "that practices and programs considered to be essential to implement the community education concept have been universally adopted with little or no empirical evidence regarding their effectiveness (p. 154)."

One of the "practices" considered essential for the implementation of community education is the formation of some type of citizens advisory council. Parson and Seay (1974) state that advisory councils are "vital links in the organization and administrative structure of community education (p. 172)." Martin and Seay (1974) and Carrillo and Heaton (1972) have listed establishment of an advisory council as one of several elements necessary for implementing a community education program. Cox (1974) went so far as to equate the use of advisory councils in community education with the use of accountability, standards, evaluation, etc.

Although the literature supports the importance of advisory councils in community education little has been written about the leadership role the director must assume in establishing and working with such an advisory council. Whitt (1971) and Walker (1973), writing about the responsibilities of the director, have both listed establishment of an advisory council as one of the director's major concerns. An examination of the leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting assists in better understanding the director's actual leader behavior. In addition, examining perceptions
of preferred leader behavior can help in the improvement and maintenance of effective and valuable advisory councils which will contribute to the quality and relevance of community education programs.

Much of the research in the field of leader behavior is based on what is termed the situational approach. According to this approach, leader behavior is viewed in terms of the situation and the variables within the situation which influence the leader's behavior. Reddin (1970) stated:

"Styles are best seen in relation to a specific situation. Any style has a situation appropriate to it and many situations inappropriate to it." (pp. 38-39)

Hemphill (1949), Gibb (1954), Shartle (1956), Halpin (1966) and Fiedler (1973) have all drawn conclusions similar to that stated above by Reddin. Therefore, an examination of several variables which are pertinent to the director in the advisory council setting might also assist in further understanding the director's leader behavior as he/she works with the council.

The objective of this study was to examine the leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting. Emphasis was placed on the differences between perceptions of the director and perceptions of the council members in regard to the director's actual and preferred leader behavior. A second emphasis was on whether or not several contextual (situational) variables pertinent to the situation of the director as he/she works with the advisory council would assist in explaining the perceptions the director had of his/her own leader behavior in the advisory council setting.
Definition of Terms

The phrases that needed definition in this study were community education director, community education advisory council, and leader behavior. These definitions should assist the reader in understanding the framework in which they were used.

Community education director

To avoid confusion, the title community education director was used synonymously with building director, community school director, community education or school coordinator or similar titles. For the purpose of this study, a community education director was designated as an individual in charge of community education programs, activities, and services at either the school building level or at the district-wide level.

Community education advisory council

While a community education advisory council may operate at the district-wide level or on the neighborhood school level, the definition of advisory councils developed by a "Task Force for Community School Development" of the Flint, Michigan, Community Schools (1973) was deemed appropriate for this study. The definition is as follows:

Community Education Advisory Councils are composed of representatives of those segments of the school community (i.e., parents, residents, teachers, administrators, students, et al) who have a vested interest in the functioning of the schools and the quality of life in the community. (p. 5)
Leader behavior

Leader behavior, frequently referred to as leadership style, was defined here as consistent patterns of actions used in helping a group move toward a common goal(s). For the purpose of this study, leader behavior was divided into two aspects, Initiating Structure and Consideration as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The definition for each of these aspects provided by Halpin (1966) was used.

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between leader and the members of his staff. (p. 39)

Summary

Since advisory councils are considered an important practice in implementing the concept of community education, the leader behavior exhibited by the director while working with the advisory council is important. The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences in the perception of the director's leader behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration, in each of the following situations: (a) actual and preferred leader behavior as perceived by the director; (b) actual and preferred leader behavior as perceived by the council; (c) actual leader behavior as perceived by both the director and the council; (d) preferred leader behavior as
perceived by both the director and the council; (e) actual leader behavior as perceived by the director and preferred leader behavior as perceived by the council; and (f) preferred leader behavior as perceived by the director and actual leader behavior as perceived by the council. In addition, several contextual variables which are relevant to the director/advisory council situation were selected to determine if the director's actual leader behavior as perceived by the director could be predicted on the basis of these variables.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature as it related to the leader behavior of the community education director in the community education advisory council setting. The material has been divided into six categories and was presented as follows: (a) a brief history of the development of the community education concept; (b) the importance of an advisory council to community education; (c) the director in the council setting; (d) the situational approach to leader behavior; (e) measurement of leader behavior; and (f) discrepancies in the perceived behavior of leaders.

It was the intent of this investigator to cover information in the above six categories which would help explain the emphasis on advisory councils in community education and explore available ideas on the role of the community education director as he/she works within the advisory council setting. In addition, the views of several authors and researchers were presented concerning the situational approach to leader behavior and the importance of task orientation and human relationships orientation as two dimensions of leader behavior which must be considered in assessing the situation. Finally, the possibility that discrepancies in the perceived behavior of leaders exists within a given situation was explored.
Seay (1974), writing in one of the latest books on community education, indicated that "The current concept of community education has developed out of three centuries of experience with schools and with non-school agencies that have performed various educational functions for the people of communities (p. 19)." During the twentieth century, the community education concept has emerged from what was commonly known as the community school movement. As early as 1929, Elsie Clapp (1940), as principal of the Ballard School near Louisville, Kentucky, developed what became one of the first community schools. Other community school developments during the thirties were found in the Tennessee Valley Authority conservation programs (Everett, 1938); a community education center developed during the middle thirties by Paul J. Misner in Glencoe, Illinois (Everett, 1938); and the combined efforts of Frank J. Manley and Charles S. Mott in guiding the early developmental stages of community schools in Flint, Michigan (Minardo, 1972).

The post World War II period brought several other examples of the community school movement and several publications in support of this idea. An article originally written in the early forties by Howard Y. McClusky reappeared during the 1950's in support of the community school concept. In this article, McClusky (1953) stated:

The school may well be the most important single agency in society to improve the community, but the primary function of the school should be that of helping the community to help itself...Thus the school must work in and with the community and only for the community when it can contribute some unique service which
no other agency possesses. (pp. 150-151, emphasis in the original)

Examples of community school program development during the forties included what became known as the "Sloan Experiment in Kentucky." During the period 1939-49, this Project in Applied Economics, which dealt with dietary practices of people in Kentucky, was administered by the University of Kentucky through the existing public schools. Other community school programs started during this period were found in the Parker District High School in Greenville, South Carolina and Holtville Consolidated Schools in Deatsville, Alabama (Seay, 1974).

One of the major developments in community school programming during the forties and early fifties was sponsored by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The "Community School Service Program" which operated between 1945-53 lead to a number of specific improvements in several Michigan communities. Seay and Crawford (1954) indicated that these improvements resulted from the combined efforts of local agencies and local citizens' committees. Examples were the Hobby House in Concord, an industrial survey in Elkton, a Health Center in Mesick, a playground in Rockford, a truck drivers' school in Stephenson, and the home-crafts industry in the Grand Traverse area.

By the 1950's, the development of community schools had created enough interest to motivate two professional groups to devote time and money to research on the role of the community school. The National Society for the Study of Education, Fifty-Second Yearbook, Part II (1953), entitled The Community School, devoted seventeen chapters to discussing and elaborating on the distinctive features of community schools. In 1954, the Educational Policies Commission
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published a brochure entitled "Strengthening Community Life" which reported the results of a year-long study of six community schools.

The social upheaval of the sixties seemed to lead to a polarization of educational viewpoints. One influential group of leaders in government, business, industry, and the military was demanding that educational agencies serve the national expansionist interests while another group of leaders representing what they considered more humanitarian interests, especially in the areas of civil rights and ecology, wanted educational agencies to serve their purposes (Seay, 1974). It was during this period of social unrest that the current concept of community education began to emerge. As Seay (1974) pointed out:

The community school concept had always recognized the programs of other educational agencies in the community, but in the sixties educators began to see the school as one among many educational agencies. Obviously, they (educators) said, education is a comprehensive thing, a social institution. Community leaders began to think in terms of community-wide, institutionalized forces which were performing--and could be expected to perform better--the functions society entrusted to education. They (educators) saw that the time had come for the school centered concept to grow into a community education concept. (p. 28)

Significant developments in the growth of community education during the sixties and early seventies included Mott Foundation financial support for a regional system of university centers and co-operating centers (Weaver and Seay, 1974). The major functions of these centers was to disseminate information about community education and to assist communities in the development and implementation of community education programs. Another development during this period was the formation in 1966 of the National Community School Education Association. (In 1973, this name was changed to the National
Community Education Association.) Weaver and Seay (1974) reported that the stated purpose of this organization was "to promulgate and promote more effectively the community education concept (p. 374)."

In addition to this national organization, a number of states have organized professional groups in support of community education. In 1971, the Pendell Publishing Company located in Midland, Michigan began publication of the first journal devoted entirely to promotion of the community education concept, *The Community Education Journal*. This journal, which is published entirely under the auspices of the Pendell Publishing Company, features articles by individuals associated with community education throughout the United States.

Advisory Councils in Community Education

Over the years, citizen involvement through the vehicle of some form of advisory council has been a part of many educational endeavors. Such groups have been used to provide citizens with an opportunity for input in areas such as building needs, millage campaigns, curriculum changes and modifications, and federally funded educational programs. Now advisory councils are being organized as part of the concept of community education.

The development of an advisory council in some form has been generally recognized as an essential step in implementing and maintaining the community education concept in any community. Woons (1973) stated that:

These citizens' committees, which may be identified by many names, one of which is the community school council, seem to be emerging as a vehicle of response to public concern about education and the development of a concept
in which the school and the community work closely together. (p. 14)

Similar attitudes toward citizen involvement in community education through participation in an advisory council were expressed by McKenzie (1974), who considered a council an excellent means for "continuous and consistent community involvement (p. 23)," and Totten (1970), who saw advisory councils as a method by which "the voices of citizens can be heard (p. 22)."

While there appears to be some disagreement among authors as to the number of steps or components in an effective community education program, Kerensky and Melby (1971), Carrillo (1973), Christopher (1972), Martin and Seay (1974), and Minzey and LeTarte (1972) all included establishment of an advisory council as one of several developmental steps. Totten and Manley (1969) maintained that an advisory council was "one of the most important organizations in the early development of the community school program (p. 233)." Olsen (1953) considered organization of advisory councils as one operational factor in developing community school programs. Cox (1974) went so far as to state that:

Community Advisory Councils in the field of Community Education have become almost a by-word ranking in use with accountability, evaluation, standards, etc. We have all come to believe in them because of the vital role they can play throughout the community education process in providing opportunities for restoring a sense of community, and encouraging meaningful participation in dealing with real problems and concerns of the community. (p. 39)

Further evidence of the commitment to developing advisory councils as a part of community education is provided by the fact that out of nine states with state funding for community schools, at least three
states, Michigan, Minnesota, and Alaska, require development of advisory councils in order for school districts to receive funds in support of community education (Mullett, 1974). In addition, a number of cities throughout the United States have reported firm commitments to development of advisory councils. Olsen (1972) related that the New Haven, Connecticut school district was "committed to working with the school council (p. 56)" as part of their community school program. Connor (1972), writing in reference to the community school program in Worcester, Massachusetts, referred to a community school advisory council as "playing a vital role in our program (p. 23)." The Flint, Michigan Board of Education (1973) approved the appointment of a Task Force to develop guidelines for the establishment of school-community advisory councils. As a result of the accomplishments of this Task Force, plans were developed to implement advisory councils in every Flint school.

While there appeared to be some agreement among authors as to the importance of implementing advisory councils in community education, the literature pointed out that a variety of ideas and opinions existed as to the purpose and role these councils should play. Berridge (1973), who saw advisory councils as a way to allow the democratic process to occur, related duties of a council to scope of involvement.

Duties of councils vary according to their purpose and also scope of involvement. The purpose of councils in the process of Community Education is to reinforce the concept of involvement. It is a positive tool which enhances the community and its individual citizens. Councils are, in reality, the democratic process in action. (pp. 101-102)
Berridge (1973) went on to specify duties on the basis of type of advisory council. He recognized two types of councils, a neighborhood council and a community-wide council. The neighborhood council is generally organized in the geographic area around an elementary school building. Suggested functions for a neighborhood council were:

1. Keep the community education coordinator informed
2. Recommend new programs
3. Assist in program planning
4. Engage in public relations activities
5. Recruit teachers
6. Analyze participation
7. Assist in evaluation
8. Communicate with the community-wide council (pp. 102-103)

In comparison to a neighborhood council, a community-wide council encompasses the entire community and provides for broader representation in terms of council membership. Berridge (1973) suggested that the functions of a council such as this were:

Their task is to receive input from the community and to study such input that the results might be beneficial to all. They (council members) gather facts, assess them, discuss alternatives and then make recommendations to appropriate resources. (p. 103)

Parsons and Seay (1974) suggested that while councils may take many forms and a community may have more than one kind of council operating at the same time, councils are basically either made up of lay representatives of a community or representatives of educational agencies in the community. Parsons and Seay (1974) recommended that legitimate functions for a lay council would include:

1. Communication
2. Assessment of educational needs
3. Tabulation of available resources
4. Plan community education goals and objectives
5. Establish priorities
6. Community-wide problem solving projects (pp. 173-174)
In 1972 as part of the in-service training program for community education directors, the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University held an in-service session on advisory councils. The purpose of this particular session was to discuss the functions of advisory councils. In response to the question, "What is the role of an advisory council?" these directors came to the following conclusions:

1. Influence and modify policies through proper channels
2. Improve communications between school and community
3. Develop community leadership
4. Assist in planning community education programs by developing basic philosophy and goals and objectives
5. Evaluation (Community School Development Center, 1972, p. 1)

The most inclusive and expansive list of areas for advisory council involvement came from the Flint, Michigan Board of Education Task Force (1973) for the development of guidelines for advisory councils. In the publication Guidelines for School-Community Advisory Councils, the Task Force (1973) suggested that "major areas of interest and importance to which each council should address itself (p. 10)" were:

1. Communications
2. Building and plant utilization
3. Planning for new schools and renovations of existing facilities
4. Student activities
5. Adult activities
6. Neighborhood and social problems
7. Curriculum
8. Human relations
9. Humaneness in education
10. Community affairs and activities
11. Coordination of social services
12. Code for student conduct (pp. 10-12)

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) have emphasized the importance of determining the purpose of an advisory council in advance of asking...
individuals to serve on such a council. "It is important to ascribe a clear and concise role to any citizen's group at its inception and to assure the group that the time spent will be on important community and educational issues and problems (p. 74)." These two authors maintained that a council can provide assistance in establishing educational purposes, providing an awareness of community problems and concerns, and assisting in establishing the basis for programs that may help solve these problems.

The Director in the Council Setting

Given the stated importance of advisory councils in implementing and maintaining the community education concept, the community education director must assume an active leadership role in establishing the council and in determining appropriate leader behavior to use in working with the council once the purpose and functions of the council have been determined. Walker (1973), in an article discussing the job description of a community school director, listed establishing a representative advisory council as one of the major responsibilities of the director. Whitt (1971) in a handbook developed for the community school director stated that "the community school director takes an active part in developing such a council, sitting in on its meetings and providing leadership when needed (p. 33)."

Once the advisory council is organized, the community education director must determine what leader behavior is appropriate to the advisory council situation. Totten and Manley (1969), writing in reference to the advisory committee (council), indicated that "The
leader must be so trained and experienced that he can shift his role to meet the situation (p. 14)." Just what this role should be in the advisory council situation is the question that confronts the community education director. Parsons and Seay (1974) indicated that it is difficult for community education leaders to allow advisory councils to function with little or no input from the director.

There are many reasons for this situation....Community educators study strategies of leadership, they practice the leadership role in almost every aspect of their work, talking and activating procedure all day and all evening, until they become, if they do not guard against the occupational hazard, non-stop leaders. (pp. 181-182)

Campbell (1973), writing about the downfall of advisory councils developed during the fifties as a part of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, issued a warning to community education leaders regarding their leadership position with advisory councils.

Conceivably, catastrophe could befall these new organizations if their leaders become overly casual or slipshod in the way that they inch forward toward their objectives. (p. 2)

How much input the community education director should have with the advisory council is an important consideration for the community education director. Mënzey (1974) suggested that "Community education personnel assist this council in its organization and development until they (community councils) are able to continue as viable organizations on their own (p. 58)." A similar position was taken by Carrillo (1973), who stated:

Initially, the community school director will have to assume leadership of the council. However, as soon as possible, the council should determine its own leadership and the director should assume the role of a consultant and technical advisor to the council. (p. 9)
At least two authors were in agreement with Carrillo's idea that the community education director's role should become one of a "consultant and technical advisor to the council (p. 9)." Cox (1974) maintained that once the council has determined what its responsibilities will be, the community educator who is working with the council can "provide the council with the techniques and technicalities involved in achieving each of its responsibilities (p. 32)." Deshler and Erlich (1972), in reference to citizen involvement in community education, indicated:

We believe that any community education effort...must have some consistent staff support and technical assistance if it is to succeed. At the outset, viable community involvement depends upon the provision of adequate staff support especially in the area of leadership development. A trained community education specialist such as the school community agent or the community school director can give the technical assistance so vital to both citizens and school staff. (p. 175)

Whether or not to move the advisory council in the direction of task orientation is another question that must be answered when the community education director attempts to ascertain an appropriate role in working with the advisory council. Norwick (1973) maintained that:

The next step in council development...was to make the council task oriented. As council members become task oriented, the council and the community education concept will grow and become meaningful to individuals and community. (p. 26)

VanNess (1974) supported Norwick's position when he asserted that the maintenance activities of the advisory council must be kept to a minimum and the leader should move quickly to new items or to "task activities that move the council toward the achievement of its goals (p. 42)."
The atmosphere in which the advisory council functions is another important consideration for the community education director. Strang (1953) pointed out that a leader should help all group members feel free and easy and refrain from judging group members' remarks although it may be appropriate to "sharpen, emphasize, and relate the ideas they express (p. 173)." LeTarte (1973), referring to advisory councils as a form of democratic involvement, stated in regard to atmosphere:

Once a council is selected an atmosphere of openness should be developed. Community members should feel free to present criticism or concern on any number of issues and do this in an open and positive manner. With this opportunity for honest disagreement, others should feel free to take issue and present alternative points of view. This should naturally lead to an interchange of ideas and the establishment of some common understanding. (p. 39)

In at least one source, the authors, Totten and Manley (1969), suggested that the role of the leader in the advisory council depends on the type of council. These two authors identified councils as informational, advisory, and problem-solving. In the case of an informational council, the leader controls the situation and makes all of the decisions. In the advisory council situation, the leader would take an active role in defining the task and the members of the group contribute knowledge and ideas. The third type council, the problem-solving group, often selects a leader from the group members. The leader in this instance lends no particular influence but keeps the group moving toward their goal.

Once the advisory council has been established, the director must ascertain what leadership role is appropriate to the advisory
council setting. The director must consider whether or not the leadership role should be an active one; the amount of consultant and technical advice the advisory council needs; the degree to which the council's activities should be task oriented; and the atmosphere in which the council functions.

**Leader Behavior**

Flinder (1969) indicated that functional leadership studies began less than a half century ago and since that time, a sizeable mass of data about leadership has been collected. Theories regarding leadership have emerged from many disciplines and have been advanced by people in a variety of special interest areas. Pertinent to this study are those studies and the accumulated information that deals with the situational approach to leadership and task orientation and human relationships orientation as two important aspects of leader behavior.

While much of the early research dealing with leadership attempted to identify traits of a leader, an examination of 124 studies on the relationships of personality factors to leadership by Stogdill (1948) lead to the following conclusions:

The qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader....A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. (pp. 63-64)

Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1967), writing in *Educational Organization*
and Administration, cited an unpublished dissertation by Myers which analyzed more than 200 studies of leadership conducted over the previous 50 years. The conclusions drawn by Myers (1954) regarding the relationship of personality traits to leadership were:

1. No physical characteristics are significantly related to leadership.

2. Although leaders tend to be slightly higher in intelligence than the group in which they are members, there is no significant relationship between superior intelligence and leadership.

3. Knowledge applicable to the problems faced by a group contributes significantly to leadership status.

4. The following characteristics correlate significantly with leadership: insight, cooperation, originality, ambition, persistence, emotional stability, judgement, popularity, and communication skills.

5. The personal characteristics of the leaders differ according to the situation. Leaders tend to remain leaders only in situations where the activity is similar. No single characteristic is the possession of all leaders. (p. 107)

Much of the current research in the field of leader behavior is based on what is commonly termed the situational approach as opposed to the earlier trait approach. According to the situational approach, leader behavior is viewed in terms of the situation and the leader's ability to adjust to the demands of the situation. Gibb (1954), in the *Handbook of Social Psychology*, suggested that four major variables were important for a comprehensive theory of leadership. These variables were: "(a) personality, (b) the attitudes, needs, and problems of the followers, (c) the group itself in regard to structure of interpersonal relations, and (d) the situation as determined
by physical setting, nature of the task, etc. (p. 914)." Gibb (1969) reaffirmed his position concerning the importance of the situation to leadership in the publication entitled Leadership which Gibb edited.

Hemphill (1949), who was involved in The Ohio State University Studies, gathered data from over 500 assorted groups and was able to demonstrate that variance in leader behavior is significantly associated with situational variance. Hemphill concluded that a large group makes more and different demands upon the leader than a smaller group. In the larger group, the leader tends to be impersonal and more inclined to enforce rules and regulations. In a smaller group, the leader plays a more personal role and is more apt to make exceptions to rules and regulations and to treat the group members as individuals.

At least three other researchers have made contributions to the situational approach to leadership. Shartle (1956) emphasized the role of the individual in the organization and stressed the importance of the situation, the organizational milieu, environmental events, and interaction of all these in understanding leadership. Reddin (1970), in his book Managerial Effectiveness, stated that "Effectiveness results from a style's appropriateness to the situation in which it is used (p. 35)." Fiedler (1973), reporting the results of a number of leadership studies, indicated that it makes no sense to talk about a good leader or a poor leader. "There are only leaders who will perform well in one situation but not well in another (p. 26)."

Two aspects of leader behavior which are of prime importance to a leader in any situation are task orientation and human relationships
orientation. The task orientation and human relationships orientation aspects of leader behavior have been identified and defined by a number of researchers and authors. Mayo (1933) concluded that man is motivated by social and psychological forces as well as economic forces and that productivity can be affected by the perception of workers that management is interested in them. This study was probably the first to identify the influence of concern for people on production in industry. Another early study by social psychologists Lewin, Lippit, and White (1938) found that groups under democratic leadership exhibited less conflict and higher productivity than groups under either autocratic or laissez-faire leadership. Although this study was conducted with groups of ten-year-old boys, it is often considered a classic in the field of leader behavior. A third early study which contributed to the available information regarding human relationships orientation and task orientation was conducted at the Harvard Manufacturing Company by Coch and French (1948). This study, which dealt with resistance to change, used group sessions in which workers were allowed to participate in varying degrees in discussing changes in production lines. The results showed that workers directly involved in the sessions learned new techniques faster and reached production levels quicker than groups with little or no involvement.

The Ohio State University Studies which were conducted in the late forties and early fifties under the direction of Shartle, and in which Stogdill, Halpin, and others were involved, found that leadership behavior could be classified into two independent factors, Initiating Structure and Consideration. Another outcome of The Ohio
State University Studies was the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed to measure Initiating Structure and Consideration. Halpin (1966) later defined these two dimensions of leader behavior as follows:

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between leader and the members of his staff. (p. 39)

These same two dimensions of leader behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration, have also been identified in several other studies. Beginning in 1947, a series of studies conducted at The University of Michigan's Survey Research Center led to the development of a continuum for leader behavior. At one end of this continuum was the employee-centered leader and at the other, the production-centered leader. Originally these researchers thought that if a leader was more employee-centered he/she would be less production-centered. More recently, this view has been changed to view the two aspects of leader behavior as being two independent factors rather than two ends of a continuum. Research on small group behavior conducted by R. F. Bales (1933) at Harvard used the terms task leader and socio-emotional leader to describe the same basic dimensions of leader behavior. Blake and Mouton (1964), in developing their managerial grid, proposed two basic leader styles, production centered and people centered. Reddin (1970), as part of his 3-dimensional managerial styles, defined task orientation as the
"extent to which a manager directs his own and his subordinates' efforts (p. 33)" and relationships orientation as the "extent to which a manager has personal job relationships (p. 33)."

A number of studies have focused on the question of whether Initiating Structure or Consideration or some combination of the two are appropriate in various leadership situations. A study of eighty-seven B-29 aircraft commanders by Halpin (1953) led to the conclusion that a successful leader is one who fosters both Initiating Structure and Consideration. In a second study of 50 Ohio school superintendents, Halpin (1956) compared perceptions of the superintendents' leader behavior by the superintendent him/herself, by board of education members, and by staff members in regard to Initiating Structure and Consideration. One outcome of this study was that all three groups characterized an ideal superintendent as one who scores high on both Consideration and Initiating Structure. In a third study conducted with 64 educational administrators and 132 aircraft commanders, Halpin (1955) attempted to determine whether these two groups of leaders differed in their leadership ideology and their leadership style. The results of this study showed that:

The leaders who function within these two different institutional settings exhibit differences in their leadership ideology and differences in their styles of leadership behavior. Specifically, the administrators, in both ideology and leader behavior show more Consideration and less Initiating than the commanders. (pp. 103-104)

Halpin (1966) provided a summary of several leader behavior studies which lead to the conclusion that effective leader behavior, favorable group attitudes, and favorable changes in group attitude
are all associated with high performance on both Consideration and Initiating Structure.

Several other recent studies have shed additional light on the importance of the leader's Initiating Structure and Consideration in the leadership situation. Likert (1961) found that supervisors who used group methods of supervision and had favorable attitudes toward their men achieved higher performance than supervisors who did not use such methods and who had unfavorable attitudes. Fiedler (1967), writing in reference to his theory of leadership effectiveness, indicated that the most favorable group situation for the leader is when the leader-group relations are good, the task is highly structured, and the leader's position power is strong. The leader is in an unfavorable position when the opposite conditions exist. Hollander (1961) pointed out that the leader must demonstrate task competence and be considered active in the group in order to meet group expectations. Owens (1970), in a book about organizational behavior in schools, stated:

The person who ignores the production needs of his fellowman while championing employee needs is misapplying the ideas of sound organizational behavior. It is also true that the person who pushes production without regard for employee needs is misapplying organizational behavior. Sound organizational behavior recognizes a pluralistic social system in which many types of needs are in equilibrium. (pp. 481-482)

The recent trend in research in the field of leader behavior is based on the situational approach as opposed to the earlier trait approach. The situational approach focuses on the situation in which the leader functions and the leader's ability to adjust according to the demands of the situation. Two aspects of leader behavior which
are important to the leader in most situations are Initiating Structure and Consideration. In general, the effective leader is one who exhibits a high degree of behavior indicative of both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Measurement of Leader Behavior

While there are several instruments available for the measurement of leader behavior, an examination of the Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook (1955) indicated that two forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire all provide scores indicative of Initiating Structure and Consideration.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) was originally developed by Fleishman in 1960 and revised in 1969. While this questionnaire allows for the leader to describe him/herself in terms of Initiating Structure and Consideration, the LOQ was not intended to be used by a group to describe their leader. Fleishman (1969) in the Manual for the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire suggested that this questionnaire be used for selection and appraisal of leaders, as a training aid in management programs and as an evaluation instrument for management development programs.

Several versions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, commonly and hereafter referred to as the LBDQ, were developed as part of The Ohio State University Leadership Studies. These forms of the LBDQ contain a series of items, each of which describes a specific manner in which the leader may behave. The respondent
indicates on a five-point Likert-type scale the frequency with which he/she perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior. The response options used in the LBDQ are always, often, occasionally, seldom, and never. The LBDQ allows a group to describe the frequency with which a leader engages in certain behavior, provided they have had the opportunity to view the person in action in a group setting. Halpin (1966) reported that the "questionnaire (LBDQ) measures the leader's behavior in a specified situation—for example, as the commander of an aircrew, or as an administrator in a public school—but does not purport to measure an intrinsic capacity for leadership (p. 90)." In addition to measuring real behavior, the LBDQ can be used to provide a measurement of ideal leader behavior, thus allowing the researcher to contrast perceptions of "what is" with "what ought to be." An additional advantage for using a form of the LBDQ was the fact that the LBDQ can be readily adapted to different group requirements without altering the meaning of the items. This allows the researcher to make appropriate adjustments in terminology without affecting the meaning of the items and at the same time, to make the instrument more personal to the population being studied.

Two forms of the LBDQ were considered for possible use in this study. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII identifies twelve factors of leader behavior. In addition to scores for Initiating Structure and Consideration, this form provides scores for ten other factors related to observable leader behavior. These ten factors were identified by Stogdill in 1959. In the Manual for
the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII, Stogdill (1963) indicated that while this is the fourth revision of Form XII, it is still in the experimental stage and subject to further revision.

The shorter form of the LBDQ, which provides only two scores for leader behavior, one for Initiating Structure and one for Consideration, was selected for use in this study. These two dimensions of leader behavior were identified by Halpin and Winer (1957) on the basis of a factor analysis of the responses of 300 B-29 crew members who used the original form of the LBDQ to describe the leader behavior of their 52 aircraft commanders.

In an 80-item form of the questionnaire, only the 15 items for measuring Consideration and the 15 items for measuring Structure were keyed and scored. The reliabilities of these short keys were found to be satisfactorily high for practical use. The two scales are correlated to a moderate degree, but are sufficiently independent to permit the use of Consideration and Initiating Structure scales as measures of different kinds of behavior. (p. 51)

In the Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Halpin (1957) reported another study in which the correlation between the scores on the two dimensions was found to be .38.

The shorter length of this particular form of the LBDQ was considered more appropriate for this study in terms of time required for administration. In addition, as Stogdill (1963) indicated, Form XII needs further revision before being used to any extent.

Discrepancies in Perception of Leader Behavior

Within any leadership situation, one can expect some discrepancy in the perception of the behavior of the group leader. Parsons and
Shils (1951) pointed out that not only what the leader does in fulfilling his/her role, but the way that group members perceive what he/she does is important. Gibb (1954) acknowledged the importance of perception in leadership theory when he stated:

Theory must recognize...that it is the perception of the leader by himself and by others, the leader's perception of others, and the shared perception by the leaders of the group with which we have to deal. (p. 914)

Boles (1971) also agreed with Gibb regarding the importance of perception in leader behavior by stating:

The present writer agrees that what the leader does, what the followers do, and what the situation is are all less important than are what the leader is perceived as doing, and the perception of involved parties as to what the situation is. (p. 57)

When these perceptions are not in agreement, the leader can anticipate some difficulty in handling the situation. Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968) indicated:

Since effectiveness in a role depends on the degree to which behavior conforms to expectations, effectiveness cannot be forthcoming if the expectations are inconsistent regardless of who the particular incumbent is. (p. 182)

Campbell (1973), writing specifically in regard to the role of the community school director with an advisory council, warned that "It should be recognized that when a leader's methods are in disharmony with those of his followers, then his ambitious dreams may become wish fulfillments more than realizable goals (p. 2)."

A number of studies over the past years have borne out the fact that within a given situation there are apt to be discrepancies in the perception of leader behavior or what leader behavior ought to be.
Stogdill and Coons (1957), in discussing a pre-test of the LBDQ, concluded that:

It would appear that a leader's description of his own behavior cannot be considered equivalent to a subordinate's description. Leaders not only tend to avoid making extreme statements about their behavior, especially about less favorable kinds of behavior, but also appear to have different values as to what behavior constitutes good leadership. (pp. 36-37)

Halpin (1956) reported a study of 50 Ohio school superintendents which helped shed light on the importance of perception in leader behavior. The purpose of his study was to determine the relationship between the superintendents' own perception of their behavior on Initiating Structure and Consideration as contrasted with the perceptions of board members and the perceptions of staff members. Furthermore, the study examined these same relationships concerning perceptions of how the superintendent should behave. The over-all results of the study were that while the staff and the board members agreed among themselves as a group in their description on the superintendent's behavior, the two groups do not agree with each other. Halpin (1956) went on to comment in regard to this particular study:

Evidence from this inquiry...show that the leader's description of his own leadership behavior and his concept of what his behavior should be have little relationship to others' perceptions of his own behavior that others have. Both reference groups, the board and the staff, impose expectations on how he (the superintendent) should behave as a leader. When these expectations are essentially similar he (the superintendent) probably encounters no difficulty in orienting his (the superintendent's) behavior to them. But to the extent that they are incompatible, he (the superintendent) is placed in a position of potential role conflict. (p. 112)
A second study by Halpin (1953) investigated the leader behavior of B-29 aircraft commanders. The results of this study indicated a difference between supervisors and subordinates when they evaluate the contribution of the dimensions of leader behavior to the effectiveness of leadership. "This difference in evaluation would appear to confront the leader with conflicting role expectations (p. 22)." In another study involving 132 aircraft commanders, Halpin (1955) compared the commander's ideologies of leader behavior and their crews' descriptions of actual leader behavior. The results of this study indicated:

The evidence suggests that the aircraft commander's knowledge of how he should behave as a leader has little bearing upon how he is perceived as behaving by the members of his crew. (p. 83)

A final study by Halpin (1955) of 64 educational administrators and 132 aircraft commanders supported the findings of the previously cited studies. The results of this study indicate that a leader's ideas of how he should behave are not highly associated with his behavior as described by the followers.

Summary

From this review of the literature, it would seem that advisory councils are an important element in implementing and maintaining the concept of community education in any community. While there is some disagreement in regard to the specific role of the community education director as he/she works with the advisory council, most authors agreed on the importance of playing an appropriate role.
The current literature relating to leader behavior leans toward the situational approach as opposed to the earlier trait approach. Two dimensions of leader behavior which must be considered in any situation are Initiating Structure and Consideration. Both dimensions are important to the leader in establishing an appropriate role for a given leadership situation. Difficulties arise within the situation when the leader and the group members perceive the importance of the two dimensions differently.

Thus, the objective of this study was to examine the leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting. Emphasis was placed on the relationships between perceptions of the director and perceptions of council members in regard to the director's actual and preferred leader behavior. A second emphasis was on whether or not several contextual (situational) variables pertinent to the director/advisory council setting would assist in explaining the perceptions the director had of his/her own leader behavior in the advisory council setting.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The objective of this study was to determine if there were differences in the perception of the director's leader behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration in each of the following situations: (a) actual and preferred leader behavior as perceived by the director; (b) actual and preferred leader behavior as perceived by the council; (c) actual leader behavior as perceived by both the director and the council; (d) preferred leader behavior as perceived by both the director and the council; (e) actual leader behavior as perceived by the director and preferred leader behavior as perceived by the council; and (f) preferred leader behavior as perceived by the director and actual leader behavior as perceived by the council. In addition, several contextual variables which are related to the director/advisory council setting were selected to determine if the director's actual leader behavior as perceived by the director could be predicted on the basis of these variables.

In order to meet the stated objective of this study, it was necessary to collect data in two phases. The first phase involved a preliminary questionnaire to determine the exact number of directors who were working with advisory councils. The second phase involved the process of collecting and analyzing data from the identified population regarding the leader behavior of the director in the
advisory council setting and data regarding the selected contextual variables.

To accomplish the two phases of the study, two forms of survey methodology were employed to obtain the needed information. Leedy (1974) identified two types of survey research as the descriptive survey and the analytical survey.

The first phase of this study involved what Leedy (1974) identified as a descriptive survey. A descriptive survey allows the researcher to observe by various methods certain characteristics of individuals and to record the results of these observations. In this study, a questionnaire was used to determine the size of the population.

The second phase of the study consisted of two parts, an examination of the director's leader behavior in the advisory council setting and an examination of several contextual variables that might serve to predict the director's leader behavior. For the first part of phase two, Leedy's (1974) explanation of the analytical survey was appropriate:

In the analytical survey approach, our purpose is... to take data that are essentially quantitative in nature (numerical data) and to analyze these data by means of appropriate statistical tools so that we may infer from them certain meanings which lie hidden within them, or at least to discern the presence of potentials and dynamic forces which lie within those data that may suggest possibilities of further investigation. In the analytical survey we are concerned primarily with problems of estimation and situations demanding the testing of a statistically based hypothesis. (p. 114)

Further explanation regarding the type of research conducted in the second part of phase two was provided by Babbie (1973), who identified
several typical modifications of basic survey design; i.e., parallel samples, contextual studies, and sociometric studies. Babbie (1973) distinguished a contextual study as follows:

When data are collected about some portions of a person's environment or milieu and used to describe the individual, this is called a contextual study: an examination of his context. (p. 67)

To expand the design of this study, the remainder of this chapter dealt with (a) operationalization of variables and group definitions; (b) population; (c) validity, reliability and adaptation of instruments; (d) data collection procedures; (e) hypotheses; and (f) data analysis techniques.

Operationalization of Variables and Group Definitions

The following operational definitions were used in this study:

**Community education director**

The 81 individuals in charge of community education programs identified by the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University as either building directors, community school directors, community education or school coordinators or similar titles.

**Community education advisory council**

That group of community representatives designed as an advisory council by the community education director. The advisory council could be a neighborhood council composed of representatives from the area served by an elementary school; a community or district-
wide council composed of representatives from the total community; or a combination of these two types.

**Leader behavior**

Those patterns of behavior exhibited by the community education director as he/she works with the advisory council which can be identified on the LBDQ as either Initiating Structure or as Consideration.

**Contextual variables**

The set of variables defined as: (a) number of times the council meets per year; (b) years of experience in community education of the director; (c) years of experience with advisory councils; (d) educational background of the director; and (e) type of advisory council.

**Population**

Phase one of this study was carried out to determine how many directors were in fact, working with some form of advisory council. To accomplish phase one, all community education directors, who were employed within the 65 school districts with community education programs located in the southwestern part of Michigan, were contacted regarding the status of their advisory councils. These 65 school districts were part of the service area of the Regional Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University. A number of the larger school districts in this area employed more than one individual with the title community school director. The usual pattern in these districts is to employ a district-wide coordinator.
with several other directors each assigned to a particular school building. It was possible that in these districts, the system-wide coordinator and each building director might have been working with an advisory council of some form. Smaller districts in the area were more apt to employ only one director who might have been working with a single council. These conditions necessitated development of a procedure to determine the exact number of directors who were working with advisory councils. The results of this preliminary questionnaire verified the fact that in some larger districts several directors were working with advisory councils.

To determine the exact size of the population, a preliminary questionnaire was developed and sent with a letter of explanation to each director in the southwestern area of Michigan served by the Regional Community School Development Center located at Western Michigan University. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine how many active director/council situations existed in the above mentioned 65 school districts. A copy of this questionnaire is found in Appendix A.

Initially two criteria were established to determine whether or not an advisory council was active. The criteria were the number of times a council met per year and whether or not the council functioned under a set of by-laws, a constitution, or similar document. In the case of the former, an advisory council that met a minimum of four times per year was considered active and in the latter, an advisory council that operated under a set of by-laws, a constitution, or similar document was considered active. An active council had to
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meet both criteria. The criterion dealing with the number of meetings was selected to insure that advisory council members would have had adequate opportunity to observe the leader behavior of the director. Valid use of the LBDQ to measure leader behavior was dependent on this criterion. The second criterion, whether or not the council functioned under a set of by-laws, a constitution, or similar document, was selected because it follows logically that better organized councils would meet on a more regular basis. Again, this would help insure more valid data regarding the leader behavior of the director.

In addition to requesting information regarding the above criteria, the preliminary questionnaire sought information to facilitate collection of data at a later time. The information requested was: (a) dates for advisory council meetings; (b) name and address of the council chairperson or other contact person; and (c) the number of people serving on the council.

A total of 81 preliminary questionnaires were mailed to directors in the 65 school districts. Two weeks after the first mailing, a second request was mailed to all non-respondents in order to achieve a one hundred percent return. Follow-up telephone calls insured that the needed information was received from all 81 directors. To check the reliability of this questionnaire, ten percent (8) of the 81 respondents were selected randomly. These eight individuals were contacted by telephone and asked to answer the same seven questions a second time. For the first six questions, response patterns identical to those received on the written questionnaire were obtained.
over the telephone. On question seven, which requested dates for council meetings during the 1974-75 school year, two individuals gave different responses over the telephone. For this question, a contingency coefficient as explained in Siegel (1956) was used to measure the association between the written and telephone responses on question seven. The obtained value of the contingency coefficient was .27, which would not indicate a satisfactory reliability for question seven. Given the time which elapsed between the contact by mail and the contact by telephone, it was reasonable to assume that council meeting dates changed for any number of legitimate reasons.

Of the 81 contacts, 20 directors indicated that they were not working with any form of council; 15 had councils that did not meet either of the two criteria; one council did not meet the criterion for number of meetings; 20 had councils that did not meet the criterion for by-laws; and 25 had councils that met both criteria. These data are displayed in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returns of Preliminary Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicated no council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had council, did not meet either criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had council, did not meet by-laws criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had council, did not meet number of meetings criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had council, met both criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNumbers in parentheses indicate percent of total returns*
It was originally intended that the population include only those advisory councils meeting both criteria. On this basis, the results of the preliminary questionnaire indicated that of the 61 directors who were working with councils, only 25 councils met both criteria. Without any specific knowledge as to whether or not the by-laws or similar document contained specifics as to number and regularity of meetings, it seemed reasonable to eliminate this criterion and thus allow the size of the population to be increased from 25 to 45 directors and their respective councils.

With the small size of the population, 45 directors and their respective advisory councils, the sample size at the .95 confidence level would be 40 (Krejcie, 1970). Given a situation where the sample and the population were so close, a decision was made not to sample but to attempt to gather data from all 45 directors and councils.

Reliability, Validity and Adaptation of Instruments

The reliability of the split-half method of the LBDQ has been reported in the Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as being .83 for the Initiating Structure scores and .92 for the Consideration scores. Halpin (1957) made split-half estimates using an odd-even split of the reliability of the two scores. The results were:

For the Consideration key, the estimate of reliability is .85, which when corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula is raised to .92...the estimated reliability of the Initiating Structure key is .71, which is raised to .83 by the Spearman-Brown correction. (p. 55)
The Halpin and Winer (1957) factor analysis study which resulted in identifying the two dimensions of leader behavior, led to an estimated reliability of .93 for Consideration and .86 for Initiating Structure.

While a search of available information pertinent to the form of the LBDQ used in this study failed to reveal specifics related to the validity of this form, there is some evidence that the two types of leader behavior measured are independent of each other. Halpin and Winer (1957) indicated that these two scales are "correlated to a moderate degree, but are sufficiently independent to permit the use of Consideration and Initiating Structure scales as measures of different kinds of behavior (p. 51)." Halpin (1957) reported another study in which the correlation between the two scores on the two dimensions was .38. Two other studies conducted by Halpin and Winer (1957) revealed correlations of .52 and .45 between Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Another reason for selecting the LBDQ for use in this study in addition to the fact that the LBDQ provides a fairly reliable method for measuring leader behavior, was the fact that the LBDQ could be readily adapted to different group requirements without altering the meaning of the items. Halpin (1966), writing in reference to modifying the LBDQ, indicated "minor changes in wording can be made in each item according to the nature of the group with which the questionnaire is used (p. 90)." For use in this study, the title community education director was substituted in the original form for all references to "he." This particular modification was
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made in order to reduce the possibility that continued use of the masculine "he" would introduce bias based on sex. Additionally, specifying community education director at the beginning of each statement regarding leader behavior would serve as a reminder to the respondents that this was the individual being described. A second change was using the phrase community education advisory council in the directions in order to identify the specific group with which the director was working. Where appropriate in the directions, the term actual was substituted for the term real and the term preferred for idea. This change was made in an attempt to select terminology which would clarify the two circumstances under which the directors and council members were to respond regarding the director's leader behavior.

Beside the LBDQ, a brief questionnaire was used to obtain certain information from the directors about several contextual variables. While there are numerous contextual variables which might be considered when attempting to explain the director's perceptions of his/her actual leader behavior within the advisory council setting, the scope of this study was necessarily limited. The variables selected were those that seemed most pertinent to the population of directors and advisory council members being used in this study. The contextual variables selected were: (a) number of times the council meets per year; (b) years of experience in community education of the director; (c) years of experience with councils; (d) educational background of the director; and (e) type of advisory council. To check the reliability of the director's questionnaire,
five of the 33 directors who returned this questionnaire were randomly sampled and asked, by telephone, to respond a second time to the questions. For questions two, three, and four, which dealt with years of experience in community education, years of experience with councils, and educational background of the director, identical response patterns were obtained between the written answers and those obtained by telephone. On question one, which asked for number of meetings per year, and five, which asked the type of council, there were some discrepancies between the answers given on the written form and the answers obtained over the telephone. To determine the significance of these discrepancies, a contingency coefficient as explained in Siegel (1956) was used to measure the association between the written and telephone responses. For question one, the obtained value of the contingency coefficient was .22, which would not indicate a satisfactory reliability for question one. Since some time passed between the contact via written questionnaire and the contact by telephone, it was possible that the number of times a council met per year might be adjusted for a number of reasons. For question five, the obtained value of the contingency coefficient was .28. As in question one, this was not a satisfactorily high reliability. In this case, the discrepancy between the written and telephone responses occurred when one of the five directors classified the form of community-wide council differently on the second contact.

Data Collection Procedures

Once modifications were made in the LBDQ and the questionnaire for directors was developed, a procedure for distribution
was established. The technique used to obtain data for this study was to send the instrument and the questionnaire through the mail. Despite the recognized shortcomings associated with use of the mail technique, this method was judged the only practical method for contacting the directors and their advisory council members. The time and expense involved in contacting each of the individuals involved personally would have been prohibitive. Before mailing, all forms of the LBDQ and the questionnaire were color and number coded to avoid confusion on the part of the recipients and to assist the researcher in tabulating the data.

Based on the information regarding meeting dates for the advisory councils obtained from the preliminary questionnaire, a mailing schedule was established. Two forms of the LBDQ, one for actual and one for preferred leader behavior, the questionnaire, a letter of explanation and a return pre-addressed envelope were mailed to each of the 45 directors. To obtain needed data from council members, an appropriate number of each form of the LBDQ, actual and preferred leader behavior, a letter of explanation, and a return pre-addressed envelope was mailed to the individual listed as contact person on the preliminary questionnaire. Within the letter of explanation, the contact person was asked to have the forms completed at the next advisory council meeting. In those instances where no contact person was listed, these materials were mailed to the director with instructions to have the advisory council members complete the forms at the next advisory council meeting. Of the 45 sets of material for advisory councils, 15 sets were mailed to a specified contact
person and 30 to the directors. Copies of the LBDQ and the director questionnaire can be found in Appendix A and copies of all correspondence in Appendix B.

Hypotheses

The second phase of this study was divided into two parts. The first part was to determine whether or not a significant difference existed in the actual and preferred leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting as perceived by the director and the actual and preferred leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting as perceived by members of his/her advisory council. Leader behavior was measured by use of the LBDQ, which provided separate scores for Initiating Structure and for Consideration.

The following were the research hypotheses for this part of phase two:

1. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director.

2. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Consideration and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director.

3. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

4. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Consideration and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.
5. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

6. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

7. There is a difference between preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

8. There is a difference between preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

9. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

10. There is a difference between actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

11. There is a difference between preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.
12. There is a difference between preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

The second part of phase two was to test the strength of the prediction of actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, on the basis of selected contextual variables. The contextual variables were: (a) number of times the council meets per year; (b) years of experience in community education of the director; (c) years of experience with advisory councils; (d) educational background of the director; and (e) type of advisory council. For the second part of phase two, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. Actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, is predictable by selected contextual variables.

2. Actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, is predictable by selected contextual variables.

The strength of the prediction of leader behavior, as stated in the above two hypotheses, was investigated by looking at the size of the multiple correlation coefficient based on the contextual variables \(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5\) as contrasted with the first level correlation between each independent variable \(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5\) and the two dependent variables, actual Initiating Structure and actual Consideration.

\[X_1 = \text{number of times the council meets per year}\]
\[X_2 = \text{years of experience in community education of the director}\]
\[X_3 = \text{years of experience with advisory councils}\]
$X_4 =$ educational background of the director

$X_5 =$ type of advisory council

Treatment of the Data

Once the data were collected according to the procedure described earlier in this chapter, each of the two parts of phase two were analyzed with appropriate statistical techniques.

For part one of phase two, a $t$-test for nonindependent or correlated groups was applied to each of the first four hypotheses and a $t$-test for independent groups was applied to hypotheses five through twelve as stated in the previous section to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of leader behavior. For part two of phase two, a multiple correlation coefficient was computed for each of the hypotheses as stated in the previous section, to determine if the contextual variables taken in combination would serve as a predictor set for the director's actual leader behavior. In addition, each variable was correlated separately with the director's actual leader behavior to determine if there was a high first order correlation.

Summary

The objective of this chapter was to explain the procedures used to collect and analyze data about the actual and preferred leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting. The two aspects of leader behavior examined were Initiating Structure and Consideration. In addition, the procedures for collecting and
analyzing data relative to prediction of the director's actual leader behavior on the basis of selected contextual variables were explained.

To accomplish these objectives, data were collected in two phases. In the first phase, a preliminary questionnaire was mailed to 81 directors in Southwest Michigan to determine how many directors were working with councils and to determine how many of these councils met at least four times per year. As a result of this questionnaire, the size of the population was set at 45 directors and their respective councils.

For the second phase of this study, the LBDQ was selected to collect data from directors and council members in regard to the director's leader behavior. The LBDQ provides a score for Initiating Structure and a score for Consideration. Additionally, a questionnaire was developed to collect data from the directors regarding the contextual variables.

Once the data were collected, a t-test was used to determine if there were differences between the perceptions of the directors and the councils in regard to actual and preferred leader behavior. A multiple correlation was used to determine if the contextual variables taken in combination would serve as a predictor of the director's actual leader behavior. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlations between each of the separate contextual variables and the director's actual leader behavior.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The objective of this study was to examine the leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting. Emphasis was placed on the differences between the perceptions of the director and the perceptions of council members in regard to the director's actual and preferred leader behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration. A second emphasis was on whether or not several contextual variables relevant to the director in the advisory council setting would assist in explaining the perceptions the director had of his/her own actual leader behavior in the council setting.

To accomplish the above stated objective, the LBDQ and a questionnaire regarding the contextual variables were mailed to 45 directors. Based on a previously established mailing schedule, appropriate forms of the LBDQ were mailed to a contact person on the advisory councils of the 45 directors. Where no contact person on the advisory councils had been identified, the directors received the materials for the advisory council members. In all instances, a letter of explanation requesting that the forms be completed and returned accompanied the materials. Approximately three to four weeks after the materials were mailed, a second letter requesting that the forms be completed was mailed to all non-respondents. See Appendix B for a copy of this letter. In addition, ten directors who had returned their materials
were contacted by telephone to obtain needed responses from advisory council members.

Chapter IV is organized as follows: First, a discussion of the returns from directors and council members; second, the data related to the perceptions of the directors' leader behavior were analyzed by use of either a correlated or independent t-test; third, the data related to the prediction of leader behavior on the basis of selected contextual variables were used to generate a multiple correlation coefficient; and fourth, a summary of the over-all results of this study.

Characteristics of the Population

The population used for this study consisted of the 45 directors and their respective advisory council members selected as the result of the administration of a preliminary questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire was mailed to each of 81 individuals identified as community education directors who were employed within one of the 65 school districts with community education programs located in southwestern Michigan. These 65 districts are a part of the service area of the Regional Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University. Each of the selected advisory councils met the criterion of meeting at least four times per year.

Of the 45 directors and their respective councils, a total of 33 directors and councils, when each council was considered as a group, returned the LBDQs and the director's questionnaire. This was a return of 73.3 percent.
Within the 33 individual advisory councils that returned the LBDQ, there was a total membership of 416. Of the 416 advisory council members, 167 individuals returned both the actual and preferred forms of the LBDQ. In the case of five of these individuals, the two forms of the LBDQ were eliminated because they were not fully completed, making accurate scoring impossible. This left 162 actual LBDQs and 162 preferred LBDQs which were usable.

The average membership on the 33 councils was 12.6. The smallest council had a membership of five, while the largest number of members was 30. Two councils had 30 members. Seventeen advisory councils had 12 or more members and 16 had less than twelve. Since the unit of analysis in this study was the mean value of an advisory council, the data for the study equally represent both large and small councils. In addition, each analysis unit is a good measure of the council's perception of the director's behavior, both actual and preferred, since the council membership is adequately represented in the mean value, as Table II indicates. The highest return per council was eight out of ten members or 80 percent, while the lowest return per council was three out of 30 or ten percent. The average percent of return per council was 42.9.

In examining returns from the councils, the average number of individuals per council who returned each form of the LBDQ was 4.9. The average number of returns per council for the 17 councils with 12 or more members was 5.5. The average number of returns for the 16 councils with less than 12 members was 4.2. Since it is recommended that a minimum number of four respondents per group is desirable, it
is evident that the average number of returns per council meets this requirement.

Table II provides a breakdown of membership of each of the 33 councils, the number of LBDQs returned per council, and the percent of returns per council.

From the total membership (416) of the 33 advisory councils, 249 individuals did not complete and return the LBDQs. The researcher did not make an official inquiry as to why these individuals did not return the LBDQs. However, several directors with whom the researcher had contact after the data were returned indicated that the length of the questionnaire and the time required to complete each form was a deterrent, especially in terms of taking time out from an advisory council meeting. In addition, low attendance at the council meeting where the forms were to be completed contributed to a low return in some cases.

Perceptions of the Director's Leader Behavior

Phase two, part one, of this study dealt with the director's actual and preferred leader behavior in the advisory council setting as perceived by both the director and members of the director's advisory council. The LBDQ was used to measure these perceptions as related to actual and preferred Initiating Structure and actual and preferred Consideration. For each dimension of leader behavior fifteen responses are scored on a scale from zero to four. The ten unscored items have been retained in the questionnaire to keep the conditions of administration similar to those used in
### Table II

Returns of LBQ by Council Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Membership of Each Council</th>
<th>Number of Returns Per Council(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>14 (46.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6 (28.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5 (23.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9 (47.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5 (35.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (46.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (46.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 (38.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6 (66.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (55.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (55.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (55.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 (44.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (57.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (57.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (57.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 (42.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Percent of returns per council in parenthesis
standardizing the questionnaire. These scores are then totaled to give a score for Initiating Structure and a score for Consideration. The possible range of scores on each dimension is zero to sixty. If several group members have responded to the items, the scores for each individual are totaled and then these scores are averaged to yield an index of leader behavior in respect to each dimension as the group perceives the behavior. It is recommended that a minimum of four respondents per group is desirable and that more than ten respondents per group does not increase the stability of the index scores.

To examine the director's leader behavior, twelve research hypotheses were postulated stating that differences would exist in both Initiating Structure and Consideration in each of the following situations: (a) actual and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the director; (b) actual and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the council members; (c) actual leader behavior, as perceived by both the director and the council members; (d) preferred leader behavior, as perceived by both the director and the council members; (e) actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the council members; and (f) preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior, as perceived by the council members. Figure I provides an overview of the specific perceptions of leader behavior covered in each of the twelve research hypotheses.

To test the differences in the director's leader behavior as postulated in the research hypotheses, the null hypothesis corresponding to each research hypothesis was tested for statistical
### Figure I

**Summary of Research Hypotheses for Comparing Directors' and Council Members' Perceptions of the Directors' Actual and Preferred Leader Behavior: Initiating Structure and Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Director Actual</th>
<th>Director Preferred</th>
<th>Council Members Actual</th>
<th>Council Members Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significance of the findings. The null hypotheses are as follows:

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 1:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 2:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Consideration and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 3:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 4:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Consideration and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 5:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 6:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.
$H_0$ for Hypothesis 7:

There is no difference between preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 8:

There is no difference between preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 9:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 10:

There is no difference between actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

$H_0$ for Hypothesis 11:

There is no difference between preferred leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the council.
H₀ for Hypothesis 12:

There is no difference between preferred leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the council.

The mean scores for each dimension of leader behavior are displayed in Figure II. In all instances, director actual, director preferred, council actual, and council preferred, the mean score for the dimension of Initiating Structure was lower than the mean score for Consideration. The highest mean score (46.21) for Initiating Structure was that of the council members in describing their perceptions of the directors' preferred leader behavior. The mean score (49.06) for Consideration was also the highest when the council members indicated their preference for the directors' leader behavior on this dimension. The lowest mean scores for the two dimensions, Initiating Structure (33.69) and Consideration (41.03), were both on the council members' perceptions of the directors' actual leader behavior.

A t-test for non-independent or correlated groups was used to test the statistical significance of each of the first four null hypotheses. A t-test for correlated groups was selected because these four hypotheses involved comparing the means of the same group under two different conditions. The comparisons were directors' actual perceptions with the directors' preferred perceptions and council members' actual perceptions with council members' preferred perceptions.

The results of comparing the directors' actual with the directors' preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the directors themselves,
Figure II

Mean Scores, Leader Behavior
Initiating Structure and Consideration

I.S. Cons.

Unbroken Line = Director Actual = DA
Broken Line = Director Preferred = DP
Dotted Line = Council Actual = CA
Dot/Dash Line = Council Preferred = CP
are displayed in Table III. The mean score (36.45) for actual Initiating Structure was significantly lower than the mean score (43.87) for preferred Initiating Structure. A similar result occurred when comparing the mean score (43.09) for actual Consideration with the mean score (48.36) for preferred Consideration. In both instances, t values for correlated groups allowed for the rejection of the null hypotheses at the .001 level of significance. The results indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the directors' perceptions of their own actual and preferred leader behavior in terms of both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The directors' preference was for a greater degree of both Initiating Structure and Consideration than what they were actually using with an even greater preference for Consideration.

Table IV displays the results of the t-values for correlated groups as related to the council members' perceptions of the directors' leader behavior. The mean score (33.69) for actual Initiating Structure was significantly lower than the mean score (46.21) for preferred Initiating Structure. Similarly, the mean score (41.03) for actual Consideration was significantly lower than the mean score (49.60) for preferred Consideration. The t-values for correlated groups allowed for the rejection of the null hypotheses at the .001 level of significance. As a result, a statistically significant difference was found to exist when comparing the council members' perceptions of the directors' actual leader behavior with the council members' perceptions of the directors' preferred leader behavior. The results hold true for both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The
Table III

_t-Values for Correlated Groups, Perceptions of Leader Behavior by Directors_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level
Critical value of \( t \) = 3.627
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level
Critical value of $t = 3.627$
council members' preference was for the directors to use more behavior indicative of both Initiating Structure and Consideration, with an even greater preference for Consideration.

A t-test for independent groups was used to analyze the results as related to each of the last eight null hypotheses. This t-test was selected because each of these eight hypotheses involved comparing the means of two independent samples of behavior. In these eight null hypotheses, the comparisons were between directors' perceptions and council members' perceptions.

The results as related to the directors' and the council members' perceptions of the directors' actual leader behavior are displayed in Table V. The mean score (36.45) for director, actual Initiating Structure, was slightly, although not significantly, higher than the mean score (33.69) for the council members' perceptions of the same behavior. At the same time, the mean score (43.09) for director, actual Consideration, was slightly, although not significantly, higher than the mean score (41.03) for council members' perceptions of the same behavior. The two null hypotheses were not rejected at the .05 level of significance. A statistically significant difference was not found between directors' and council members' perceptions of the directors' actual leader behavior Initiating Structure or the directors' actual leader behavior Consideration. In this instance, the directors described themselves as using more behavior indicative of both Initiating Structure and Consideration than the council members described the directors as using, but this difference was not statistically significant.
Table V

_t-Values for Independent Groups, Perceptions of Directors and Council Members, Actual Leader Behavior_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council, Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Initiating Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Actual Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council, Actual Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value of $t = 1.98$
Table VI displays the t-tests as applicable to the preferred leader behavior for directors, as perceived by both the directors themselves and by members of their advisory councils. The mean score (43.87) for director, preferred Initiating Structure, was significantly lower than the council members' mean score (46.21) for the same leader behavior. The mean score (48.36) for the director, preferred Consideration, was lower than the mean score (49.60) for preferred Consideration, as perceived by the council members. At the .05 level, the null hypothesis comparing director preferred Initiating Structure with council preferred Initiating Structure was rejected. This indicated that a statistically significant difference exists between the perceptions of these two groups. The council members preferred that the director use more behavior indicative of Initiating Structure than the director would prefer. The null hypotheses comparing director preferred Consideration with council preferred Consideration could not be rejected at the .05 level. Thus, a statistically significant difference was not found between the directors' perceptions of preferred Consideration and council members' perceptions of the same behavior.

The t-values as related to the hypotheses dealing with actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the council members, are displayed in Table VII. The mean score (36.45) for director, actual Initiating Structure, was significantly lower than the mean score (46.21) for the council members' preferred perceptions of the same behavior. The mean score (43.09) for director, actual Consideration, was
Table VI

_t-Values for Independent Groups, Perceptions of Directors and Council Members, Preferred Leader Behavior_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Preferred</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council, Preferred</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
Critical value of _t_ = 1.98
### Table VII

_t-Values for Independent Groups, Perceptions of Actual Leader Behavior by the Director and Preferred Leader Behavior by Council Members_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Actual Initiation Structure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council, Preferred Initiation Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Actual Consideration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council, Preferred Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level

Critical value of \( t \) = 3.45
significantly lower than the mean score (49.60) for preferred Consideration for council members. The obtained value of the $t$ when applied to the null hypotheses led to the rejection of both null hypotheses at the .001 level of significance. A statistically significant difference existed when comparing actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the council members. This difference was found to exist for both Initiating Structure and Consideration. In both instances of Initiating Structure and Consideration, the council members' preference was for more of these two types of behavior than what the directors' described themselves as using. Additionally, the council members indicated that they preferred more Consideration than Initiating Structure.

Table VIII displays the $t$-values for comparisons of the preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior, as perceived by council members. The mean score (43.87) of director, preferred Initiating Structure, was significantly higher than the mean score (33.69) for the council members' actual Initiating Structure. Similarly, the mean score (48.36) for director, preferred Consideration, was significantly higher than the mean score (41.03) for the council members' perceptions of actual Consideration. The obtained value of $t$ led to the rejection of both null hypotheses at the .001 level of significance. These results indicated that a statistically significant difference does exist between the perceptions of directors in terms of preferred leader behavior and the perceptions of council members in terms of actual leader behavior.
Table VIII

t-Values for Independent Groups, Perceptions of Preferred Leader Behavior by the Directors and Actual Leader Behavior by Council Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>41.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level

Critical value of t = 3.45
These differences were significant for both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The directors' descriptions of their preferences for both Initiating Structure and Consideration were higher than the descriptions of the council members in terms of how they presently see the director.

To summarize, the results of phase two, part one, indicated that a statistically significant difference existed at the .001 level in perceptions of the directors' leader behavior in terms of Initiating Structure and Consideration in each of the following situations: (a) actual and preferred, as perceived by the director; (b) actual and preferred, as perceived by the council members; (c) actual, as perceived by the director, and preferred, as perceived by the council members; and (d) preferred, as perceived by the director, and actual, as perceived by the council members. In addition, a statistically significant difference existed at the .05 level between director, preferred Initiating Structure, and council, preferred Initiating Structure. A statistically significant difference was not found in perceptions of the directors' actual leader behavior in terms of Initiating Structure and Consideration, as perceived by both the director and the council members. In addition, a statistically significant difference was not found between director, preferred Consideration, and council, preferred Consideration. Table IX provides a summary of the t-values for each hypothesis with an indication of where statistically significant differences were found to exist.
### Table IX

Summary, $t$-Values for Hypotheses Related to Differences in Perceptions of Leader Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Director, Actual and Preferred, I.S.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director, Actual and Preferred, Cons.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Council, Actual and Preferred, I.S.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Council, Actual and Preferred, Cons.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director, Actual, I.S. and Council, Actual, I.S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Director, Actual, Cons. and Council, Actual, Cons.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director, Preferred, I.S. and Council, Preferred, I.S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Director, Preferred, Cons. and Council, Preferred, Cons.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Director, Actual, I.S. and Council, Preferred, I.S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Director, Actual, Cons. and Council, Preferred, Cons.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Director, Preferred, I.S. and Council, Actual, I.S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-6.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Director, Preferred, Cons. and Council, Actual, Cons.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-5.96**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .001 level
Prediction of Leader Behavior

The objective of the second part of phase two was to investigate the strength of the prediction of actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, on the basis of several contextual variables which are pertinent to the director/advisory council setting. The contextual variables were: (a) number of times the council meets per year; (b) years of experience in community education of the director; (c) years of experience with advisory councils; (d) educational background of the director; and (e) type of advisory council. Information about the contextual variables was obtained by asking each director to complete the director's questionnaire.

The two hypotheses associated with phase two, part two, were:

1. Actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, is predictable by selected contextual variables.

2. Actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, is predictable by selected contextual variables.

The strength of the prediction of leader behavior was investigated by looking at the size of the multiple correlation coefficient based on the contextual variables \((X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5)\) as contrasted with the first level correlation between each independent variable \((X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5)\) and the two dependent variables, actual leader behavior Initiating Structure and actual leader behavior Consideration. The independent variables were identified as follows:
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In the first order of prediction, low correlations were found to exist between the dependent variable, actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, as perceived by the director, and each of the five contextual variables as identified above. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to obtain the correlations between the dependent variable and each of the independent variables. The first order correlations are displayed in Table X. The variable identified as years of experience in community education had the highest correlation, -0.18.

Table X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>R1,1,2,3,4,5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple correlation coefficient of the five contextual variables with the directors' actual leader behavior Initiating Structure was 0.57 (see Table X). This multiple correlation accounts for only 32 percent of the variance in the dependent variable and would not be considered high enough to consider the five contextual variables significant predictors of actual leader behavior.
variables in combination as strong predictors of the directors' actual leader behavior Initiating Structure. However, this would be a better predictor than any of the contextual variables taken separately.

In the second instance of prediction, low correlations were also found to exist between the dependent variable, actual leader behavior Consideration, as perceived by the director, and each of the five contextual variables. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to obtain the correlations between the dependent variable and each of the independent variables. The first order correlations are displayed in Table XI. The variables identified as number of times the council meets per year had the highest correlation, -0.13.

Table XI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>R².1,2,3,4,5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple correlation coefficient of the five contextual variables with the directors' actual leader behavior Consideration was 0.20 (see Table XI). Taken in combination, the five contextual variables were better predictors than when each contextual variable was considered separately. However, since it accounts for only 4 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, the multiple correlation was not large enough to be considered as a strong predictor.
Summary

Phase two, part one, of this study dealt with the difference between the perceptions of the directors and perceptions of council members in regard to the director's actual and preferred leader behavior in the advisory council setting. Out of the twelve research hypotheses which suggested a difference in perceptions of the director's leader behavior, a significant difference was found to exist in several situations at the .001 level. These differences were found for both Initiating Structure and Consideration in these situations: (a) actual and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the director; (b) actual and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the council members; (c) actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the council members; and (d) preferred leader behavior as perceived by the director, and actual leader behavior, as perceived by the council members. At the .05 level, a statistically significant difference also existed between director preferred Initiating Structure and council members' preferred Initiating Structure. A statistically significant difference was not found for both Initiating Structure and Consideration when comparing the perceptions of the directors and the council members in terms of actual leader behavior. Additionally, a statistically significant difference was not found between directors' preferred Consideration and council members' preferred Consideration.

Phase two, part two, of this study investigated the prediction of the directors' actual leader behavior, as perceived by the directors.
themselves. The five contextual variables chosen as possible predictors were: (a) number of times the council meets per year; (b) years of experience in community education of the director; (c) years of experience with advisory councils; (d) educational background of the director; and (d) type of advisory council. Taken separately, none of the five contextual variables were found to be highly correlated with either the directors' actual leader behavior Initiating Structure or actual leader behavior Consideration. Similarly, when these variables were considered in combination, the resulting multiple correlations were not strong enough to the variables as predictors of the directors' actual leader behavior in terms of Initiating Structure or Consideration.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss this study and the results. The chapter is organized as follows: First, a summary of the problem and procedures; second, the conclusions in light of the results; third, recommendations for practitioners; and fourth, implications for further research.

Review of the Problem and Procedures

Over the years, citizens advisory councils in many forms have been used in education and are currently considered an important developmental step for implementing and maintaining community education in a community. With advisory councils playing an important role in the community education concept, the director must assume an active leadership role in not only establishing the advisory council, but in determining appropriate leader behavior to use in working with the advisory council members.

The objective of this study was to examine the leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting. Emphasis was placed on the differences in perceptions of the directors and perceptions of the council members in regard to the directors' leader behavior in terms of Initiating Structure and Consideration. Comparisons in perceptions were made in these situations: (a) actual and preferred, as
perceived by the director; (b) actual and preferred, as perceived by the council members; (c) actual, as perceived by both the director and the council members; (d) preferred, as perceived by both the director and the council members; (e) actual, as perceived by the director, and preferred, as perceived by the council members; and (f) preferred, as perceived by the director, and actual, as perceived by the council members.

A second emphasis of this study was on whether or not several contextual variables pertinent to the director/advisory council setting would assist in explaining the perceptions the director had of his/her own leader behavior in the advisory council setting. These contextual variables were: (a) number of times the council meets per year; (b) years of experience in community education of the director; (c) years of experience with advisory councils; (d) educational background of the director; and (e) type of advisory council.

To accomplish the objective of this study, data were collected in two phases. In the first phase, a preliminary questionnaire was used to determine the exact number of directors working with advisory councils. For the second phase, the LBDQ was used to collect data from directors and advisory council members in regard to the directors' actual and preferred leader behavior in terms of Initiating Structure and Consideration. In addition, a questionnaire to directors provided information regarding the selected contextual variables.

In phase one, the preliminary questionnaire was mailed to 81 directors in southwestern Michigan requesting information about their council and to obtain information needed to facilitate future data
collection. As a result of this questionnaire, the size of the population, directors and their respective advisory councils, was set at 45.

In phase two, a total of 33 directors and their respective advisory councils completed and returned appropriate forms of the LBDQ and the directors' questionnaire. This was 73.3 percent of the population of 45 in terms of individual directors and councils when returns from each council were considered as a group rather than as the number of individual council members who responded. The percent of individual council members who responded was 38.9 when comparing total number of council members who returned the LBDQ with total council membership.

For the second phase of the study, the data were analyzed in two parts. In the first part, the twelve research hypotheses regarding differences between the directors' and council members' perceptions of the directors' leader behavior were analyzed with an appropriate t test. In eight of the twelve hypotheses, a statistically significant difference was found to exist at the .001 level. The statistically significant differences existed in both Initiating Structure and Consideration in each of the following situations: (a) actual and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the director; (b) actual leader behavior, as perceived by the director, and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by council members; and (d) preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the directors, and actual leader behavior, as perceived by the council members. In addition, a statistically significant difference existed at the .05 level.
between director preferred Initiating Structure and council preferred Initiating Structure. A significant difference was not found for both Initiating Structure and Consideration when comparing the perceptions of the directors and the council members in terms of actual leader behavior. Also, a significant difference was not found between director preferred Consideration and council preferred Consideration. Figure III provides an overview of the hypotheses, the $t$ values, and an indication of where significant differences exist.

The second part of phase two investigated whether or not the contextual variables might predict the directors' actual leader behavior, as perceived by the directors themselves. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to test the correlation of each variable with the directors' actual leader behavior in terms of both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The variable identified as years of experience in community education had the highest correlation with the directors' actual leader behavior Initiating Structure, while the variable number of times the council meets per year had the highest correlation with actual Consideration. In both instances, the correlation was not high enough to be statistically significant.

When all five contextual variables were considered in combination, they were more highly correlated with the director's own perceptions of actual Initiating Structure than with actual Consideration. However, the resulting multiple correlations were not high enough to consider the variables in combination as adequate predictors of the directors' own perceptions of their actual leader behavior.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Director Actual</th>
<th>Director Preferred</th>
<th>Council Members Actual</th>
<th>Council Members Preferred</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-6.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-5.96**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level  
**Significant at the .001 level  

Figure III  
Summary of Research Hypotheses and t-Values for Comparing Directors' and Council Members' Perceptions of the Directors' Actual and Preferred Leader Behavior: Initiating Structure and Consideration
Conclusions

This study was undertaken to examine the leader behavior of the director in terms of Initiating Structure and Consideration as he/she works within the advisory council setting. The study examined the possibility that differences would exist between the perceptions of the director and the perceptions of the council members in regard to the actual and preferred leader behavior of the director. In addition, several contextual variables applicable to the director/advisory council setting were selected as possible predictors of the director's perceptions of his/her own actual leader behavior.

A number of studies by Halpin (1953, 1955, 1956) as well as the work of Blake and Mouton (1964), Likert (1961), Fiedler (1967) and Reddin (1970) have all concluded that Initiating Structure and Consideration are two important aspects of any leadership situation. The director's leadership role within the advisory council setting is no exception.

In describing actual and preferred leader behavior, the directors would prefer that they exhibit more behavior indicative of both Initiating Structure and Consideration than what they see themselves as presently exhibiting. Similarly, council members preferred more Initiating Structure and Consideration than they described the director as presently using. Figure IV provides a graphic representation of the mean scores for the dimensions of Initiating Structure and Consideration.

While Halpin (1953, 1956), Hollander (1961), Fiedler (1967) and Owens (1970) concluded that both dimensions of leader behavior are
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Figure IV

Mean Scores, Leader Behavior
Initiating Structure and Consideration

Unbroken Line = Director Actual = DA
Broken Line = Director Preferred = DP
Dot/Dash Line = Council Actual = CA
Dotted Line = Council Preferred = CP
necessary to successful leadership, the results of the present study indicate a preference for the leader, in this case the director, to exhibit even more behavior indicative of Consideration than Initiating Structure. This preference was found in the perceptions of both directors and council members when describing actual and preferred leader behavior.

Within any given leadership situation, one might anticipate some discrepancies in the perceptions of the behavior of the group leader. Stogdill and Coons (1957) and the studies of Halpin (1953, 1955, 1956) have all concluded that a leader's perceptions of his/her own leader behavior are apt to differ from others' perceptions of the same behavior. In the present study, a difference was not found when comparing the directors' perceptions of their actual leader behavior with the council members' perceptions of the actual leader behavior. This was true for both Initiating Structure and Consideration. Therefore, the results of the previously cited studies were not replicated. In addition, a difference was not found when directors and council members described their perceptions of director preferred Consideration.

In this particular study, when comparing the directors' actual and preferred leader behavior, as perceived by the directors themselves, a significant difference was found to exist. This difference held true for both Initiating Structure and Consideration. Similar conclusions resulted when comparing the council members' perceptions of the director's actual and preferred leader behavior. This suggests that while a difference was not found between the directors' and the council members' perceptions of the director's present behavior,
both groups would prefer that the director use more behavior which demonstrates both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

When contrasting the directors' perceptions of their actual leader behavior with the leader behavior preferred by the council members, a significant difference was found to exist. This would lead to the conclusion that how the directors presently behave in working with the council is not what the council members prefer in terms of leader behavior. The council members' preference was for more leader behavior indicative of both Consideration and Initiating Structure than what the directors describe themselves as presently using.

Contrasting the directors' perceptions of preferred behavior with the council members' perceptions of how the director actually behaves also led to a significant difference in perceptions. These results were true for both Initiating Structure and Consideration. Halpin (1956) obtained similar results in a study of school superintendents where he concluded that a leader's concept of what his behavior should be has little relationship to others' perceptions of the leader's present behavior. As in the comparisons cited in the previous paragraph, the directors preferred that they exhibit more leader behavior indicative of both Initiating Structure and Consideration than what council members perceived them to be currently using. Similarly, behavior suggestive of Consideration was preferred to a greater extent than Initiating Structure.

To summarize, while the results indicated that a difference was not found between directors and council members when they described the directors' actual leader behavior and when they described the
directors' preferred leader behavior in terms of Consideration, they do differ when comparing descriptions of actual leader behavior with descriptions of preferred leader behavior. An additional discrepancy appeared when comparing director preferred Initiating Structure with council preferred Initiating Structure. This would seem to indicate that how the director is presently behaving while working within the advisory council setting is different than the leader behavior preferred by both the directors and council members. These discrepancies would suggest that as the director works with an advisory council, he/she may be confronted with differing perceptions as to what leader behavior is appropriate for this situation.

The results of the study which dealt with the prediction of the directors' leader behavior led to the conclusion that taken separately or in combination, none of the five contextual variables were adequate predictors of the directors' actual leader behavior. This would indicate that how the director perceives him/herself as presently behaving with the council has little relationship to number of times the council meets per year; years of experience in community education of the director; years of experience with advisory councils; educational background of the director; or type of advisory council.

Recommendations for Practitioners

Advisory councils may be either a formality to be observed by the director or a real asset to the community education concept. Since advisory councils have a great potential for service and contribution to community education, a number of recommendations for practitioners based on the findings of this study seemed pertinent.
First, there is a need for various forms of training for directors in regard to advisory councils as they relate to the concept of community education. One area these training opportunities should deal with is appropriate leader behavior for the director to use with an advisory council. Directors should become aware of specific behaviors indicative of both Initiating Structure and Consideration. National workshops and conventions, state conventions and various forms of workshops and seminars might be considered as appropriate places to facilitate this recommendation.

Second, and closely related to the first recommendation, is the suggestion that directors actively seek to improve their own leadership skills and their own knowledge of current theories relating to leader behavior. The LBDQ could be used to assist the director in identifying the specific leader behaviors which need to be changed in terms of working with an advisory council. Comparing self perceptions and the perceptions of the council in terms of each specific leader behavior will point out where discrepancies exist and provide some direction for the director to improve his/her own leadership skills. Once the director has completed the LBDQ and requested the council members to do the same, the results could be used at in-service meetings, workshops, seminars, or formal classes in educational leadership and administration to assist the director in improving his/her leadership skills. Participation in formal classes in the area of communications and/or group process would also assist the director in gaining more insight into his/her leadership skills.
Third, directors should become aware of the results of this study. Recognizing that discrepancies do exist in perceptions of the directors' leader behavior may help the director improve his/her leader behavior and as a result, assist the director in becoming a more effective leader in the advisory council setting.

Implications for Further Research

In view of the findings of this study, a number of implications for further research seem appropriate. It is suggested that this study be replicated with a larger population and in other geographic areas where community education programs are in operation. This would not only add to the knowledge of the leader behavior of the director in the advisory council setting, but might assist in further understanding the discrepancies in perception of leader behavior that exists in various settings. If this study should be replicated, it is suggested that the instruments be mailed to each council member rather than asking that the instrument be completed at a council meeting. This might help increase the number of council members who respond.

A similar study related to the directors' leader behavior might be completed which would compare the perceptions of the directors with perceptions of administrators, teachers, and other personnel associated with the operation of a community education program. Such a study would shed further light on the leader behavior of a director as he/she operates within the total framework of a community education program.
Research is also needed that would examine leader behavior of the director in relation to the purpose and function of the advisory council. Such a study is needed to determine if different types of leader behavior are appropriate depending on the functions of the council, and to further assist the director in becoming an effective leader with the advisory council. Closely related to this is the need for research to examine the perceived effectiveness of the director in relation to the leader behavior exhibited by the director in the advisory council setting.

There are a number of other contextual variables which could be considered as possible predictors of the director's leader behavior. Variables to consider include age of the director, sex, communication skills of the director, composition of council membership, number of members on the council, and whether or not the council operates with by-laws, a constitution or similar documents.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

Preliminary Questionnaire
LBDQ-Actual for Directors
LBDQ-Preferred for Directors
Questionnaire to Directors
LBDQ-Actual for Council Members
LBDQ-Preferred for Council Members
Preliminary Questionnaire

Please complete all information and return as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope.

Director's name ____________________________________________________

School District ____________________________________________________

(The above information will only be used as a means of identifying those directors who have responded to this initial questionnaire.)

1. Are you currently working with some form of community education advisory council?

If yes, please answer questions 2-7. If no, simply return questionnaire with the above information.

2. How often (times per year) did your community education advisory council meet during the 1973-74 school year?

3. How often (times per year) will your community education advisory council meet during the 1974-75 school year?

4. Does your community education advisory council function under a set of by-laws, a constitution, or a similar document?

5. How many people serve on your community education advisory council?

6. What is the name and address of your community education advisory council chairperson?

7. When, be as specific as possible, will your community education advisory council be meeting during the 1974-75 school year?

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return as soon as possible.
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Actual)

Following is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior in the community education (school) advisory council setting. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether you feel the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, your own behavior in the community education (school) advisory council setting.

Note: The term "group" refers to the community education (school) advisory council.
The term "members" refers to all the people on the community education (school) advisory council.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently you engage in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether you always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never
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THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

1. The community education director does personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. The community education director makes his/her attitude clear to the group. A B C D E
3. The community education director does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. The community education director tries out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. The community education director acts as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. The community education director is easy to understand. A B C D E
7. The community education director rules with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. The community education director finds time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. The community education director criticizes poor work. A B C D E
10. The community education director gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
11. The community education director speaks in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E
12. The community education director keeps to himself/herself. A B C D E
13. The community education director looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
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THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

14. The community education director assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. The community education director is the spokesperson of the group. A B C D E
16. The community education director schedules the work to be done. A B C D E
17. The community education director maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E
18. The community education director refuses to explain his actions. A B C D E
19. The community education director keeps the group informed. A B C D E
20. The community education director acts without consulting the group. A B C D E
21. The community education director backs up the members in their actions. A B C D E
22. The community education director emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E
23. The community education director treats all group members as his/her equals. A B C D E
24. The community education director encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E
25. The community education director gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors. A B C D E
26. The community education director is willing to make changes. A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

27. The community education director makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.   A B C D E

28. The community education director is friendly and approachable.   A B C D E

29. The community education director asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.   A B C D E

30. The community education director fails to take necessary action.   A B C D E

31. The community education director makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.   A B C D E

32. The community education director lets group members know what is expected of them.   A B C D E

33. The community education director speaks as the representative of the group.   A B C D E

34. The community education director puts suggestions made by the group into operation.   A B C D E

35. The community education director sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.   A B C D E

36. The community education director lets other people take away his leadership in the group.   A B C D E

37. The community education director gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.   A B C D E

38. The community education director gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.   A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

39. The community education director sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. A B C D E

40. The community education director keeps the group working together as a team. A B C D E
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Preferred)

Following is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior as you think you SHOULD act in the community education (school) advisory council setting. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe what an ideal community education (school) director ought to do in the community education (school) advisory council setting.

Note: The term "group" refers to the community education (school) advisory council.

The term "members" refers to all the people on the community education (school) advisory council.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

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

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

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

A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never
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THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

1. The community education director should do personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. The community education director should make his/her attitude clear to the group. A B C D E
3. The community education director should do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. The community education director should try out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. The community education director should act as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. The community education director should be easy to understand. A B C D E
7. The community education director should rule with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. The community education director should find time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. The community education director should criticize poor work. A B C D E
10. The community education director should give advance notice of change. A B C D E
11. The community education director should speak in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E
12. The community education director should keep to himself/herself. A B C D E
13. The community education director should look out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
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THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

14. The community education director should assign group members to particular tasks. A B C D E

15. The community education director should be the spokesperson for the group. A B C D E

16. The community education director should schedule the work to be done. A B C D E

17. The community education director should maintain definite standards of performance. A B C D E

18. The community education director should refuse to explain his/her actions. A B C D E

19. The community education director should keep the group informed. A B C D E

20. The community education director should act without consulting the group. A B C D E

21. The community education director should back up the members in their actions. A B C D E

22. The community education director should emphasize the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E

23. The community education director should treat all group members as his/her equals. A B C D E

24. The community education director should encourage the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E

25. The community education director should get what he/she asks for from his/her superiors. A B C D E

26. The community education director should be willing to make changes. A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

27. The community education director should make sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members. A B C D E

28. The community education director should be friendly and approachable. A B C D E

29. The community education director should ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations. A B C D E

30. The community education director fails to take necessary action. A B C D E

31. The community education director should make group members feel at ease when talking with them. A B C D E

32. The community education director should let group members know what is expected of them. A B C D E

33. The community education director should speak as the representative of the group. A B C D E

34. The community education director should put suggestions made by the group into operation. A B C D E

35. The community education director should see to it that group members are working up to capacity. A B C D E

36. The community education director should let other people take away his/her leadership in the group. A B C D E

37. The community education director should get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group. A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

38. The community education director should get group approval in important matters before going ahead. A B C D E

39. The community education director should see to it that the work of group members is coordinated. A B C D E

40. The community education director should keep the group working together as a team. A B C D E
QUESTIONNAIRE

In each case, check the ONE answer that is most appropriate:

1. How many times per year does your community education advisory council meet?
   ______ a. 1-3 times
   ______ b. 4-6 times
   ______ c. 7-9 times
   ______ d. 10 or more times
   ______ e. Other, please explain

2. How many years have you been a community education director?
   ______ a. 1-12 months
   ______ b. 13 months-5 years
   ______ c. More than 5 years

3. How many years have you worked with a community education advisory council?
   ______ a. 1-12 months
   ______ b. 13 months-5 years
   ______ c. More than 5 years

4. What is your educational background?
   ______ a. Formal degree, no special training in community education
   ______ b. Formal degree, with special training in community education
   ______ c. Inservice workshops, seminars in community education
   ______ d. Combination of the above, indicate which combination

5. How would you classify your community education advisory council?
   ______ a. A neighborhood or block advisory council system
   ______ b. A city or community-wide council with the membership comprised of representatives selected from neighborhood or block councils
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c. A city or community-wide council with membership comprised of representatives who are not on neighborhood or block councils

d. A city or community-wide council with membership comprised of a combination of representatives from neighborhood or block councils

e. A city or community-wide council with no other council system such as a neighborhood or block council system in existence

f. Other, please explain

________________________________________

________________________________________
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Actual)

Following is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your community education (school) director in the advisory council setting. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your community education (school) director in the advisory council setting.

Note: The term "group" refers to the community education (school) advisory council.

The term "members" refers to all the people on the community education (school) advisory council.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently (often) the community education (school) director engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.

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

A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never
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THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

1. The community education director does personal favors for group members.
   A B C D E

2. The community education director makes his/her attitude clear to the group.
   A B C D E

3. The community education director does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
   A B C D E

4. The community education director tries out his/her new ideas with the group.
   A B C D E

5. The community education director acts as the real leader of the group.
   A B C D E

6. The community education director is easy to understand.
   A B C D E

7. The community education director rules with an iron hand.
   A B C D E

8. The community education director finds time to listen to group members.
   A B C D E

9. The community education director criticizes poor work.
   A B C D E

10. The community education director gives advance notice of changes.
    A B C D E

11. The community education director speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
    A B C D E

12. The community education director keeps to himself/herself.
    A B C D E

13. The community education director looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
    A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

14. The community education director assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. The community education director is the spokesperson of the group. A B C D E
16. The community education director schedules the work to be done. A B C D E
17. The community education director maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E
18. The community education director refuses to explain his actions. A B C D E
19. The community education director keeps the group informed. A B C D E
20. The community education director acts without consulting the group. A B C D E
21. The community education director backs up the members in their actions. A B C D E
22. The community education director emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E
23. The community education director treats all group members as his/her equals. A B C D E
24. The community education director encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E
25. The community education director gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors. A B C D E
26. The community education director is willing to make changes. A B C D E
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THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

27. The community education director makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.

28. The community education director is friendly and approachable.

29. The community education director asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

30. The community education director fails to take necessary action.

31. The community education director makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.

32. The community education director lets group members know what is expected of them.

33. The community education director speaks as the representative of the group.

34. The community education director puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

35. The community education director sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.

36. The community education director lets other people take away his leadership in the group.

37. The community education director gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.

38. The community education director gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.
THINK about how frequently the community education director engages in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

39. The community education director sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

40. The community education director keeps the group working together as a team.
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Preferred)

Following is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your community education (school) director as you think he/she SHOULD act. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe what an ideal community education (school) director ought to do in the community education (school) advisory council setting.

Note: The term "group" refers to the community education (school) advisory council.

The term "members" refers to all the people on the community education (school) advisory council.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the community education (school) director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never
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THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

1. The community education director should do personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. The community education director should make his/her attitude clear to the group. A B C D E
3. The community education director should do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. The community education director should try out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. The community education director should act as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. The community education director should be easy to understand. A B C D E
7. The community education director should rule with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. The community education director should find time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. The community education director should criticize poor work. A B C D E
10. The community education director should give advance notice of changes. A B C D E
11. The community education director should speak in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E
12. The community education director should keep to himself/herself. A B C D E
13. The community education director should look out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

14. The community education director should assign group members to particular tasks.  A B C D E
15. The community education director should be the spokesperson for the group.  A B C D E
16. The community education director should schedule the work to be done.  A B C D E
17. The community education director should maintain definite standards of performance.  A B C D E
18. The community education director should refuse to explain his/her actions.  A B C D E
19. The community education director should keep the group informed.  A B C D E
20. The community education director should act without consulting the group.  A B C D E
21. The community education director should back up the members in their actions.  A B C D E
22. The community education director should emphasize the meeting of deadlines.  A B C D E
23. The community education director should treat all group members as his/her equals.  A B C D E
24. The community education director should encourage the use of uniform procedures.  A B C D E
25. The community education director should get what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.  A B C D E
26. The community education director should be willing to make changes.  A B C D E
THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

27. The community education director should make sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.

28. The community education director should be friendly and approachable.

29. The community education director should ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

30. The community education director fails to take necessary action.

31. The community education director should make group members feel at ease when talking with them.

32. The community education director should let group members know what is expected of them.

33. The community education director should speak as the representative of the group.

34. The community education director should put suggestions made by the group into operation.

35. The community education director should see to it that group members are working up to capacity.

36. The community education director should let other people take away his/her leadership in the group.

37. The community education director should get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group.
THINK about how frequently the community education director SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

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

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

38. The community education director should get group approval in important matters before going ahead.

39. The community education director should see to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

40. The community education director should keep the group working together as a team.
APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

Letter Accompanying Preliminary Questionnaire
Follow-Up Letter, Preliminary Questionnaire
Cover Letter for LBDQ and Questionnaire to Directors
Cover Letter for LBDQ to Council Members
Follow-Up Letter to Directors and Council Members
October 18, 1974

Dear

As you know, formation of a community education advisory council is an important element in implementing the concept of community education. Once an advisory council is formed, the leader behavior (style) of the community education director in working with the advisory council is most important.

As a dissertation topic, I am attempting to gain a better understanding of the leader behavior (style) exhibited by the community education director in the advisory council setting. To do this, I need some information regarding your advisory council. This information is needed in order to identify a contact person on your council and to assist in determining the sample size needed to complete this study. At a later time, you and the members of your advisory council may be asked to provide further information.

Let me assure you that this study is in no way intended to serve as an evaluation of individual advisory councils or their community education directors. All responses will be used only for the purpose of statistical analysis on a group basis. All replies will be kept confidential.

Your prompt response to the attached questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg  
Graduate Assistant  
Community School Development Center  
Western Michigan University
November 11, 1974

Dear

About two weeks ago, as part of my dissertation, I mailed out a preliminary questionnaire regarding advisory councils in community education. Since this is such a select population, it is essential that I get a return from each individual involved with community education in the southwestern part of Michigan.

Enclosed is a second copy of this questionnaire which I would appreciate your completing and returning as soon as possible.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg
Graduate Assistant
Community School Development Center
Western Michigan University
December 31, 1974

Dear

Earlier this fall you were asked to provide some information regarding your community education advisory council. Based on the information received from this questionnaire, you and the members of your advisory council are now being asked to provide some additional information regarding the leader behavior of the community education director in the advisory council setting.

Enclosed you will find two forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, one regarding the leader's actual behavior and a second, regarding the leader's preferred behavior. Directions for completion of each of these two forms will be found on the cover page of each form. In addition to the LBDQ, a short questionnaire is enclosed. Please complete each of the three forms and return as soon as possible. A stamped, return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

At the same time that you are being asked to complete the LBDQ, the members of your advisory council are being asked to complete two similar forms. These forms with appropriate directions were mailed to the contact person you indicated on the earlier questionnaire. At the next meeting of the advisory council, would you please urge the council members to complete these forms.

Let me assure you that this study is in no way intended to serve as an evaluation of individual advisory councils or individual community education directors. All responses will be used only for the purpose of statistical analysis on a group basis. All replies will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your assistance. Your prompt completion of these forms is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg
December 31, 1974

Dear

As a graduate student at Western Michigan University, I am working on my dissertation in the area of community education advisory councils. To do this, I need your assistance in collecting information regarding the leader behavior of your local community education director as he/she works with the advisory council.

Enclosed are several copies of two forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. At the next advisory council meeting would you please have each council member present fill out one copy of the white form and one copy of the yellow form. It is important that each council member fill out independently, one copy of each form. Instructions for filling out these forms are on the front of each form. Please place the completed forms in the enclosed, stamped, addressed folder and return as soon as possible.

At the same time members of the advisory council are completing these forms, your local community education director is also being asked to complete a similar set. Your director is aware that you are being asked to assist in collecting this information.

Let me assure you and other members of the advisory council that this study is in no way intended to serve as an evaluation of individual advisory councils or their community education directors. All responses will be used for the purpose of statistical analysis on a group basis. All replies will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your assistance. Your help in having these forms completed and returned is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg
Dear

In an effort to collect data for my dissertation, you received a request to complete three forms regarding your leader behavior within the advisory council setting. If you have not completed these forms, I would appreciate your doing so and returning them as soon as possible.

In addition, you or a contact person on your advisory council received a request to have the members of the council complete similar forms. Since this information is also important to the completion of my dissertation, it would be helpful if you would have these completed and returned at your earliest convenience.

Your prompt attention to the above requests is appreciated. Without your assistance a study such as this would not be possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg