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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In a society where change is not only prevalent but continuous, it is natural to look to the basics in life to provide a steadying force. One of these basics is the social process of community. Indecision and confusion in social process is relieved when leadership is provided to help a group clarify goals and move toward the attainment of those goals. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the concept of community education has been so readily accepted and has grown so rapidly in all parts of the country. The community education concept attempts to provide the educational leadership required to relieve the indecision and confusion resulting from the current societal malaise.

Citing the assumptions made by Minzey and LeTarte (1972), that communities do seek and are capable of positive change, that social problems have solutions, that one of the strongest forces for change is community power, and that community members are desirous of improving their
Communities, Seay and Associates (1974) state:

Community education offers the best hope now visible in American society for developing these assumptions into foundations for sustained action upon complex societal problems. (p. 46)

This growing demand for leadership in community education makes it important that consideration be given to the influential factors in the training and development of community education leaders. One of these factors is the influence of the leadership style of the supervising community education administrator upon the leadership style of the leader in training or subordinate administrator. Also of interest is the relationship of leadership style congruence between the two administrators and other situational variables in the administrators' roles as community education leaders, i.e., helping groups clarify goals and moving toward accomplishment of those goals.

Statement of the Problem

It would seem that the relationship between the community education administrator-supervisor and the leader in training may be considered as analogous to the relationship between super- and subordinate community education directors in a school district. Both of these relationships indicate ultimate authority of one administrator over the other, but
allowing, nonetheless, for the other administrator to exercise some authority of his own within the structure of the organization. The authority of both the superior and the subordinate is manifested by characteristic behavior, i.e., by leadership style. In attempting to determine the degree of influence in leadership style of the administrator-supervisor upon that of the leader in training, the analogous relationship between super- and subordinate community education directors in a school district was studied.

The purpose of this study, then, was to investigate the similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate community school administrator (director) in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate community school administrator (director). The study further sought to determine the relationship between the congruence of superordinate/subordinate administrators' leadership style and (1) the length of contact of the two administrators in this relationship; (2) the perception of superordinate/subordinate leadership style influence by the administrators themselves; (3) the satisfaction of the administrators in their positions as this satisfaction relates to dealings with their super- or subordinate co-administrator; and (4) the perception of
the effectiveness of the co-administrator by the other administrator.

Following are the theoretical hypotheses upon which this study is based:

\( H_1: \) There is a similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate administrator.

\( H_2: \) The length of contact of the two administrators in the superordinate/subordinate relationship is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

\( H_3: \) The degree of perception of style influence by the administrators themselves is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

\( H_4: \) The degree of satisfaction of the administrators in their positions as this satisfaction relates to the other (paired) administrator is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

\( H_5: \) The degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.
Definition of Terms

Since the following concepts are integral to this study, it is necessary here to define them as they are used in this context.

Leadership style is "the consistent manner in which actions are performed in helping a group move toward goals acceptable to its members" (Boles, 1968, p. 3). This behavior pattern is measured on two dimensions: task orientation and relationships orientation. Task orientation is the degree to which the leader directs his subordinates' efforts toward attainment of goals. The characteristic actions of this dimension are planning, organizing, and controlling. Relationships orientation is the degree to which the leader has personal job relationships. The characteristic actions of this dimension are those that show mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration of their feelings (Reddin, 1972). Based on these two dimensions, there are four basic styles according to Reddin: (1) separated style--characterized by less-than-average task orientation and less-than-average relationship orientation; (2) dedicated style--characterized by more-than-average task orientation and less-than-average relationship orientation; (3) related style--characterized by
less-than-average task orientation and more-than-average relationship orientation; and (4) integrated style—characterized by more-than-average task orientation and more-than-average relationship orientation.

Administrators are those persons who put into effect policies and rules of an organized social system (school district) and who help the group move toward commonly accepted goals (Boles, 1968). Two categories of administrators are used in this study: subordinate administrators and immediate superordinate administrators. Subordinate administrators are those administrators who have another administrator superior to them in the functional hierarchical structure of the school district. Immediate superordinate administrators are those administrators who are directly superior to a subordinate administrator in the functional hierarchical structure of the school district.

Congruence of superordinate/subordinate administrators' leadership style is the similarity between the basic leadership styles of the two administrators as measured by the style synthesis categories of Reddin's (1972) Management Style Diagnosis Test.

Length of contact is the number of years that the superordinate and subordinate have been working together.
in this relationship.

Perception of superordinate/subordinate leadership style influence by the administrators themselves is the degree to which the administrators themselves feel they have been influential (superordinate) or influenced (subordinate) in leadership style by their co-administrator.

Satisfaction of the administrators in their position as this satisfaction relates to dealings with their super-or subordinate co-administrator is the degree to which the administrators feel their job satisfaction comes directly from their relationship with their super- or subordinate co-administrator.

Perception of the effectiveness of the co-administrator by the other administrator is the rating of administrative effectiveness of the co-administrator given by the other administrator.

Need and Significance of the Study

The concept of community education has shown remarkable growth since its inception in the 1930's. There were over 500 community school districts in operation in the United States during the 1972-73 school year, involving almost 2,300 school buildings and approximately 1,500
community school directors. Even more remarkable are the projected figures for 1977, estimating a growth of almost 200 percent (Mott Foundation, 1972). These growth projections, plus the fact that federal legislation has recently allocated millions of dollars for development and continuation of community education throughout the country, serve to emphasize that there is, and will be, an increasing demand for adequately trained community education leaders.

Many aspects of the community education concept, however, remain unexplored. One of these is the very basic question of which is the most effective method for preparation and training of community education leaders.

Current graduate training programs in community education leadership generally follow traditional university requirements. These requirements usually include the fulfillment by the leadership candidate of one or more internships spent under the direction of established community education leaders who are working in the field. This practical on-the-job involvement is considered to be one of the most important phases of the candidates' training. Though it is difficult to measure exactly the kind and degree of influence this experience has upon the candidate, it would seem especially important to attempt to ascertain the impact
that the internship supervisor himself, with his concomitant leadership style, has upon the candidate and his perceptions. If the internship supervisor's leadership style is considered to have a great impact upon the candidate's resultant leadership style, perhaps more emphasis ought to be placed upon the prospective supervisor's leadership style when the candidate is selecting an internship, in addition to the other selection criteria of type and scope of community education program being operated.

Since the population of this study was comprised of community school administrators (directors), this investigation complemented recent studies by Johnson (1973), Niles (1974), and Kliminski (1974), which also investigated the characteristics of this population.

Johnson (1973) developed a leadership training model for community school directors. This model defined six areas of concern: (1) the major functions of the community school director; (2) the approach for training of the community school director; (3) the major training needs of the community school director; (4) the delivery system to be utilized for the training of community school directors; (5) the methods of instruction for this training; and (6) the evaluation procedure for the community school director.
It would seem that the present study of superordinate/subordinate style similarity and its relationship to length of contact, perception of influence, degree of job satisfaction, and perception of effectiveness would indicate further relationships to be hypothesized regarding the interaction of the situational elements of leadership style and the training methods to be used for this population. Of special import would be the selection of internship supervisors mentioned above.

Niles (1974) and Kliminski (1974), in concurrent studies, investigated the cognitive styles and the skill areas of the most successful Michigan directors of community education and other Michigan directors of community education. The results of Niles' study indicate that there is a difference between the dominant elements of the learning styles of the most successful directors and the dominant elements of the other directors. Kliminski's study shows that there is also a difference in the skill areas dominant in each of the two groups. Investigation of the relationships indicated in the present study would yield further implications concerning some of the influential factors in individual skill development and cognitive style determination. The findings of the present study can thus serve to identify
yet another element in the training and development of community school directors, that of the relationship of superordinate leadership style and the style of the subordinate, and allowance can then be made for consideration of this interaction in the planning of future community school directors' training programs.

Theoretical Rationale

The theoretical framework of leadership as investigated in this study is that of the situationist orientation, rather than the traitist doctrine. The concept of leadership, then, is considered to be an interaction of the leader himself with the elements of the situation in which the leadership takes place, rather than as a collection of traits inherent in the personality of the leader himself without regard for the influence of the situation.

Getzels and Guba (1957) state that leadership style is a function of both the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions of the leader's role in a social system. One of the components of the nomothetic dimension is the expectations of the institution, as directed by one's immediate superior. Therefore, the style by which this leadership is exerted would be a primary element of the situation and would thus
be influential in the shaping of the behavior of the subordinate administrator in the execution of his role.

Reddin (1970) also indicated that style is a function of the situation, and proceeded to define "situation" by means of five elements: organization, technology, superior, co-workers, and subordinates. Since one of the elements listed is the superior, including his own leadership style, it can be considered an influencing factor in the style (behavior) of the subordinate as he executes his role.

This influence of the supervisor's style of leadership upon that of his/her subordinates was indicated in a 1964 analysis of 78 sales offices by Bowers and Seashore, as reported in Likert (1967). Their findings noted that

the supervisor's pattern of leadership ... tends to be replicated in the leadership behavior of his subordinates; that is, the subordinates tend to provide leadership in much the same way as does the formal leader. (p. 72)

If this relationship exists in a business setting (sales), the general principles of the leadership elements common in all superordinate/subordinate administrative situations could allow the same influence to exist in the educational administrative setting.

If leadership style, then, is a function of the situation and its elements, as Halpin (1966), Fiedler (1967,
1969), Getzels and Guba (1957), and Reddin (1970) indicate, then the longer a particular situation and its elements (of which "superior" is one) are present, the more clearly the relationship between the two accompanying leaders' styles should become. Therefore, there should be a direct relationship between superordinate/subordinate style similarity and the length of time the two leaders have spent working together in their respective roles. Also, since these above-mentioned elements of the situation are components of the social system in which leadership takes place (Getzels & Guba, 1957), it is likely that the more influence exerted by superior (superordinate) leadership style upon the subordinate style, the greater will be the perception of this influence by the administrators themselves. This means that there should be greater perceived influence by those individuals where there is, in fact, style similarity.

Job satisfaction, too, is a function of the situation (Herzberg, 1968). Since one of the elements of the situation involves co-workers, both super- and subordinate, it is likely that some job satisfaction (or lack of it) will originate in dealings with one's co-workers. It seems, then, that the greater the congruence between superordinate/
subordinate styles, the greater the satisfaction of the administrators with their jobs insofar as this relates to dealings with their co-administrators.

Perception of effectiveness also seems to be affected by style similarity between superordinate/subordinate administrators. Moser (1957) indicates that high mutual ratings of effectiveness by superintendents and principals are accompanied by similarities in leadership styles as these styles are defined by Getzels and Guba (1957). Since both Reddin's and their leadership style definitions are situationally based, classification of leadership styles by Reddin's categories should also show a relationship of effectiveness ratings and similarities in leadership styles.

Overview

The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate community education administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate administrator. Also studied were the relationships of superordinate/subordinate style congruence with length of contact of the two administrators, the administrators' perceptions of leadership style influence, the administrators'
job satisfaction as it relates to dealings with their co-administrators, and the perception of administrative effectiveness.

All participants were given Reddin's Management Style Diagnosis Test and a short researcher-constructed questionnaire administered by the researcher in an interview setting. A description of the method used to identify subjects and to administer the tests is found in Chapter III.

An introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, definition of central concepts, analysis of the need and significance of the study, and a brief theoretical rationale were stated in Chapter I.

Chapter II will review the literature pertinent to the study. Description of the population and sample selected for the study, as well as the instruments and methods used in the data collection, will be presented in Chapter III. Analyses of the statistical findings pertinent to each hypothesis will be the major emphasis of Chapter IV, while Chapter V will discuss the results and implications of the analyses, along with appropriate conclusions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Since the primary focus of this study was the relationship of leadership styles of community education administrators, the review of the literature was concentrated mainly on related theory of leadership and leadership styles. The variables of job satisfaction and administrative effectiveness were reviewed only insofar as they are related to the situational elements used as a contextual framework for the theory of leadership. In addition to these areas, models pertaining to the training of community education administrators were examined for purposes of correlation.

Theory of Leadership and Leadership Styles

Historically, there have been two major schools of thought regarding leadership theory: (1) trait theory; and (2) situational theory, including behavioral theory (Cartwright & Zander, 1958; Filley & House, 1969; Kimbrough, 1968; Owens, 1973; Scott & Spaulding, 1972; Stogdill, 1974). The earliest theory to develop was concerned with leadership
as an attribute of the leader; hence, it has generally been referred to as the trait theory of leadership. The focus of this theory was on the determination of characteristic traits of the leader from which his leadership behavior stemmed, regardless of the setting in which the behavior occurred. "Trait theory asserts that there are a finite number of identifiable characteristics, or traits, of successful and effective leaders" (Filley & House, 1969, p. 393). Those who espoused this theory conducted studies to determine the commonality of these traits, such as independence, aggressiveness, self-control, and friendliness, among various types of leaders (Owens, 1973). This research, however, was not limited to personality factors. Physical characteristics, social background, intelligence, ability, and social characteristics were also investigated throughout the early part of the twentieth century (Stogdill, 1974).

Attempts were made by various researchers to correlate the results of these trait investigations. Jenkins (1947) surveyed 47 military studies and concluded that there was little commonality in the various leadership qualities studied. Only four traits of leaders (extraversion, intelligence, initiative, and humor) were found in all 20 studies
reviewed by Bird (1940). Stogdill (1948) investigated over 100 studies and found several groups of traits demonstrated by all leaders, but his final conclusion was:

The findings suggest that leadership is not a matter of passive status, or of the mere possession of some combination of traits. It appears rather to be a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion. (p. 66)

Gibb (1954) also conducted a comparative analysis of leadership trait studies and reached conclusions similar to Stogdill's, that there seemed to be no consistent pattern of traits present in all leaders. He stated:

Leadership has usually been thought of as a specific attribute of personality, a personality trait, that some persons possess, and others do not, or at least that some achieve in high degree and others scarcely at all. The search for leaders has often been directed toward finding those persons who have this trait well developed. The truth would seem, however, to be quite different. In fact, viewed in relation to the individual, leadership is not an attribute of the personality but a quality of his role within a particular and specified social system. (Gibb, 1966, p. 88)

Thus it is, as McGregor (1966) stated, that "research findings to date suggest that it is more fruitful to consider leadership as a relationship between the leader and the situation than as a universal pattern of characteristics possessed by certain people" (p. 75).
Hence, the thrust of much of the current leadership research and definition formulation has been in the second major theoretical orientation mentioned earlier, the situational (behavioral) theory. As noted later, this theoretical framework has, in turn, become the foundation for much of the research in the area of leadership style.

The situational theory of leadership in its extreme form is the behavioral orientation that is concerned only with what the leaders do, regardless of their personality. Rules governing overall leader behavior in areas of communication, delegation, planning, controlling, and coordination were early stated by classical management theorists such as Fayol, Roethlisberger, and Taylor (Filley & House, 1969). This concept of leadership concentrated on the correct model of behavior which the effective leader could emulate. Since the emphasis was entirely upon the training of the leader to follow these rules and methods, this approach became very mechanical and, hence, ineffective (Owens, 1973).

Of late, then, researchers have been concentrating upon the more moderate orientation of the situational theory that involves consideration of both the personality of the leader and the social setting in which he leads,
i.e., the unique combination of a particular leader functioning in a particular hierarchical organization (social system). This is what is meant here by the situational theory of leadership. Within this situational framework, then, it is possible to review three areas of the literature: (1) historical perspectives of development, (2) formulation of a definition of leadership, and (3) an analysis of leadership style.

As noted above, situational leadership theory research arose partly from the inadequacies found in the practical application of the trait theory and the behaviorist version of the situational theory (McGregor, 1966). Perhaps some of the most comprehensive research in this area was conducted by Stogdill and others at the Ohio State University (Campbell, 1956; Hemphill, 1956; Scott, 1956; Stogdill, 1957; Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Stogdill, Scott, & Jaynes, 1956; Stogdill, Shartle, & Associates, 1956; Stogdill, Shartle, Scott, Coons, & Jaynes, 1956). This research, conducted in the late 1940's and early 1950's, examined leadership in various settings, with various leaders, and under various circumstances and constraints. In general, it was found that leadership was largely determined by the various components of the situation in which the leader was
operating (Stogdill, 1974). The leader could no longer be considered as the only cause-effect variable shaping leadership behavior. Rather, as Zaleznik and Moment (1964) stated, "The Ohio State study emphasizes the fact that . . . the way [the leader] behaves is not really an 'independent variable' in organizational situations" (p. 424).

In the early 1950's, Hemphill joined forces with the Ohio State group and assisted in the development of a descriptive questionnaire that analyzed leadership behavior according to two different patterns or subscales of behavior: (1) initiation of structure in interaction, which dealt with the building of relationships between the leader and group members in areas of organization, communication, and methods of procedure, according to the group's task; and (2) consideration, which dealt with the building of relationships of trust and cooperation between the leader and group members (Hemphill, 1958). These two dimensions of leader behavior parallel the two goals of group functioning: (1) group achievement, or the group's striving to accomplish its task; and (2) group maintenance, or the group's striving to remain intact as a group (Halpin, 1966). The subscales of leader behavior thus developed by the Ohio State group have formed the basis for much subsequent
leadership style research. This research is reviewed below.

The second area of review within this situational theory of leadership is that of formulation of a definition of leadership. This definition is based directly upon dimensions of leadership that were determined in the research findings noted above. The primary emphasis of this definition formulation is that leadership is situationally based and relative to the setting in which it occurs.

Zaleznik and Moment (1964) stated that leadership "is a relational attribute, including the behavior of the leading person and the behavior of the followers" (p. 414). Homans (1950) defined leadership behavior in terms of a situational analysis by the leader and the followers of the costs and benefits to be exchanged in the social system by each. Thus, each chooses when to lead and when to follow, according to the comparisons made and the maintenance of the equilibrium of the social system. McGregor (1960) analyzed leadership as comprised of four major variables:

There are at least four major variables now known to be involved in leadership: (1) the characteristics of the leader; (2) the attitudes, needs, and other personal characteristics of the followers; (3) characteristics of the organization, such as its purpose, its structure, the nature of the tasks to be
performed; and (4) the social, economic, and political milieu. It means that leadership is not a property of the individual, but a complex relationship among these variables. (p. 182)

Gibb (1947, 1966) stressed that there are three principles of leadership: (1) that it is always relative to the situation; (2) that it is always toward some objective goal; and (3) that it is an interaction that takes place in a hierarchical structure, i.e., in a social system.

Halpin (1966), one of the group of researchers from the Ohio State study, also stated that it is most important to consider the social system in which the leadership takes place:

The behavior of the leader and the behavior of group members are inextricably interwoven, and the behavior of both is determined to a great degree by formal requirements imposed by the institution of which the group is a part. (p. 81)

One of the hypotheses tested and verified by Stogdill, Shartle, and Associates (1956) was that leadership is multidimensional. It "arises and becomes structured as a result of the interactions among the members of a social group. It must be evaluated in terms of its effects upon the group." (p. vii).

Finally, Cartwright and Zander (1958) enumerated some
of the aspects of the situation which must be considered
in analyzing specific instances of leadership:

The nature of leadership and the traits of
leaders will accordingly be different from
group to group. Situational aspects such as
the nature of the group's goals, the structure
of the group, the attitudes or needs of the
members, and the expectations placed upon the
group by its external environment, help to
determine which group functions will be needed
at any given time and who among the members
will perform them. (p. 538)

Thus, leadership can be summarized as the performance
of those acts which help the group achieve its objectives.
This definition is meant to succinctly embody all the situ-
ational aspects reviewed: the individual leader and the
group with its particular goals as it functions within the
hierarchical structure of a social system.

The third area of situational leadership theory noted
for review is that of leadership style. Various authors'
concepts of leadership style and specific instances of
style development in hierarchical settings are examined in
this section.

Some of the earliest research on leadership style,
per se, was done by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939). The
researchers investigated three styles of adult leadership:
(1) authoritarian, (2) democratic, and (3) laissez faire.
Each of these styles was exhibited by each of the adults as leaders of different groups of boys. The results showed different amounts of aggressive behavior occurred among the boys under each of the three different styles of leadership, indicating the impact of style upon group performance and climate.

More recent leadership style research is based largely upon the two dimensions of leader behavior as defined by the Ohio State studies. These more recent studies seem to incorporate many of the situational components mentioned by Barraclough (1973):

Managerial style results from adaptation to a variety of forces: organizational structure, the administrator's personality and value system, his concept of personal success, experiences both in and out of his managerial capacity, and the role expectations of others. Whatever its determinants, the resulting style greatly influences the organization and its personnel. (p. 1)

Owens (1973) developed a matrix of leadership styles that identified five different styles: (1) the autocratic leader who uses authority as his principal leadership tool; (2) the bureaucratic leader who depends on the organization's policies for his principal guidelines; (3) the diplomatic leader who uses personal persuasion; (4) the participative leader who shares his leadership function with the
group; and (5) the free-rein leader who defines problems and parameters and then allows subordinates to operate according to their own discretion. It would seem that Owens (1973) has based his matrix of styles on the two leadership dimensions discussed above. The autocratic and bureaucratic leaders emphasize the initiation of structure in the interaction dimension, the diplomatic and participative leaders stress the consideration dimension, and the free-rein leader seems to embody a bit of each of the two dimensions. Owens (1973) stressed, too, that the leader must vary his style according to the demands of the situation.

The individual leader in the hierarchical setting of the organizational structure is the foundation for Getzels and Guba's (1957) style definition. Leadership must be exhibited by an individual in the reality of a particular social system, and so the leader, according to Getzels and Guba, must coordinate the dynamics of two dimensions of leadership behavior: (1) the nomothetic dimension, which embodies the demands of the institution in role expectations; and (2) the idiographic dimension, which embodies the demands of the leader's own individual personality in specific need-dispositions. Thus, these authors defined
three styles of leadership: (1) normative, which emphasizes the institutional demands; (2) personal, which emphasizes the personal demands; and (3) transactional, which alternates emphases between normative and personal, as the situation warrants (Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968).

Blake and Mouton (1964) also point to the determinants of the situation as primary in leadership style, "that managerial styles are not fixed. They are not unchanging. They are determined by a range of factors" (p. 14). The authors then proceeded to map leadership style according to the two Ohio State dimensions, devising a grid scale of 1 (low) to 9 (high) for both of the two, independent dimensions. The dominance of either dimension varies according to the unique combination of conditions present in each situation.

An expansion of this concept of variation of leadership style according to the situation is to be found in the work of Blanchard and Hersey (1970). Their Life Cycle Theory is based on "the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of maturity of followers or groups" (p. 304). Using the two dimensions of leadership behavior developed at Ohio State, they contended that when a group is low in maturity, the proper leadership
style is high in initiation of structure and low in consideration. As the group matures, the style changes in the following pattern: (1) high structure, high consideration; then (2) high consideration, low structure; and, finally, (3) low consideration, low structure for groups that are very mature and more or less self-directed. This theory allows the leader to analyze the level of maturity of the group, and then choose the appropriate style, so that it is not necessary to begin with high structure, low consideration. It was hypothesized by the authors that it is sometimes necessary for the leader to revert to a previous style if the group has regressed in maturity.

Reddin (1970) also based his leadership style theory on the two dimensions of leadership behavior defined by the Ohio State study: initiation of structure and consideration. He added the element of leadership style effectiveness, the appropriateness of the leader behavior to the demands of the situation. Thus he added a third dimension to the measurement of style. According to Reddin (1970), there are four basic styles: (1) separated, which is low in structure and low in consideration; (2) dedicated, which is high in structure and low in consideration; (3) related, which is low in structure and high in considera-
tion; and (4) integrated, which is high in structure and high in consideration. Reddin (1970) then described leader behavior in each of these styles when effective and when ineffective. Since the author viewed the leader as "someone seen by others as being primarily responsible for achieving group objectives" (p. 8), the effective leader is that leader who can influence the group to achieve its objectives.

Reddin's (1970) three-dimensional theory listed five elements of the situation which must be considered by the leader when he chooses the appropriate style: (1) organization, (2) technology, (3) superior, (4) co-workers, and (5) subordinates. By using these five elements according to the three dimensions mentioned above, Reddin (1972) developed the Management Style Diagnosis Test. The unique feature of this instrument is that the leader can ascertain not only his basic style, but whether or not this style is appropriate to the situation in which he is operating, since the test requires that the leader complete it according to the particular characteristics of his present position. This test is discussed more fully in the instrumentation section of Chapter III of this study.

As one of the elements of the situation which has a
bearing on leadership style, the relation of super- and subordinate leaders in role expectations has been examined from many different aspects. Getzels (1958) stated:

Roles are complementary. Roles are interdependent in that each role derives its meaning from other related roles in the institution. In a sense, a role is a prescription not only for the given role incumbent but also for the incumbents of other roles within the organization, so that in a hierarchical setting the expectations of one role may to some extent also form the sanctions for a second interlocking role. (p. 153)

Fiedler (1967) noted the influence in style that the superordinate administrator can exert over the subordinate administrator. He stated that style control can come from the fact that the superordinate will select for subordinates only those individuals who demonstrate perceptions and behavior similar to his own, or this control can come from the influence of his own style of leadership. Unless a superordinate has the opportunity to create a whole new set of subordinate administrators, he generally is expected to work with the ones already in the organization. "Thus, the influence of the middle-level manager over his work groups is more likely to be due to his own leadership style than to his ability to select and replace subordinate managers" (p. 237).
Stogdill, Scott, and Jaynes (1956) echoed this view of mutual role expectation and influence when they stated:

In formal organizations, it is not organization alone which sets up role expectation for its members. The members set up expectations for each other and for the organization as a whole. (p. 4)

Much of the research completed at Ohio State was in the area of superordinate/subordinate relationships. One hypothesis verified by this research (Stogdill, Scott, & Jaynes, 1956) was that junior naval officers "set up expectations for seniors but do not appear to follow them in their own behavior. Juniors tend to do as seniors do, not as they say seniors ought to do" (p. 54). The study further stated that "the performance of subordinates often parallels that of their superiors" (p. 94).

In another Ohio State study, Stogdill (1957) researched the effects of responsibility, authority, and delegation between superordinates and subordinates. He stated that his findings "appear to support a relational conception of responsibility and authority" (p. 84),

that the responsibility and authority perceived and exercised by seniors (superiors) will exert a conditioning effect upon the responsibility and authority of their juniors (subordinates) and vice versa. (p. 66)

Scott (1956), also in an Ohio State research project,
attempted to ascertain the effects of superordinate leadership behavior upon subordinate perception of the organization. He found a positive relationship between the effectiveness of the superordinate's leadership behavior and the organizational perception of subordinates. Differences in superordinate leadership style correlated with variations in the perceptions of the organizational structure by the subordinates, thus influencing the behavior of the subordinates.

Argyris (1954), in describing leadership patterns that he believed existed in many industrial settings, stated that superordinates tend to evaluate subordinates according to their own self-concept. Subordinates similar in style to that of the superordinate received higher ratings:

Perhaps all modern industrial organizations based upon such principles as "unity of commands" and "task specialization" automatically place subordinates in a dependency relationship with their leader. (p. 74)

It may be that this dependency relationship was the motivating force behind the results of a study conducted by Zaleznik and Moment (1964). They investigated the effects of training programs upon the subsequent leadership behavior of foremen in an industrial setting. The results indicated that, though the foremen learned their lessons well,
their behavior when they went back to the line tended to be reflective of their superior's particular leadership style rather than reflecting the new behaviors learned in the training sessions:

This meant that regardless of what they were taught in the training program, each foreman's behavior was more strongly influenced by the behavior of his superiors than by the content of the training program. (p. 423)

In another summary of industrial research, Livingston (1969) stated that "subordinates, more often than not, appear to do what they believe they are expected to do" (p. 182). He further noted that the power of a superior's expectations exerts a tremendous influence upon the behavior of subordinates. "What the manager believes about himself subtly influences what he believes about his subordinates, what he expects of them, and how he treats them" (p. 85).

Turner (1954) reported on a series of intensive research studies made at Yale. Interviews of workers and foremen of two large automobile assembly plants were conducted. The results indicated that to a great extent "foremen learn their assumptions and ways of perceiving others from higher management" (p. 80). This indicated, as Zaleznik and Moment (1964) noted, that the basic beliefs
and assumptions of management are more influential than particular training programs. The relationship between superordinates and subordinates seems to be essentially a circular, mutually reinforcing pattern (McGregor, 1960). As Turner (1954) noted:

Supervisors believe that the attitudes they themselves express in dealing with the foremen will inevitably be reflected in the manner in which foremen deal with the men. And general foremen and department heads have learned their attitudes from their supervisors. (p. 81)

The effects of the amount of influence that a superordinate has with his own superordinate upon the behavior of his subordinates were researched by Pelz (1951). He found that if a superordinate has influence with his superior, his subordinates respond with a much better attitude, i.e., his leadership style is much more effective. This, again, demonstrated the relational characteristic of superordinate/subordinate interaction in the area of leadership styles.

In the business setting, a clear relationship between the style of the superordinate and that of his subordinate was established in a 1964 study by Bowers and Seashore, cited in Likert (1967). The study of 78 sales offices and their personnel reported that the leadership pattern of
the supervisor, as measured on the four dimensions of support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation, tended to be used by the subordinates as well. Though the relationship cannot be necessarily concluded to be causal, it indicated, at least, a common influence of the elements of the situation.

There have also been studies on the role expectation influence in superordinate/subordinate leadership styles in the educational setting. Gross and Herriott (1965) researched the relationship of degrees of professional leadership between principals and their superiors. They found significant statistical differences showing that "the greater the executive professional leadership displayed by the principal's immediate administrative superior, the greater the executive professional leadership of the principal" (p. 108). The higher administrators showed, by their behavior, that they approved of this type of behavior and thus created a strong incentive for their subordinates, the principals, to show similar behavior. The subordinates were also thus assured of their superior's support in carrying out such behavior.

In research conducted by Willerman (1973), it was found that superordinates who are high in structure and high in
consideration influence their subordinates' (principals') perceptions of basic organizational hierarchical needs. This means that the decisions made by principals were directly affected by the leadership style of the superordinate. Those superordinates whose leadership styles were low in structure and low in consideration did not influence their principals' decision-making. Willerman (1973) stated, then, that only high structure, high consideration superordinates are effective in dealing with their subordinates.

Wiggins (1970) stated, from his research dealing with systems analysis of principals' behavior, that the personal style and effectiveness of a principal is affected by the role expectations of the various groups he serves, including both his superordinates and his subordinates. Wiggins questioned the concept that conceptualizes the principal's power, authority, and influence as originating in the office itself. Rather, he viewed it as a focus of the many influences on the role of the principal.

Thus, it seems from the literature that there is reason to believe there is some relationship between the leadership style of the superordinate, as a function of the situation, and the leadership style of the subordinate, also as a function of the situation. Further research
is cited below concerning perceptions of superordinates and subordinates in the areas of job satisfaction and administrative effectiveness.

Job Satisfaction

The basis for much research regarding job satisfaction in the situational theory of leadership behavior is the concept of need satisfaction. Therefore, this review dealt with two main areas: (1) theory of human needs, and (2) pertinent research regarding situational job satisfaction.

According to Maslow (1943), there are five hierarchical sets of basic needs: (1) the physiological needs, such as hunger, sex, and thirst; (2) the safety needs for peace and security; (3) the love needs that motivate belongingness and affection; (4) the esteem needs for self-respect and respect of others; and (5) the need for self-actualization, to make the most of one's potential. These needs emerge in sequence; that is, as the lower-level needs are satisfied, the next highest level becomes the motivating force. Gratified needs no longer serve a motivational purpose.

McGregor (1960) based his theory of leadership directly upon the hierarchical satisfaction of needs defined by
Maslow (1943). McGregor (1960) stated that Theory X—the traditional view of leadership that perceives man as having a dislike for work and responsibility, as having little ambition, and as having to be coerced by punishment to perform—is based upon the lower-level physiological and safety needs. Theory Y, on the other hand, is based on the continuous satisfaction of the higher levels of need (love, esteem, and self-actualization), since this theory is the integration of individual and organizational goals. In this concept of leadership, man is naturally attracted to work, is able to exercise self-direction, and views achievement as its own reward. McGregor (1966), then, saw the purpose of leadership as one of satisfaction of various levels of need: "The outstanding characteristic of the relationship between the subordinate and his superiors is his dependence upon them for the satisfaction of his needs" (pp. 50-51).

Herzberg (1966) also dichotomized Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs, dividing them into physical needs (the two lower levels) and psychological needs (the three higher levels). Herzberg further stated that most leadership that attempts to motivate by concentrating on satisfying the physical needs ultimately fails because it eventually loses
its motivational power. The research conducted by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), on sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among clerical and production workers, professional and managerial personnel in 12 different sites indicated that:

First, the factors involved in producing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction. Thus, the opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job satisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job. (pp. 75-76)

Some of the factors that were found in this study to lead to extreme dissatisfaction were company policy and administration, supervision, relationship with one's supervisor, work conditions, and salary. Those factors that were found to lead to extreme satisfaction included achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth (Herzberg, 1968). All these factors are, in one sense or another, elements of the situation, and thus to be considered in determining appropriate leadership behavior or style.

Getzels (1958) discussed some derivations of his leadership as a social process theory, mentioned earlier, and the applicability of this theory to superordinate/
subordinate perceptions of roles. He stated that the institutional dimension of these roles is really shown by two separate individual sets of expectations and interpretations, one by the superordinate and one by the subordinate. He further stated that the effective or ineffective functioning of the leadership process depended upon "the nature of the overlap---i.e., on the relative congruence or discrepancy---between the separate perceptions of the expectations" (p. 159). It seems, then, that Getzels is stressing that the more closely the individual leadership styles of the two incumbents agree in perception, the more effective is the leadership in the situation; hence, the more satisfying their roles become. As stated by Getzels:

When the perceptions of the expectations of participants in an administrative interaction overlap, the participants feel satisfied with the work accomplished no matter what the actual behavior or accomplishment; when the perception of the expectations does not overlap, the participants feel dissatisfied. (p. 160)

In another work, Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968) pointed out that satisfaction in one's role comes from two sources: (1) extrinsic sanctions, which are controls external to the person such as praise, promotion, and increase in pay; and (2) intrinsic sanctions, which are
controls internal to the person such as performance, inner motivations, and accomplishment. These two categories seem parallel to the two classifications of Maslow's (1943) five hierarchical levels of need indicated by McGregor (1960) and Herzberg (1965), mentioned above.

The complementarity of role performance and satisfaction was noted by Stogdill, Scott, and Jaynes (1956):

Job satisfaction appears to be highly related to the influence of activities and attitudes of other people with whom a member is associated in the performance of his task. These activities and attitudes, at the same time, are an important factor in determining what the member does. (p. 8)

Stogdill (1974) also investigated the effects of each of the two dimensions (initiation of structure and consideration) of the leader's behavior upon the performance of subordinates. He found that the initiation of structure dimensions of the superordinate's style correlated with the subordinate's actual work performance, while the consideration aspect was more clearly related to the subordinate's expectations and values. Thus, the style of leadership that the superordinate used had a differential effect upon the behavior of subordinates. Job satisfaction in relation to these two dimensions was also investigated in this study, and it was found that the initiation of
structure by the superordinate was more positively correlated with follower satisfaction than the consideration dimension:

Thus, the structuring and reinforcement of expectation is important not only in the emergent stages of leadership; the leader must continue to satisfy member expectations if he is to maintain his role effectively. (Stogdill, 1974, p. 416)

This element of meeting subordinates' expectations by demonstrating predictable patterns of leadership behavior was also stressed by Buchanan (1971) and by Pelz (1951).

Various specific elements of the situation have been examined by researchers regarding the relationship of superordinate and subordinate and the effect of this relationship upon job satisfaction. The element of meaningful interpersonal interaction between elementary school principals and their subordinates contributed to an increase in job satisfaction in the subordinates, Feitler and Long (1971) maintained. Tosi (1970) found that the superordinate/subordinate pairing that effected the most satisfaction in the subordinate was one wherein the superordinate's style was directive (high in structure) and the subordinate's manner of behavior was authoritarian, thus emphasizing the element of personality characteristics of the subordinate in the degree of job satisfaction noted.
From this review it seems, then, that job satisfaction can be considered as a function of the situational elements inherent in the leadership style relationship of superordinates and subordinates. Role expectations by superordinates and subordinates, intrinsic motivations, personality characteristics, and the degree of interpersonal interaction were all elements which were found to be related to job satisfaction.

Administrative Effectiveness

Though perception of administrative effectiveness is closely related to job satisfaction, these two variables are not synonymous, nor necessarily coexistent, in a given leadership situation. Thus, it is necessary to examine research which attempted to define administrative effectiveness in terms of its situational components.

Drucker (1967) stresses the behavioral aspect of the situational leadership theory when he states that "effective executives have . . . the ability to get the right things done" (p. 22). He then proceeded to define these right things by listing five managerial habits: (1) management of time; (2) focus on contribution and results; (3) capitalization on strengths of self, personnel,
situation, and institution; (4) concentration on major areas; and (5) analysis of decision-making steps. Drucker (1967) stressed analysis and capitalization upon the strong points of the situation, personnel, etc., clearly placing his definition of effectiveness in a situational framework.

Katz (1955) also stressed the behavior of the leader as the core of effective administration, and defined this behavior in terms of three skill dimensions: (1) technical skills, which involve proficiency in the techniques, procedures, methods, and processes of the leader's role; (2) human skills, which are concerned with dealings with people, including perceptions of superordinates and subordinates; and (3) conceptual skills, which concern the leader's ability to understand the entire organizational structure in theory and practice. Katz stressed that effective administrative behavior is the function of the leader's training in, and proper blend of, these three skills. He stated that one type of skill may be more important at a certain level or in certain situations than another: "The relative importance of these three skills seems to vary with the level of administrative responsibility" (p. 42). This seems to indicate that Katz viewed leadership as a function of the situation.
An analysis of the effect of leadership behavior upon formal organizational structure and structure of personal interactions led to Stogdill's (1957) perspectives on administrative effectiveness. He stated that the degree of effectiveness in a group is a function of the particular organizational position of the leader and the interaction structure of the group, as well as the particular emphases of leadership style dimensions demonstrated by the leader.

McGregor (1966) used the criterion of successful completion of task as a measure of effectiveness. This success is dependent, however, upon the type of relationship that exists between the superordinate and the subordinate. Effectiveness was viewed as a consequence of this relationship. McGregor (1966) further clarified this by stating that this effectiveness-producing superordinate/subordinate relationship demanded a participative, shared responsibility in the organizational climate. This viewpoint seems to emphasize the consideration dimension of situational leadership theory.

Hemphill (1958), on the other hand, stressed the initiation of structure dimension as the measure of effectiveness. He viewed leadership as being primarily concerned with problem-solving. An effective leadership act "rests
upon the demonstration that the act contributed to the solution of a mutual problem" (p. 110). Hemphill (1958) further distinguished between effective leadership acts and successful leadership acts. Successful leadership acts initiate structure-in-interaction during the problem-solving process, but effective leadership acts contribute directly to the problem's solution.

Since Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968) perceived leadership as a blend of the two dimensions of institutional role expectation and personal role behavior, they then defined leadership effectiveness as the concordance or functional agreement of the individual's role behavior and the institutional role expectations for that individual, with the expectations serving as criteria for measurement. This definition, then, also seems to explain administrative effectiveness in terms of a situational framework.

Several studies have been conducted to attempt to verify some of the above-mentioned theoretical components of administrative effectiveness. Moser (1957) investigated the relationship of leadership styles and ratings of effectiveness between superintendents and principals. He found that ratings of administrative effectiveness tended to be mutually high when the two administrators also shared a
similar leadership style. Since Moser (1957) defined leadership style in terms of Getzels and Guba's (1957) nomothetic and idiographic dimensions, these findings seem to indicate that perceptions of effectiveness in the superordinate/subordinate relationship are based upon mutually shared role expectations, problem-definition, role behavior, and organizational climate. This correlates with McGregor's (1966) definition of effectiveness discussed above. The findings of Utz (1972) also identified a similar relationship. He noted that the dimensions of consideration and organizational climate had a positive relationship to perceptions of effectiveness. Principals who were higher in concern for people also were perceived by their teachers as being more effective.

Fiedler (1967) developed a Contingency Model for analyzing leadership behavior and its effectiveness in a group. He viewed effectiveness as dependent upon the particular contingencies of the group's task and of the amount of leadership influence needed in the situation and allowed by the group. Thus, effectiveness is a function of the leader's style and of the task of the group. The matching of the appropriate leadership style with the degree of leadership influence allowed by the group results in effective leader
Reddin (1970) perceived effectiveness from a similar situational aspect. He stated that "effectiveness is best seen as something a manager produces from a situation by managing it appropriately" (p. 3). The criterion that he stressed for measuring effectiveness is the extent to which the leader achieves output requirements of his role, and this achievement, in turn, is dependent upon the interaction of five situational elements: (1) organization, (2) technology, (3) superior, (4) co-workers, and (5) subordinates. Reddin maintained that there is no set formula of behaviors for effective leadership, but that the leader must demonstrate style flex, i.e., he must be skilled in analyzing all the elements of the situation, judging the extent of influence of each, and then choosing the proper leadership behavior.

The above review of pertinent literature seems to indicate that administrative effectiveness is a function of the situation and that it is measured by the degree to which the demands of the situation are met by the behavior of the leader. Administrative effectiveness, then, can be considered as directly influenced by the particular behavior the leader chooses, i.e., by leadership style.
Models Pertaining to Training of Community Education Administrators

The literature on models pertaining to the training of community education administrators is based directly upon analyses of scope and function of the community education administrator's role. This review, therefore, first discussed theory and research regarding the role expectations of the community education administrator and, secondly, models for training of community education administrators.

In one of the early comprehensive studies of the community school and its personnel, Drummond (1953) stressed the necessity for versatility and an interdisciplinary orientation on the part of the community school director. Not only does the role demand the performance of administrative duties of planning, organizing, and controlling, but Drummond especially notes that there is a great need for human relations skills and sensitivity to the community, its problems and resources.

By 1969, the role of the community education administrator seemed to have become more visible, more solidified, and somewhat more specialized. Though great variations existed in actual practice throughout the country, many
role definitions seemed to emulate the pattern developed in Flint. Thus, Totten and Manley (1969), in their analysis of community education in Flint, reflected general practices when they stated that the job of the community school director was twofold: (1) community development through knowing the community, and (2) program development by organization and utilization of community resources. These two functions both require the primary skill-need stressed by Keidel (1969), that of communication with all levels of the school system and all groups of the community, of being people-oriented rather than program-oriented.

There are 10 characteristics of people who have leadership abilities that Kerensky and Melby (1971) applied to the qualities required of a community education administrator. The majority of these qualities stress human relations components, such as involvement, concern for people, and faith in their abilities. The authors noted that community education leadership demands a specific kind of preparation:

We cannot expect teachers and administrators to be concerned with the affective consideration of the educational process if only the cognitive concerns are emphasized and practiced in the preparation of their programs. (p. 140)

Weaver and Seay (1974) viewed the role of the commu-
nity education administrator as a balance of the three skill areas of conceptual, human, and technical skills noted by Katz (1955), discussed in the first section of this chapter. Since Weaver (1972) perceived the goals of community education as shifting from the conventional, school-based model to an emerging, community-oriented model, he likewise noted a shift in the balance of skills required in the role of the community education administrator to meet these demands. Whereas the conventional model necessitated a high degree of human skills as well as skills in the conceptual and technical areas, Weaver (1972) postulated that the shift to the emerging model demands high degrees of technical and conceptual skills, and less emphasis on the human skills.

Research to discover just what skills are demanded by the roles being practiced by community education administrators was undertaken by concurrent studies of Niles (1974) and Kliminski (1974). Both of these studies analyzed the same two groups of people. One group was composed of those directors of community education in Michigan who were identified by experts in the field as most successful in their roles; the other group was a random sample taken from the remaining number of community education
directors in Michigan. Niles (1974) compared the cognitive styles of these two groups. He found that there was a difference in the collective cognitive styles of the two groups. Each group responded to different components in their learning environment. The most successful group seemed to prefer learning through a balanced usage of theoretical elements in their environment, especially theoretical audio elements, while the other group responded more positively to theoretical visual elements. Thus, as Niles (1974) stated, these differences may be indicative of important cognitive style trends. It is also quite possible that these cognitive style differences may indicate an even greater disparity in certain skills and traits between the most successful and undesigned directors of community education. (p. 70)

Kliminski (1974) compared these same two groups of community education directors in terms of their individual blends of conceptual, human, and technical skills. His findings indicated that the successful group of directors showed higher levels of technical, conceptual, and human skills when rated by themselves and by their superordinates. Ratings by subordinates, however, did not indicate any significant differences. Other demographic data in this study showed that successful directors had a larger number
of semester hours in community education, had worked with community education for a longer period of time, and had experienced more intensive training in community education. These findings underscore the interrelationships between role expectations and definition, training, and performance.

Models for training of community education administrators based upon definitions of role have been proposed by many authors. Keidel (1969) believed that a carefully structured training program of internships would be central in his model: "A marked effort would be made to expose the trainee to a variety of situations, techniques and approaches by assigning him to a series of coordinators" (p. 80).

Totten and Manley (1969) suggested that formal training for community education administrators concentrate on four specific areas: (1) community, (2) leadership, (3) human relations, and (4) school administration areas. The authors also stressed that it was necessary to have a great deal of on-the-job training and direction. In another work, speaking of the formal training done by colleges and universities, Totten (1970) stated that it is important for the trainee to get out into the field, into the reality of the situation, and thus broaden his background and prepara-
tion for his eventual position.

Three components of the training program for community education directors were stressed by Minzey and LeTarte (1972): (1) a mastery of the concept, (2) a functional understanding of the tools for implementation, and (3) an internship under the direction of a qualified community education director in the field. It would seem that the latter component would provide the opportunity for the attainment of the first two components to be measured and evaluated.

The development of a leadership training model for community education directors was the main emphasis of research done by Johnson (1973). He recommended three phases of training: (1) overview of theory and practice; (2) internship under the guidance of a community educator; and (3) development of the three skill areas of conceptual, human, and technical skills in practical experience. All three phases stress the utilization of both the university and the local on-the-scene resources as delivery agencies. The measure of the training model would be found in those elements of the program that necessitated application and performance in work situations.

Weaver (1974) based his six training goals for
community education administrators upon his emerging model of community education: (1) development of knowledge and skill in both management and leadership; (2) development of ability to handle conflict inherent in role; (3) development of style flexibility based upon analysis of the situation and the role; (4) development of technical, human, and conceptual skills required; (5) development of individual personal requisites unique to the process orientation of the role; and (6) development of the ability to critique, to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate both theory and practice. Weaver (1974) contended that these goals cannot be developed solely in the classroom setting. Rather, they flourish in a setting that blends theory and practice, that provides opportunity to experience and then to evaluate, such as internship-seminar programs. For the future, Weaver and Seay (1974) envisioned provision of training experiences tailored to the background, experiences, and needs that the student brings to the program. Such training would also include many opportunities for analyses of situational elements that influence on-the-job decision-making and skill utilization.

From the authors and research reviewed, it seems important that the relationship of the training to the
role be bridged by the analysis of the situation provided by carefully structured internship programs. There is indication that these experiences afford the trainee with leadership examples and leadership opportunities that provide both standards for development and space for development. Thus the scene is set for the influence of the elements of the situation to shape, and be shaped by, the personnel in the situation.

Summary

In Chapter II, the literature relevant to the present study was presented. The review discussed four major areas: (1) theory of leadership and leadership styles, including historical perspectives and focusing on the situational theory of leadership; (2) job satisfaction, insofar as this is related to the elements of the situation; (3) administrative effectiveness, insofar as this is related to the elements of the situation; and (4) models pertaining to the training of community education administrators. Each section reviewed theory as well as empirical research that has contributed to the development of the theory.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate community school administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate community school administrator. The study further sought to determine the relationship between the congruence of superordinate/subordinate administrators' leadership style and (1) the length of contact of the two administrators in this relationship; (2) the perception of superordinate/subordinate leadership style influence by the administrators themselves; (3) the satisfaction of the administrators in their positions as this satisfaction relates to dealings with their super- or subordinate co-administrator; and (4) the perception of the effectiveness of the co-administrator by the other administrator.

The study was undertaken in July 1974, when preliminary information regarding the feasibility of obtaining the necessary cooperation from subjects of the investigation...
was obtained from the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University. Actual data collection began in August 1974, and was completed in October of the same year. All paired super- and subordinate administrators of community education from school districts in southwestern Michigan were selected. Those districts which employed the selected sample were: (1) Grand Rapids Public Schools; (2) City of Muskegon Public Schools; (3) Kalamazoo Public Schools; (4) Wyoming Public Schools—G.R.A.E.T. (Godwin Regional Adult Education Training); (5) Paw Paw Public Schools; (6) Orchard View (Muskegon) Public Schools; (7) Reeths-Puffer (Muskegon) Public Schools; (8) Portage Public Schools; and (9) Lakeview (Battle Creek) Public Schools.

Selection of Population and Sample

Since the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of leadership styles of paired super- and subordinate community education administrators, it was possible to select only those school districts that employed two or more community education administrators. Further, the instrument used for determination of leadership style demanded that the personal interview setting be used in
the data collection. Therefore, because of the time and expense involved, it was imperative that the sample from the above population be chosen because of its geographical proximity to the location of the researcher.

In order to obtain a sufficiently large number of observations, all possible subjects in southwestern Michigan were selected as the sample. This group consisted of 53 individuals and comprised 43 superordinate/subordinate pairs, and was selected from the school districts mentioned above. Those individuals in the population who were only employed part time or who were directly answerable to two different superordinates in the district were not included in the sample. From this sample, cooperation and participation in the study were obtained from all but one individual. Thus, the final study totals showed 52 individuals and 42 superordinate/subordinate pairs.

Selection of Instrument

The instrument used to determine leadership style was the Management Style Diagnosis Test (Appendix A), developed by Reddin (1972). This test was administered to each community education administrator in an interview setting.

The Management Style Diagnosis Test consists of 64
pairs of statements that describe various facets of leadership behavior. The administrator is asked to select one statement from each pair that more closely aligns with his/her own leadership behavior in the particular leadership situation in which the administrator is currently working. This forced-choice format demands that the subject indicate preferences between every possible pairing of the statements, thus portraying the individual and unique leadership style perception of each subject. The test scoring of the subjects' selected statements results in a set of three dimension scores: (1) task orientation score, (2) relationship orientation score, and (3) effectiveness score. By using these three scores, it is then possible to ascertain the subject's style synthesis, the subject's average style, according to the dimension diagram of the test.

The four basic styles identified by Reddin (1970) are based on the two dimensions of Task Orientation (TO) and Relationships Orientation (RO). Task Orientation is characterized by the planning, organizing, and controlling behavior of the leader. Direction is given to the efforts of subordinates in striving for goal attainment. Relationships Orientation is characterized by behavior of the
leader that shows trust, respect, and consideration of subordinates' ideas and feelings (Reddin, 1970). The specific degree of each of these dimensions shown in the leader's behavior results in four basic styles: (1) integrated, (2) dedicated, (3) related, and (4) separated. The integrated style shows both high TO and high RO, integrating both task and subordinates, while the dedicated style pairs high TO with low RO, indicating dedication to task but only slight concern for subordinates. The related style portrays high RO but low TO, i.e., great concern with relationships but not with task; and the separated style designates both low RO and low TO, i.e., not much concern with either task or relationships.

Since the Management Style Diagnosis Test describes leadership style in terms of the subject's current leadership situation, it seemed most appropriate for analysis of leadership style similarity in terms of situational factors.

Reliability of the Management Style Diagnosis Test

Reddin (1974) noted test-retest reliability data of the basic styles component of the Management Style Diagnosis Test from a study involving a sample of 104 subjects from
Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. These coefficients for managerial styles were reported as ranging from .66 to .70, over a 3-month period. Reddin (1974) also reported a similar subsequent 2-year study of 57 subjects that indicated somewhat lower coefficients, from .45 to .59. These subjects had not changed positions between testings. Among a sample of 46 other subjects who had changed positions, the coefficients reported ranged from .40 to .61.

In a matched-group reliability check of the Management Style Diagnosis Test, Reddin (1970) found that the two groups of managers of industrial relations units both showed almost exact proportions of style distribution, with the dominant and the two supporting styles being identical in both groups.

Davies (1972) conducted a study of a sample of county police force personnel in Durham, England. In an attempt to determine the components of an organizational development program for promotion candidates from this group, the existing task orientations and relationships orientations of the individuals were measured by using both the Blake Grid Questionnaire and the Management Style Diagnosis Test (Reddin, 1972). Promotion candidates were analyzed
according to dominant style indicated on each test. Subsequent follow-up indicated that the candidates eventually chosen for promotion after extended civil service exams were those who were shown to have the basic style of "related" on the Management Style Diagnosis Test. Thus, as Davies (1972) stated, "The 3-D Theory can give a reliable guide to current managerial style as a component of selection" (p. 356).

Validity of the Management Style Diagnosis Test

Reddin (1970) reported that various groups showed strong differences in the results of the Management Style Diagnosis Test. In a study of 33 presidents and vice-presidents of an international corporation, 58 percent were found to have an integrated style of leadership. Since presidents and vice-presidents are likely to be concerned in achieving the tasks of their roles and are also likely to supervise by interaction, it seems that the dominant style of this group would tend to be high in RO and high in TO, i.e., the integrated style. The next most often found dominant style of this group was the dedicated style (high TO and low RO), with 27 percent. Reddin (1970)
stated that the international corporation with which this group was associated was well known for its autocratic management. Thus, it would seem likely that the group would contain a sizeable percentage of task-oriented leaders.

In another study of heads of voluntary agencies, Reddin (1970) reported that, unlike the managers in the above study who were in authority positions, this group consisted of individuals who must work with those who often have more authority and power than they themselves have. It would seem likely, then, that this group be more concerned with relationships orientation than task orientation. The results of this study indicated that 52 percent of this group had a related style as their dominant leadership behavior, thus supporting this prediction. The next largest group (20 percent) showed as having the dedicated style.

A third study (Reddin, 1970), of a group of scientific research and development managers, also supported this predictive accuracy of the Management Style Diagnosis Test. It would seem that the concern of these managers of professionals would be mainly in the area of relationships, since the subordinates already have clear orientations to the
task. Thus, there should be a large percentage of the related style (high RO, low TO) among the group. The results of the Management Style Diagnosis Test showed that 42 percent of the group did, in fact, perceive themselves to have this style, while the next largest style group was 21 percent.

Construction of the Questionnaire

In addition to taking the Management Style Diagnosis Test, the subjects of this study were also asked to answer several questions concerning perception of superordinate/subordinate influence, length of time spent working together in superordinate/subordinate roles, perception of administrative effectiveness of each other, and degree of job satisfaction that comes from working with each other (Appendix B).

Due to the length of time required for the administration of the Management Style Diagnosis Test and the total interview time limitations of approximately 30 minutes demanded by the schedules of the subjects, the questionnaire developed by the researcher was constructed so as to be short and direct. Only one question was asked in each of the four areas mentioned above, with responses given on
a Likert-type scale of 0 through 6. Thus, there was no way to check for internal consistency by cross-checks within the instrument itself. Also, since the population for which the questionnaire was constructed was unique insofar as the subjects had to fulfill the community education administrative function and had to be in a superordinate/subordinate relationship, it was not possible within the limitations of time and resources available to check reliability by matched-group testing or by the test-retest method.

Regarding validity, the researcher-constructed questionnaire was carefully screened by community education and leadership experts at Western Michigan University and by a group of doctoral students in educational leadership. Suggested changes were made in language, format, and scale. It was thought that the clearest possible statement of each question was finally devised.

The scale used in several of the questions in the questionnaire was a Likert-type scale. This type of scale has been widely used in psychological and social science attitude testing (Kerlinger, 1973). Since the questionnaire asked for perceptions, this type of scale was most appropriate. The purpose of the scale was to place the
respondents somewhere on a continuum of agreement with the perception (attitude) being examined. Thus, the scale allowed for a great amount of variance in the responses. In this questionnaire, there were seven possible choices that ranged from 0 (none, not at all) to 6 (all, much).

Data Collection

The data were collected by means of a personal interview. Contacts were initially made with the superordinate administrators of the superordinate/subordinate pairs. Appointments were made to meet with each of the administrators either separately or in groups, as their schedules allowed, at their offices. After a short explanation of the study and the use to be made of the results, instructions were given for completion of both the instruments. The subjects then completed the instruments while the researcher waited. The amount of time usually required for these tasks was approximately 30 minutes.

There were several instances where a follow-up appointment had to be scheduled individually with one or another of the group not present at planned group meetings. In this manner, every individual in the sample was tested, with the exception of one whose schedule would not permit
completion of the instruments. All answers to both instruments were given in terms of the administrators' present situations and positions.

Treatment of the Data

The Management Style Diagnosis Test was scored according to the instructions developed by Reddin (1972), as noted in Appendix A. The responses to each of the 64 pairs of statements were transformed into adjusted raw scores and subsequently charted to derive dimension scores in Task Orientation and Relationships Orientation. Analysis of these scores according to Reddin's (1972) diagram showed a basic style synthesis for each subject.

The basic style synthesis of each subordinate administrator was compared with that of his/her paired superordinate administrator to determine similarity/dissimilarity proportions. These proportions were tested by means of the binomial test for large samples (Siegel, 1956). This test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the proportions of observed frequencies and the proportions of frequencies expected on the basis of chance at the .05 level. Since the Management Style Diagnosis Test designated one out of four basic styles for
each subject, and since the two paired administrators must
both have had the same basic style to have style similarity
as defined in this study, there were 16 different combina-
tions of basic styles possible, with only 4 of these com-
binations meeting the similarity criterion. The other 12
combinations did not meet the similarity criterion. Thus,
the proportions of chance used to test this hypothesis were
the expected values of 1 out of 4 and 3 out of 4, or .25
and .75.

In the analysis of Hypothesis One, that there is a
similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate
administrator in a school district and the leadership style
of his/her immediate superordinate administrator, \( H_{10} \) was
tested against \( H_{11} \) as follows:

\[ H_{10} : \text{The proportion of similar pairs of super-} \]
\[ \text{ordinate/subordinate administrators is} \]
\[ \text{less than or equal to the proportion of} \]
\[ \text{dissimilar pairs.} \]

\[ H_{11} : \text{The proportion of similar pairs of super-} \]
\[ \text{ordinate/subordinate administrators is} \]
\[ \text{greater than the proportion of dissimilar} \]
\[ \text{pairs.} \]

Hypothesis Two, dealing with the relationship between
the congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership
styles and the length of contact of the two administrators
in their respective roles, was tested by comparing the
proportions of paired administrators with similar leadership styles to proportions of paired administrators with dissimilar leadership styles according to the length of time they have been working together in their roles. Two categories were used for "length of time": (1) less than 2 years working together, and (2) 2 years or more working together. The format, then, for analyzing the data of this hypothesis was a two-by-two contingency table, and the test used was Fisher's exact probability test (Siegel, 1956), at the .05 level of significance, to determine whether the two groups differed in the proportions with which they fell into the two classifications. \( H_{20} \) was tested against \( H_{21} \) as follows:

\[
H_{20}: \text{The proportion of superordinate/subordinate pairs of administrators with congruent leadership styles who have been working together for two or more years is less than or equal to the proportion of superordinate/subordinate pairs with congruent leadership styles who have been working together for less than two years.}
\]

\[
H_{21}: \text{The proportion of superordinate/subordinate pairs of administrators with congruent leadership styles who have been working together for two or more years is greater than the proportion of superordinate/subordinate pairs with congruent leadership styles who have been working together for less than two years.}
\]

The researcher-constructed questionnaires were scored
by finding the means of the equivalents (ratings) noted by
groups of subjects, according to the classification of
superordinate or subordinate, and similarity or dissimilar-
ity in basic leadership style. Thus, Hypotheses Three,
Four, and Five—regarding the relationships between super-
ordinate/subordinate style congruence and (a) the percep-
tion of influence, (b) the satisfaction in role, and (c)
the perception of administrative effectiveness—were ana-
lyzed by means of two subhypotheses each. The means of
each of the groups were tested by use of a t test of dif-
f erences between independent means (Glass & Stanley, 1970)
at the .05 level of significance. $H_{30}$ was tested against
$H_{31}$ as follows:

$H_{30a}$: The mean of the degree of perception of
style influence of the superordinate
administrators from congruent leadership
style pairs is less than or equal to the
mean of the degree of perception of style
influence of the superordinate adminis-
trators from noncongruent leadership
style pairs.

$H_{31a}$: The mean of the degree of perception of
style influence of the superordinate
administrators from congruent leadership
style pairs is greater than the mean of
the degree of perception of style influ-
ence of the superordinate administrators
from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

$H_{30b}$: The mean of the degree of perception of
style influence of the subordinate admin-
istrators from congruent leadership style
pairs is less than or equal to the mean of the degree of perception of style influence of the subordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\( H_{31b} \): The mean of the degree of perception of style influence of the subordinate administrators from congruent leadership style pairs is greater than the mean of the degree of perception of style influence of the subordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\( H_{40} \) was tested against \( H_{41} \) as follows:

\( H_{40a} \): The mean of the degree of satisfaction of the superordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from congruent leadership style pairs is less than or equal to the mean of the degree of satisfaction of the superordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\( H_{41a} \): The mean of the degree of satisfaction of the superordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from congruent leadership style pairs is greater than the mean of the degree of satisfaction of the subordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\( H_{40b} \): The mean of the degree of satisfaction of the subordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from congruent leadership style
pairs is less than or equal to the mean of the degree of satisfaction of the subordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\[ H_{41b}^{\text{t}}: \] The mean of the degree of satisfaction of the subordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from congruent leadership style pairs is greater than the mean of the degree of satisfaction of the subordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator) from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\[ H_{50}^{\text{w}} \] was tested against \( H_{51}^{\text{i}} \) as follows:

\[ H_{50a}^{\text{t}}: \] The mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the superordinate administrators from congruent leadership style pairs is less than or equal to the mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the superordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

\[ H_{51a}^{\text{i}}: \] The mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the superordinate administrators from congruent leadership style pairs is greater than the mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the superordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.
H_{0b}^0: The mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the subordinate administrators from congruent leadership style pairs is less than or equal to the mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the subordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

H_{1b}^0: The mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the subordinate administrators from congruent leadership style pairs is greater than the mean of the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator for the subordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

Thus, in testing each of the operational hypotheses, the .05 level of significance was used as the basis for acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses. A discussion of the results of these statistical tests is found in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

After a brief introduction, this chapter consists of four main topic areas: (1) review of the problem, (2) analysis of collected data as related to each of the five main hypotheses, (3) analysis of other related data, and (4) summary of the findings of the chapter. These findings were based on the scores obtained from 42 pairs of superordinate/subordinate community school administrators in southwestern Michigan. The scores were from the Management Style Diagnosis Test (Reddin, 1972) and a questionnaire constructed by the researcher.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate community school administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate community school administrator. In addition to studying this style similarity, the research also investigated the
relationship between the congruence of superordinate/subordinate administrators' leadership style and the length of time that the two administrators had spent working together in their roles, the perception of leadership style influence by the administrators themselves, the satisfaction of the administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction relates to their dealings with their paired administrator), and the perception of effectiveness of the one administrator by the other administrator.

Thus, the five theoretical hypotheses of this study are:

\( H_1: \) There is a similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate administrator.

\( H_2: \) The length of contact of the two administrators in the superordinate/subordinate relationship is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

\( H_3: \) The degree of perception of style influence by the administrators themselves is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

\( H_4: \) The degree of satisfaction of the administrators in their positions as this satisfaction relates to the other (paired)
administrator is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

H₅: The degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

Analysis of Collected Data

Hypothesis One

For this hypothesis, dealing with the similarity of the leadership styles of superordinate and subordinate community school administrators, the data from Reddin's (1972) Management Style Diagnosis Test were used. These data are found in Appendix C. Comparison of basic leadership styles for each pair of superordinate/subordinate administrators indicated a similarity of styles for 14 pairs and a dissimilarity of styles for 28 pairs, totaling 42 pairs altogether.

The proportions of 14 superordinate/subordinate pairs with similar leadership styles, and 28 superordinate/subordinate pairs with dissimilar leadership styles, were tested by means of the binomial test for large samples.
(Siegel, 1956), using the correction for continuity since the variable is discrete. It was found that this proportion of similarity and dissimilarity has a one-tailed probability associated with its occurrence of \( p = .14 \). This probability indicated that there was not a significant proportion at the .05 level of similarity in superordinate and subordinate styles, as stated in directional hypothesis \( H_{11} \). Therefore, null hypothesis \( H_{10} \), that the proportion of similar pairs of superordinate/subordinate administrators is less than or equal to the proportion of dissimilar pairs, cannot be rejected.

**Hypothesis Two**

Hypothesis Two, concerning the relationship of length of contact of the two administrators in the superordinate/subordinate relationship and the congruence of their leadership styles, employed the results of the comparison of styles from the Management Style Diagnosis Test and information from the researcher-constructed questionnaire regarding the number of years that the subjects have worked in their school districts and in their present positions. This information is noted in Appendix C. The superordinate/subordinate pairs were then divided into the two classifica-
tions of less than 2 years working together and of 2 or more years working together, according to the congruency and noncongruency of leadership styles, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--Classification of superordinate/subordinate administrative pairs according to style congruency and length of contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Contact</th>
<th>Style Congruency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congruent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or more</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportions of this two-by-two classification were tested by applying Fisher's exact probability test (Siegel, 1956). It was found that the proportions of this table, plus that of a table even more deviant, have a total probability of .07 of occurrence by chance, as stated in null hypothesis $H_{20}$. This probability indicated that there was not a significantly greater proportion at the .05 level of superordinate/subordinate pairs of administrators who had worked together in their roles for 2 years or more, as stated in directional hypothesis $H_{21}$. Therefore, null hypothesis $H_{20}$, that the proportion of superordinate/subordinate pairs of administrators with congruent leadership styles who have been working together for 2 or more years
is less than or equal to the proportion of superordinate/subordinate pairs with congruent leadership styles who have been working together for less than 2 years, cannot be rejected.

**Hypothesis Three**

The relationship of congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles and the degree of perception of style influence by the administrators themselves is the concern of Hypothesis Three. The data required for this analysis were the results of the comparisons of styles from the Management Style Diagnosis Test and the means of the ratings from the researcher-constructed questionnaire regarding perception of superordinate/subordinate influence in leadership style.

The mean ratings of perception of style influence were tested by applying two t tests of differences between independent means (Glass & Stanley, 1970): one t test was performed to compare the means of the two groups of superordinate administrators; the other t test was performed to compare the means of the two groups of subordinate administrators. The results of the t test conducted on the means of the two groups of superordinate administrators are found in
Table 2, while the results of the \( t \) test on the means of the two groups of subordinate administrators are found in Table 3.

**TABLE 2.**—Comparison of mean ratings of perception of style influence of superordinate administrators from congruent and noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Style Status</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>( .40^a )</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncongruent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One-tailed \( p = .65 \)

**TABLE 3.**—Comparison of mean ratings of perception of style influence of subordinate administrators from congruent and noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Style Status</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>( -.07^a )</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncongruent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One-tailed \( p = .47 \)

Since both the subhypotheses under Hypothesis Three are directional, the one-tailed probability for the \( t \) value was found, as noted in Tables 2 and 3. In both cases, congruent and noncongruent superordinates and subordinates did not differ significantly at the .05 level in their ratings.
of perception of style influence since the $t$ values have the high probabilities of .65 and .47. In fact, the mean of the noncongruent superordinates was slightly higher than that of the congruent superordinates, in the opposite direction than the one predicted in the subhypothesis. Thus, neither one of the two null subhypotheses, $H_{30a}$ nor $H_{30b}$, can be rejected. Therefore, it cannot be rejected that the mean of the degree of perception of style influence of the superordinate administrators or of the subordinate administrators from congruent leadership style pairs is less than or equal to the mean of the degree of perception of style influence of the superordinate administrators or of the subordinate administrators from noncongruent leadership style pairs.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis Four, regarding the relationship of the congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles and the degree of satisfaction of the administrators in their positions as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator, was also divided, for analysis purposes, into two subhypotheses. The data of concern here were the results of the comparison of styles from the
Management Style Diagnosis Test and the means of the ratings from the researcher-constructed questionnaire regarding satisfaction of the administrator in his/her role as this satisfaction relates to the other or paired administrator.

As was the format for Hypothesis Three, the means of these satisfaction ratings were also tested by using two t tests of differences between independent means (Glass & Stanley, 1970), one test for the two groups of superordinate administrators and the other test for the two groups of subordinate administrators. Results of these two t tests are found in Tables 4 and 5, the first for congruent and noncongruent superordinates, and the second for congruent and noncongruent subordinates.

### TABLE 4.--Comparison of mean ratings of satisfaction in role of superordinate administrators from congruent and noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Style Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.40a</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncongruent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] one-tailed p = .35
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TABLE 5.—Comparison of mean ratings of satisfaction in role of subordinate administrators from congruent and non-congruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Style Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.23(^a)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncongruent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One-tailed p = .11

Since both subhypotheses under Hypothesis Four are directional, the one-tailed probability for each t value was determined, as noted in Tables 4 and 5. Both of these probabilities are above the .05 level chosen as significant, indicating that there were not significant differences between the means of the congruent and noncongruent superordinates or subordinates in their ratings of satisfaction in role. Neither of the subhypotheses, \(H_{41a}\) nor \(H_{41b}\), was supported; thus, neither of the two null subhypotheses, that the means of the degree of satisfaction of superordinate or subordinate administrators in their positions (as this satisfaction is related to the other or paired administrator) from congruent leadership style pairs is less than or equal to the means of the degree of satisfaction of superordinate or subordinate administrators in their positions from noncongruent leadership style pairs, can
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be rejected.

**Hypothesis Five**

Hypothesis Five concerns the relationship of the congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership style and the degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator. As with Hypotheses Three and Four, there were two subhypotheses involved in the analysis. The data necessary for this analysis were the results of the comparison of styles from the Management Style Diagnosis Test and the means of the ratings from the researcher-constructed questionnaire regarding the perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator.

The mean ratings of superordinates and subordinates regarding perceptions of administrative effectiveness were also tested by utilization of two t tests of differences between independent means (Glass & Stanley, 1970), as was the procedure with Hypotheses Three and Four. The results of these comparison tests are found in Tables 6 and 7, the first for congruent and noncongruent superordinates, and the second for congruent and noncongruent subordinates.
TABLE 6.--Comparison of mean ratings of perception of administrative effectiveness of superordinate administrators from congruent and noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Style Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncongruent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}One-tailed \( p = .33 \)

TABLE 7.--Comparison of mean ratings of perception of administrative effectiveness of subordinate administrators from congruent and noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Style Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncongruent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}One-tailed \( p = .63 \)

Since both subhypotheses under Hypothesis Five are directional, the one-tailed probability for each \( t \) value was found, as noted in Tables 6 and 7. Both of these probabilities indicated that there were no significant differences at the .05 level between the means of the congruent and noncongruent superordinates or subordinates in their ratings of administrative effectiveness. Therefore, neither of the two null subhypotheses, \( H_{50a} \) nor \( H_{50b} \), that
the means of the degree of perception of effectiveness of
the other administrator by the paired administrator for
both the superordinate and subordinate administrators from
congruent leadership style pairs is less than or equal to
the means of the degree of perception of effectiveness of
the other administrator by the paired administrator for
both the superordinate and subordinate administrators from
noncongruent leadership style pairs, can be rejected. It
was noted, also, that the mean of the noncongruent subordinates was, in fact, slightly higher than that of the congruent subordinates, thus tending in the opposite direction
than the one predicted in the subhypothesis.

Analysis of Other Collected Data

Though there were no hypotheses stated in the study
regarding the comparison of (1) the mean ratings of congruent superordinates and subordinates on the variables of
perception of style influence, satisfaction in role, and
perception of administrative effectiveness and (2) the mean
ratings of noncongruent superordinates and subordinates on
these same three variables, _t_ tests of differences between
the means (Glass & Stanley, 1970) of these groups were also
performed. The data from these tests are presented in
Tables 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

**TABLE 8.**—Comparison of mean ratings of perception of style influence of superordinates and subordinates from congruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.85a</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOne-tailed p = .20

**TABLE 9.**—Comparison of mean ratings of perception of style influence of superordinates and subordinates from noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-1.68a</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOne-tailed p = .05

**TABLE 10.**—Comparison of mean ratings of satisfaction in role (as this satisfaction is related to the paired administrator) of superordinates and subordinates from congruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.18a</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOne-tailed p = .43
**TABLE 11.**--Comparison of mean ratings of satisfaction in role (as this satisfaction is related to the paired administrator) of superordinates and subordinates from noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-1.67^a</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aOne-tailed p = .05

**TABLE 12.**--Comparison of mean ratings of perception of administrative effectiveness of superordinates and subordinates from congruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.15^a</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aOne-tailed p = .44

**TABLE 13.**--Comparison of mean ratings of perception of administrative effectiveness of superordinates and subordinates from noncongruent style pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.72^a</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aOne-tailed p = .24
As can be noted from the probabilities of the $t$ value for each table, there is a significant directional difference at the .05 level between the mean ratings of perception of style influence of superordinates and subordinates from noncongruent pairs (see Table 9). There is also a significant difference at the .05 level between the mean ratings of satisfaction in role of these same two groups (see Table 11). None of the other $t$ values indicated significant relationships at the .05 level of significance.

These findings are further discussed in Chapter V.

Summary of Findings of the Chapter

The results of the statistical tests performed on the data collected for all five hypotheses indicated that there were no significant proportions (Hypotheses One and Two) nor significant differences between means (Hypotheses Three, Four, and Five) at the .05 level. Thus, none of the null hypotheses was rejected in favor of the alternate hypotheses. The probability of .07 for the proportions of congruent and noncongruent style pairs with less than 2 years of working together and of those pairs with 2 or more years of contact indicated a significant relationship at the .10 level.
Though the relationships between congruent groups of superordinates and subordinates and noncongruent groups of superordinates and subordinates were not stated as hypotheses of this study, statistical tests were performed on the mean responses of these groups on the three variables of perception of style influence, satisfaction in role, and perception of administrative effectiveness. A significant directional difference at the .05 level was found between the mean ratings of noncongruent superordinates and subordinates regarding perception of style influence. A significant directional difference at the .05 level was also found between the mean ratings of these same two groups regarding satisfaction in role.

Chapter V discusses the conclusions and implications that can be drawn from these statistical findings.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The discussion of this chapter is divided into four main areas: (1) a brief review of the problem, (2) a summary of the findings of statistical tests performed on the collected data, (3) conclusions that can be determined from these statistical results, and (4) implications generated by these findings and conclusions.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate community school administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate community school administrator. The research also investigated the relationship between the congruence of superordinate/subordinate administrators' leadership styles and the length of time that the two administrators had spent working together in their roles, the perception of leadership style influence of the superordinate upon the subordinate,
the satisfaction of the administrators in their roles (as this satisfaction is related to their dealings with their paired administrator), and the perception of effectiveness of the one administrator by the other administrator.

There were, therefore, five theoretical hypotheses in this study:

$H_1$: There is a similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate administrator.

$H_2$: The length of contact of the two administrators in the superordinate/subordinate relationship is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

$H_3$: The degree of perception of style influence by the administrators themselves is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

$H_4$: The degree of satisfaction of the administrators in their positions as this satisfaction relates to the other (paired) administrator is greater in those instances where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

$H_5$: The degree of perception of effectiveness of the other administrator by the paired administrator is greater in those instances
where there is congruence of superordinate/subordinate leadership styles than in those instances where there is lack of such congruence.

Summary of Findings of Statistical Tests

For Hypothesis One, the proportion of superordinate/subordinate administrative pairs with similar leadership styles was compared with the proportion of superordinate/subordinate administrative pairs with dissimilar leadership styles. It was determined that there was not a significant overall similarity at the .05 level between the leadership styles of super- and subordinate community school administrators.

The proportions of congruent superordinate/subordinate style pairs and of noncongruent superordinate/subordinate style pairs were classified according to length of time spent working together in their roles and thus analyzed to test Hypothesis Two. The results of this analysis indicated that there was not a significant relationship at the .05 level between congruency of style and length of time spent working together, but there was such a relationship at the .10 level.

Hypothesis Three was tested by comparisons of differences between mean ratings of perception of style influence
of (1) superordinates from congruent style pairs with superordinates from noncongruent style pairs, and (2) subordinates from congruent style pairs with subordinates from noncongruent style pairs. Neither test indicated a significant difference at the .05 level between the mean ratings.

Comparison of differences between mean ratings of satisfaction in role of (1) superordinates from congruent style pairs with superordinates from noncongruent style pairs, and (2) subordinates from congruent style pairs with subordinates from noncongruent style pairs were used to test Hypothesis Four. The results of these tests showed no significant differences at the .05 level.

For Hypothesis Five, comparisons of the differences between the mean ratings of perception of administrative effectiveness of (1) superordinates from congruent style pairs with superordinates from noncongruent style pairs, and (2) subordinates from congruent style pairs with subordinates from noncongruent style pairs were performed. There were no significant differences at the .05 level indicated in either test.

In addition to testing these hypotheses, statistical tests were also performed to compare the differences between the following: (1) the mean ratings of congruent
superordinates with the mean ratings of congruent subordinates on the variables of perception of style influence, satisfaction in role, and perception of administrative effectiveness; and (2) the mean ratings of noncongruent superordinates with the mean ratings of noncongruent subordinates on these same three variables. The results of these tests indicated that there was a significant directional difference at the .05 level between the mean ratings of perception of style influence of superordinates and subordinates from noncongruent style pairs. There was also a significant directional difference at the .05 level between the mean ratings of satisfaction in role of these same two groups.

Conclusions

Hypothesis One

The statistical comparison of the proportion of superordinate/subordinate administrative pairs with similar leadership styles to that of superordinate/subordinate administrative pairs with dissimilar leadership styles showed a one-tailed probability of .14, which was not significant at the .05 level. However, this probability was low enough to indicate a definite tendency toward acceptance of the
research hypothesis, $H_{11}$, that there is a similarity between the leadership style of the subordinate administrator in a school district and the leadership style of his/her immediate superordinate administrator.

The tendency toward style similarity indicated in testing this hypothesis would seem to be consistent with the findings of leadership style similarity between superordinate and subordinate administrators noted in previously cited research. Fiedler (1967), for example, stated that the control the superordinate exerts over the subordinate really results in superordinate influence on the leadership style of the subordinate. Stogdill, Scott, and Jaynes (1956) found that this parallel between the styles of superordinates and subordinates existed in the military setting, while Scott (1956) indicated that differences in superordinate leadership behavior resulted in differences in subordinate behavior. This conditioning effect of the superordinate's leadership style upon the responsibility and authority shown by subordinates was also noted by Stogdill (1957), and, in an industrial setting, by Zaleznik and Moment (1964), Livingston (1969), and Turner (1954). Bowers and Seashore (Likert, 1967) found similarity in leadership styles of superordinates and subordinates to
exist in the business offices they investigated, while Gross and Herriott (1965), Willerman (1973), and Wiggins (1970) noted the presence of this similarity in the leadership behavior of principals and superintendents. The results of analysis of the data for this hypothesis also seem to reinforce McGregor's (1960) belief in the circular, mutually reinforcing character of the superordinate/subordinate relationship.

The fact that the style similarity in the community school setting of this study was not prominent enough to be statistically significant at the more stringent .05 level could be due in part to the unique nature of the community school. It is the role of the community school, and therefore of community school administrators, to be flexible and adaptable in meeting the educational needs of the community which they serve. Thus, there would seem to be more allowance for differences not only in modes of operation, but also in determination of priorities in the community school setting, depending upon the particular, moment-to-moment exigencies of the situation. This demand for flexibility is not necessarily true of the more highly structured business, military, industrial, and educational settings investigated in the above studies.
Another aspect to be considered in the analysis of the leadership styles is the fact that out of the 28 pairs of super- and subordinate administrators with dissimilar styles, 17 of these pairs had a superordinate with an integrated style, while the subordinate had a related style (see Appendix C). The occurrence of such a large number of this particular combination of styles would seem to indicate that there were some characteristics in the nature of the community school that were influential in the determination of administrative style. In 15 of these 17 integrated/related pairs, the superordinate worked in the central office of the district, while the subordinate was located in a neighborhood school building. Thus, the role of the superordinate, in these cases, would seem to be one of dealing with the hierarchical structure in the district in attempting to get the job accomplished, though still having to be concerned with the staff personnel. There was emphasis, then, on both the dimension of the task and the dimension of relationships. These are the characteristics of the integrated stylist.

The subordinate administrators from these integrated/related pairs, on the other hand, were located in the neighborhood schools. Therefore, their roles were mainly
concerned with the people of the community in assessing educational needs and identifying solutions to these needs. It is logical, then, that local administrators be more concerned with the relationships dimension of the situation than with the task dimension. Thus, these administrators were more likely to be related stylists.

Considering all of the above aspects of the style data, there seems to be a basis for concluding that there was some style similarity between super- and subordinate community school administrators, but that leadership style seemed nevertheless to be greatly dependent upon the unique nature of the particular administrator's role. This would seem to support Fiedler (1967) and Reddin (1970), who contend that style is, indeed, a function of the role of the leader.

Hypothesis Two

The results of the statistical test of the data for this hypothesis indicated a one-tailed significant relationship at the .10 level, but not at the .05 level. Thus, there was a moderate relationship between the length of time the two administrators spent working together in their roles and the congruency of their styles, i.e., the longer
the two administrators worked together, the more likely were their styles to be congruent. This finding, as in the case of Hypothesis One, seems to demonstrate McGregor's (1960) contention that the superordinate/subordinate relationship is essentially repetitive and dependent, and that the longer the pattern repeats itself, the more obvious it becomes.

One reason why the length of time the two administrators worked together seemed not to influence congruity of style could be the flexibility and adaptability that is characteristic of the nature of the community school administrator's role. As community school administrators attempt to meet the educational needs of the community, they must operate within and deal with the realities of a continually changing balance of social forces that influence the lives of the population these administrators serve. The situations within which the community school director must exert leadership behavior often do not follow previously experienced patterns of development. Thus, established policies and regulations that serve well for more usual circumstances often have to be changed or adapted to meet the requirements of the situations presented by the innovation of the community school program. Indeed, community
school directors seem much more likely, than do other administrators, to be confronted by problems for which traditional school policy has never been formulated. This is even more true when comparing the role of the community school director with that of an administrator in the business, industrial, or military setting. In these latter settings, the situations demanding leadership behavior very often involve strict regulatory procedures, clearly applicable policy, or previously determined precedent.

Another factor that may be operative in the lack of expected influence could be the absence of close physical proximity of the two administrators in their working sites. In many cases, superordinates and subordinates each worked in a different location within the school district. This is quite different from those situations where superordinate and subordinate share the same building. Thus, the length of time spent in the superordinate/subordinate relationship would not have as much influence in those cases where there is not close physical proximity.

**Hypothesis Three**

There were no significant differences at the .05 level indicated by the statistical comparisons of the mean ratings.
of congruent and noncongruent superordinates and congruent
and noncongruent subordinates regarding perception of style
influence. Research by Fiedler (1967) and by Reddin (1970)
both indicated that superordinate leadership style does
exert a direct influence upon the leadership behavior of
subordinates, as noted above. Neither author, however,
states that this influence was necessarily perceived as
such by the subordinates. Thus, the results of this study
regarding this hypothesis are not in contradiction with
research which indicates superordinate leadership influence
upon subordinate style.

There are several reasons which may account for this
lack of difference in the perception of style influence
between congruent and noncongruent superordinates and sub-
ordinates. One may be in the subtlety of the influence
being exerted. Livingston (1969) noted this when he stated
that the expectations of the superordinate were a subtle
influence upon the behavior of the subordinate. The day-
to-day superordinate/subordinate interactions may occur
without much cognizance of their minute influential effects
upon subsequent behavior, much as running water may gradu-
ally reshape the appearance of the terrain.

Another reason for this lack of expected difference
in perception of style influence could be the fact that
the other exigencies of the situation, such as the demands
of the administrative role inherent in the nature of the
community school, may be so strong as to override percep-
tions of individual superordinate influence upon the sub-
ordinate. The daily problems that arise in the leadership
of a program that is tied to the wants and needs of the
community it serves, as is the case with the community
school program, tend to be of such an intense and urgent
nature as to lessen the perception of the effect of the
more subtle influential forces caused by the superordinate's
leadership style.

Third, since the findings of Hypothesis One suggesting
a tendency toward similarity in style did not necessarily
indicate causality, it could be true that the style simi-
larity that does exist is not directly caused by the influence
of the superordinate upon the subordinate per se, but by a
combination of the varied elements of the situation. Thus,
there would not necessarily be a significant difference in
perception of style influence between congruent and noncon-
gruent superordinates or subordinates indicated when this
variable is measured by itself, even though styles in many
cases may be quite similar.
Hypothesis Four

The results of statistical tests here also indicated no significant differences at the .05 level when the mean ratings of satisfaction in role (as this satisfaction is related to the other or paired administrator) of congruent superordinates and congruent subordinates were compared with the mean ratings of noncongruent superordinates and noncongruent subordinates, respectively. However, the one-tailed probability of the difference between the two groups of subordinates (.11) showed a tendency toward difference. This would seem to indicate that those subordinates from superordinate/subordinate pairs with noncongruent leadership styles were more likely to have less satisfaction in their roles than those subordinates from pairs with congruent leadership styles. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that subordinates often have less influence in, or opportunity to change, their situations and thus would tend to express greater dissatisfaction when the role was not to their liking, as could be the case when their styles were not congruent with those of their superordinates. The subordinates from pairs with congruent styles, on the other hand, may be more inclined to feel satisfaction in their
roles, since congruency in styles would enable these subordinates to react to shared situations in a manner similar to the behavior of their superordinates.

The tendency toward greater satisfaction in their roles on the part of subordinates from congruent pairs shown in this study may indicate that higher levels of the subordinates' needs (Maslow, 1943), such as esteem needs and the need for self-actualization, were being met for those from congruent pairs. This would also be consistent with the point made earlier in this section, that subordinates from noncongruent pairs may have felt less influential in their positions, less able to actualize their potential.

In terms of McGregor's (1960) theory, the results of this study would indicate that perhaps the superordinates from noncongruent pairs were exercising their leadership role based on a Theory X philosophy, which mainly concentrates on meeting the lower-level needs of safety and security of their subordinates. The superordinates from congruent pairs, on the other hand, would be more concerned with the higher-level needs of subordinates (Theory Y), and would strive to integrate organizational and personal goals of subordinates, thus raising the degree of the subordinates' satisfaction in role.
An analysis of the results according to Herzberg's (1966) paradigm would indicate that subordinates from congruent pairs tended to show greater satisfaction because they were being more effectively motivated than the subordinates from noncongruent pairs. This more effective motivation would come from implementation of those factors that lead to satisfaction, such as responsibility, achievement, and work enrichment, on the part of the superordinates from the congruent pairs.

Finally, Getzels (1958) indicated that role satisfaction came from those superordinate/subordinate interactions where superordinate and subordinate expectations overlap. The tendency toward greater satisfaction of the subordinates from congruent pairs indicated here is consistent with Getzels' theory insofar as the congruity of style indicates a correlation or overlap of the expectations of the two administrators. Since the superordinate and the subordinate in each of the congruent pairs share the same basic style, they would tend to react to the common elements of their roles with similar behavior; thus, greater satisfaction in role would result.
Hypothesis Five

The results of statistical tests for this hypothesis indicated no significant differences at the .05 level when comparing the mean ratings of congruent and noncongruent superordinates and congruent and noncongruent subordinates regarding perception of effectiveness of the other administrator. These results are not consistent with the findings of Argyris (1954) and Moser (1957), both of whom found that ratings of administrative effectiveness were higher in those cases where there was style similarity. McGregor (1966), on the other hand, indicated that administrative effectiveness was dependent upon the presence of the relationships dimension in the leader's behavior, while Hemp-hill (1958) stressed the presence of the task dimension. Fiedler (1967) and Reddin (1970) contended that the total of all the elements of the situation must be considered to determine administrative effectiveness, and that both the relationships dimension and the task dimension be involved in the evaluation. Thus, the lack of differences in ratings between congruent and noncongruent pairs in this study is consistent with Fiedler (1967) and with Reddin (1970), that different situations demand different leadership behavior. Since the superordinates and subordinates of a number of
the administrative pairs in this study often were located in different places, and were expected to meet different role demands, it would seem that perception of administrative effectiveness would not necessarily be dependent upon style congruency. Hence, there would be a lack of difference between the ratings of the two types of pairs.

Other collected data

As mentioned above, statistical tests were performed on the data other than those necessary to test the hypotheses of the study. It was thought that the results of these tests might shed further light upon the interactionary forces in the superordinate/subordinate relationship.

A significant directional difference at the .05 level was found between the mean ratings of noncongruent superordinates and subordinates regarding perception of style influence. This indicated that the superordinates thought they had more influence upon their subordinates' leadership style than the subordinates felt, when in fact there was not style congruence. This may be caused by the inability of superordinate role incumbents to perceive clearly the reality of the situation when dealing with information which is either self-generated or solicited from outside.
sources. The superordinate is often the recipient of filtered information and perceptions as a function of his position. Subordinates may, in this case, have had a truer concept of reality than the superordinates.

A significant directional difference at the .05 level was also found between the mean ratings of noncongruent superordinates and subordinates regarding satisfaction in role as this satisfaction related to the other administrator. This indicated that the superordinates felt more satisfaction in their dealings with subordinates than these subordinates felt in their dealings with the superordinates. This concurs with the theories of Maslow (1943), Herzberg (1966), and McGregor (1960), who stressed that it was characteristic of the subordinate to be dependent upon the superordinate for satisfaction of his needs. Since the superordinates in this study were in positions to exert more control over the shared situations, it would follow that they would feel more satisfaction from these experiences than the subordinates, who not only feel less control, but who often may have acted and reacted in these common situations with behaviors different from those of superordinates, as indicated by the noncongruent leadership styles.
Summary

In summary, the results of this study indicated that there was a tendency, though not statistically significant, for superordinates and subordinates to share the same leadership style, and that this tendency was more likely to be true among those superordinate/subordinate pairs who had worked together longer, i.e., 2 or more years. This relationship was not established to be causal, however, but was thought rather to be the result of the interaction of many variables, such as the demands of the situation, the expectations of the role on the part of both superordinates and subordinates, and the pattern of reinforcement used in meeting the needs of both superordinates and subordinates, as well as the unique personality of the individuals involved. Two variables, perception of style influence of superordinate upon subordinate and perception of administrative effectiveness of the other administrator, were examined in relation to style congruency or lack of it, and were not determined to be significantly different in the two cases. A third variable, satisfaction in role as this satisfaction related to the other administrator, was shown to have a tendency to be lower among subordinates.
from noncongruent style pairs than among subordinates from congruent style pairs. Statistical differences were found in the ratings of superordinates and subordinates from non-congruent pairs regarding perception of style influence and satisfaction in role. In both cases, subordinates rated their perception of style influence by the superordinates and their satisfaction in their roles as this satisfaction related to the superordinates lower than did their paired superordinate administrators.

Implications

Several implications can be noted from consideration of the above conclusions. First, the indications that leadership style is a functional focus of the many elements of the situation point to the need for accurate analysis in defining the leadership style elements of the situation by leadership role incumbents. The tendency toward adopting a style similar to that of the superordinate shown in analysis of data for Hypothesis One indicates that internship programs for community education leaders should make the trainees aware of this tendency and should provide training components to assist students in identification of personal leadership style and of those elements in the situation.
that influence leadership behavior. This need for awareness of style influence factors was also indicated by the results of Hypothesis Three, which noted that the influence may be subtle and not perceived, but nonetheless present.

Secondly, the conclusions drawn from analysis of the data for Hypothesis One, showing differences in style for leaders in different levels of administration, concur with Katz's (1955) contention that the proper balance of the three skill areas he identified (conceptual, technical, and human) varies with the level of administrative responsibility. These conclusions also correlate with Kliminski (1974), who noted from his study of two groups of administrators--most successful community school directors and other community school directors—that there were differences in the balance of conceptual, human, and technical skills between the two groups, and that the successful group had more intensive training for their roles. Further, Niles (1974) stated that the differences he found between the cognitive styles of the most successful community school administrators and other community school administrators were indicative of an even greater disparity in certain skills between the two groups. Thus, the implication here is that training programs, which are measured
and evaluated by the success of their trainees once they are working in the field (Johnson, 1973), should include development of skill in analysis of leadership style elements inherent in various situations which shape the leadership behavior of the role incumbents.

Thirdly, the conclusions of this study, especially those of Hypotheses One and Five, lead directly to implications concerning the desirability of similarity in leadership style for effective leadership on the part of administrative teams. The elements of the situation and the particular demands of each leadership role must be examined before decisions regarding the proper personnel for the roles can be made.

Another related implication here is the consideration of leadership style when promoting from the field to highly structured administrative positions. Care must be taken to avoid the error that, just because an individual has shown successful leadership behavior in the role of the local director, he/she will automatically be able to exhibit those leadership behaviors demanded by the new situation. The need, then, is to seek suitable personnel, those who exhibit style flex, through some form of pre-service screening.
A fifth consideration implied by the conclusions of the study, especially the lack of significant differences in Hypotheses Three, Four, and Five, is the need for further research of the three variables of perception of style influence, satisfaction in role, and perception of administrative effectiveness, as they interact upon each other rather than as separate components. This research may be fruitful in terms of further enlightenment in the area of the dynamics of administrative superordinancy and subordinancy.

Sixth, the conclusions dealing with the lower ratings of subordinates from noncongruent pairs regarding perception of style influence underscore the need for frequent communication between superordinates and subordinates in this general area of perceptions. Such communication will help the superordinate to avoid such administrative blind spots as were indicated earlier. It may also serve to raise the level of satisfaction in role of the subordinate administrators.

Finally, the conclusions of this study point to a need for further examination of the blend of leadership skill areas noted by Weaver (1972) in his emerging model. He stressed that in the future human skills would be of less
importance to the community school director, and that conceptual and technical skills would assume greater roles. The large number of related stylists determined by this study would seem to imply that human skills have had, and continue to have, a great deal of dominance in the leadership behavior of the community school director, especially on the local level. However, an equally large number of integrated stylists, especially among superordinate administrators, seem to support Weaver's contention that conceptual and technical skills are showing a greater, or at least an equal, amount of influence. This may be a fruitful area of further research as the concept of community education develops in both theory and practice.
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APPENDIX A

MANAGEMENT STYLE DIAGNOSIS TEST
Instructions

The score sheet that follows has sixty-four boxes numbered from one to sixty-four. These boxes are used to record your choice of each pair of questions, also numbered from one to sixty-four, in the Questionnaire.

Look at the sixty-four pairs of statements in the Questionnaire. If you think the first statement of a pair is the one that best applies to you, put an "A" in the appropriate box. If you think the second statement is the one that best applies to you, put a "B" in the appropriate box. When you have finished, all the boxes will have either an "A" or a "B" in them. Notice that the boxes are numbered in sequence across the page; therefore, you should fill in the top line first, the second line next and so on.

Example

The first pair of statements is:

A  He overlooks violations of rules if he is sure that no one else knows of the violations.

B  When he announces an unpopular decision he may explain to his subordinates that his own boss has made the decision.

If you think that statement "A" is a better description of
your behavior than "B," write an "A" in the first box. If you think that statement "B" applies, put a "B" in the first box. To decide which statement best applies, ask yourself: "OF THE TWO STATEMENTS GIVEN, WHICH BEST DESCRIBES WHAT I ACTUALLY DO ON THE JOB I NOW HAVE?" It may be helpful, in difficult cases, to answer as someone would who really knew and understood your present approach to your job. Some statements you may find a little ambiguous, sometimes both will apply, often, neither will seem to apply. However, in every case pick the one statement that best describes you at present if you were faced with the circumstances described.

Questionnaire

1. **A** He overlooks violations of rules if he is sure that no one else knows of the violations.
   **B** When he announces an unpopular decision, he may explain to his subordinates that his own boss has made the decision.

2. **A** If an employee's work is continually unsatisfactory, he would wait for an opportunity to have him transferred rather than dismiss him.
   **B** If one of his subordinates is not a part of the group, he will go out of his way to have the others befriend him.
3. A When the boss gives an unpopular order, he thinks it is fair that it should carry the boss's name, and not his own.

B He usually reaches his decisions independently, and then informs his subordinates of them.

4. A If he is reprimanded by his superiors, he calls his subordinates together and passes it on to them.

B He always gives the most difficult jobs to his most experienced workers.

5. A He allows discussions to get off the point quite frequently.

B He encourages subordinates to make suggestions, but does not often initiate action from them.

6. A He sometimes thinks that his own feelings and attitudes are as important as the job.

B He allows his subordinates to participate in decision making, and always abides by the decision of the majority.

7. A When the quality or quantity of departmental work is not satisfactory, he explains to his subordinates that his own boss is not satisfied, and that they must improve their work.

B He reaches his decisions independently, and then tries to "sell" them to his subordinates.

8. A When he announces an unpopular decision, he may explain to his subordinates that his own boss has made the decision.

B He may allow his subordinates to participate in decision making, but he reserves the right to make the final decision.
9. A He may give difficult jobs to inexperienced subordinates, but if they get into trouble he will relieve them of the responsibility.
B When the quality or quantity of departmental work is not satisfactory, he explains to his subordinates that his own boss is not satisfied, and that they must improve their work.

10. A He feels it is as important for his subordinates to like him as it is for them to work hard.
B He lets other people handle jobs by themselves, even though they may make many mistakes.

11. A He shows an interest in his subordinates' personal lives because he feels they expect it of him.
B He feels it is not always necessary for subordinates to understand why they do something, as long as they do it.

12. A He believes that disciplining subordinates will not improve the quality or quantity of their work in the long run.
B When confronted with a difficult problem, he attempts to reach a solution which will be at least partly acceptable to all concerned.

13. A He thinks that some of his subordinates are unhappy, and tries to do something about it.
B He looks after his own work, and feels it is up to higher management to develop new ideas.

14. A He is in favor of increased fringe benefits for management and labor.
B He shows concern for increasing his subordinates' knowledge of the job and the company, even though it is not necessary in their present position.
15. A He lets other people handle jobs by themselves, even though they may make many mistakes.

B He makes decisions independently, but may consider reasonable suggestions from his subordinates to improve them if he asks for them.

16. A If one of his subordinates is not a part of the group, he will go out of his way to have the others befriend him.

B When an employee is unable to complete a task, he helps him to arrive at a solution.

17. A He believes that one of the uses of discipline is to set an example for other workers.

B He sometimes thinks that his own feelings and attitudes are as important as the job.

18. A He disapproves of unnecessary talking among his subordinates while they are working.

B He is in favor of increased fringe benefits for management and labor.

19. A He is always aware of lateness and absenteeism.

B He believes that unions may try to undermine the authority of management.

20. A He sometimes opposes union grievances as a matter of principle.

B He feels that grievances are inevitable and tries to smooth them over as best he can.

21. A It is important to him to get credit for his own good ideas.

B He voices his own opinions in public only if he feels that others will agree with him.
22. A He believes that unions may try to undermine the authority of management.

B He believes that frequent conferences with individuals are helpful in their development.

23. A He feels it is not always necessary for subordinates to understand why they do something, as long as they do it.

B He feels that time-clocks reduce tardiness.

24. A He usually reaches his decision independently, and then informs his subordinates of them.

B He feels that unions and management are working towards similar goals.

25. A He favors the use of individual incentive payment schemes.

B He allows discussions to get off the point quite frequently.

26. A He takes pride in the fact that he would not usually ask someone to do a job he would not do himself.

B He thinks that some of his subordinates are unhappy, and tries to do something about it.

27. A If a job is urgent, he might go ahead and tell someone to do it, even though additional safety equipment is needed.

B It is important to him to get credit for his own good ideas.

28. A His goal is to get the work done without antagonizing anyone more than he has to.

B He may assign jobs without much regard for experience or ability but insists on getting results.
29. A He may assign jobs without much regard for experience or ability but insists on getting results.

B He listens patiently to complaints and grievances, but often does little to rectify them.

30. A He feels that grievances are inevitable and tries to smooth them over as best he can.

B He is confident that his subordinates will do satisfactory work without any pressure from him.

31. A When confronted with a difficult problem, he attempts to reach a solution which will be at least partly acceptable to all concerned.

B He believes that training through on-the-job experience is more useful than theoretical education.

32. A He always gives the most difficult jobs to his most experienced workers.

B He believes in promotion only in accordance with ability.

33. A He feels that problems among his workers will usually solve themselves without interference from him.

B If he is reprimanded by his superiors, he calls his subordinates together and passes it on to them.

34. A He is not concerned with what his employees do outside of working hours.

B He believes that disciplining subordinates will not improve the quality or quantity of their work in the long run.

35. A He passes no more information to higher management than they ask for.

B He sometimes opposes union grievances as a matter of principle.
36. A He sometimes hesitates to make a decision which will be unpopular with his subordinates.
   B His goal is to get the work done without antagonizing anyone more than he has to.

37. A He listens to complaints and grievances, but often does little to rectify them.
   B He sometimes hesitates to make a decision which he feels will be unpopular with his subordinates.

38. A He voices his own opinions in public only if he feels that others will agree with him.
   B Most of his subordinates could carry on their jobs without him if necessary.

39. A He looks after his own work, and feels it is up to higher management to develop new ideas.
   B When he gives orders, he sets a time limit for them to be carried out.

40. A He encourages subordinates to make suggestions, but does not often initiate actions from them.
   B He tries to put his workers at ease when talking to them.

41. A In discussion he presents the facts as he sees them, and leaves others to draw their own conclusions.
   B When the boss gives an unpopular order, he thinks it is fair that it should carry the boss's name, and not his own.

42. A When unwanted work has to be done, he asks for volunteers before assigning it.
   B He shows an interest in his subordinates' personal lives because he feels they expect it of him.
43. A He is as much interested in keeping his employees happy as in getting them to do their work.

          B He is always aware of lateness and absenteeism.

44. A Most of his subordinates could carry on their jobs without him if necessary.

          B If a job is urgent, he might go ahead and tell someone to do it, even though additional safety equipment is needed.

45. A He is confident that his subordinates will do satisfactory work without any pressure from him.

          B He passes no more information to higher management than they ask for.

46. A He believes that frequent conferences with individuals are helpful in their development.

          B He is as much interested in keeping his employees happy as in getting them to do their work.

47. A He shows concern for increasing his subordinates' knowledge of the job and the company, even though it is not necessary in their present position.

          B He keeps a very close watch on workers who get behind or do unsatisfactory work.

48. A He allows his subordinates to participate in decision making, and always abides by the decision of the majority.

          B He makes his subordinates work hard, but tries to make sure that they usually get a fair deal from higher management.

49. A He feels that all workers on the same job should receive the same pay.

          B If any employee's work is continually unsatisfactory, he would wait for an opportunity to have him transferred rather than dismiss him.
50. A He feels that the goals of union and management are in opposition but tries not to make his view obvious.

B He feels it is as important for his subordinates to like him as it is for them to work hard.

51. A He keeps a very close watch on workers who get behind or do unsatisfactory work.

B He disapproves of unnecessary talking among his subordinates while they are working.

52. A When he gives orders, he sets a time limit for them to be carried out.

B He takes pride in the fact that he would not usually ask someone to do a job he would not do himself.

53. A He believes that training through on-the-job experience is more useful than theoretical education.

B He is not concerned with what his employees do outside of working hours.

54. A He feels that time-clocks reduce tardiness.

B He allows his subordinates to participate in decision making, and always abides by the decision of the majority.

55. A He makes decisions independently, but may consider reasonable suggestions from his subordinates to improve them if he asks for them.

B He feels that the goals of union and management are in opposition but tries not to make his view obvious.

56. A He reaches his decisions independently, and then tries to "sell" them to his subordinates.

B When possible he forms work teams out of people who are already good friends.
57. A He would not hesitate to hire a handicapped worker if he felt he could learn the job.

B He overlooks violations of rules if he is sure that no one else knows of the violations.

58. A When possible he forms work teams out of people who are already good friends.

B He may give difficult jobs to inexperienced subordinates, but if they get in trouble he will relieve them of the responsibility.

59. A He makes his subordinates work hard, but tries to make sure that they usually get a fair deal from higher management.

B He believes that one of the uses of discipline is to set an example for other workers.

60. A He tries to put his workers at ease when talking to them.

B He favors the use of individual incentive payment schemes.

61. A He believes in promotion only in accordance with ability.

B He feels that problems among his workers will usually solve themselves without interference from him.

62. A He feels that unions and management are working toward similar goals.

B In discussion he presents the facts as he sees them and leaves others to draw their own conclusions.

63. A When an employee is unable to complete a task, he helps him to arrive at a solution.

B He feels that all workers on the same job should receive the same pay.
64. A He may allow his subordinates to participate in decision making, but he reserves the right to make the final decision.

B He would not hesitate to hire a handicapped worker if he felt he could learn the job.
### Individual Score Sheet

**STEP 2**
Total your A's in each Horizontal Row

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 3**
Total your B's in each Vertical Column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 4**
Transfer the A's from Step 2

---

**STEP 5**
Add two numbers above to get the Unadjusted Raw Score

--- (Total of this row should be 64)
STEP 6
Insert the Normal Adjustment Factors which will be supplied

STEP 7
Add or subtract Line 6 and Line 5 to get the Adjusted Raw Score

STEP 8
Insert Adjusted Raw Scores A to H under "Score" below and in all the boxes that appear to the right.

STEP 9
Add the numbers in the boxes below the TO, RO, and E vertical columns. These are your Dimension Raw Scores.

SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIMENSION
RAW SCORES

TO    RO    E
STEP 10
Convert Dimension Raw Scores into Dimension by using this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If your Dimension Raw Score is</th>
<th>0-29</th>
<th>30-31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36-37</th>
<th>38 &amp; over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Dimension Score is</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STEP 11
Write Dimension Score here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Style Synthesis

Write your Dimension Score for TO, RO, and E from Step 11 in the middle of the diagram. To find your Style Synthesis, move across diagram from left to right, taking appropriate branches as indicated by your score. For example, to start, move up A if your TO Score is above two or down B if your TO is below two; continue in this way until you come to your Style Synthesis in the right-hand column. Circle it. This Style Synthesis is your average style which takes into account all of your answers.

```
EXECUTIVE
COMPROMISER
BENEVOLENT
AUTOCRAT
AUTOCRAT
DEVELOPER
MISSIONARY
BUREAUCRAT
DESERTER
```
APPENDIX B

RESEARCHER-CONSTRUCTED QUESTIONNAIRE(S)
AND ACCOMPANYING LETTERS
Introductory Letter

Western Michigan University
College of Education
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear Community Education Administrator:

You are no doubt aware of the fact that, as a community educator, you are part of one of the fast-growing movements in the United States today. You are no doubt aware, too, that many questions about this movement still remain unanswered.

As part of doctoral studies at Western Michigan University, I am attempting to determine the similarity between the leadership styles of superior-subordinate pairs of community education administrators. I am also interested in the perceptions of these administrators regarding their job satisfaction, administrative effectiveness, and style influence.

Therefore, I am soliciting your cooperation in helping me determine these characteristics. Your role in this school district qualifies you as a subject for this study. Your cooperation will be necessary in completing a leadership style test and several additional questions regarding particulars of your administrative role. The maximum amount of time usually required to complete these items is approximately 30 to 40 minutes. All responses will be held in strictest confidence, and only overall group data will be analyzed in the report. There will be no way to identify specific responses in this report.

I sincerely appreciate it if you will take time from your busy schedule to complete these items. Your help is invaluable. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna M. Schmitt
Western Michigan University
College of Education
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear Community Education Administrator:

The following questions pertain to your perceptions of your own and your "paired" administrator's role. It is important that you answer the questions in terms of your present situation and position, and that you are as accurate as possible.

As noted before, all answers will be taken as absolutely confidential. There will be no way to identify specific responses in the final report since all data will be given in terms of the entire group studied.

Thank you for your most necessary and appreciated cooperation.

Sincerely,

Donna M. Schmitt
Questionnaire for Superordinates

NAME: ________________________________________________

SCHOOL DISTRICT: ______________________________________

POSITION: ____________________________________________

NUMBER OF YEARS IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT AND IN THIS POSITION, INCLUDING THE PRESENT YEAR: __________

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN TERMS OF YOUR PRESENT SITUATION AND POSITION:

DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP STYLE—Leadership style is the consistent manner in which actions are performed in helping a group move towards goals acceptable to its members.

Use the above definition as a guide to answer the following question:

During the time span within which you have been working with ___________________________ in this position, how do you rate the influence you feel your leadership style has had upon ___________________________ 's leadership style?

(Circle one of the numbers below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Much Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
During the time span within which you have been working with __________________ in this position, what part of your job satisfaction in your role comes directly from your relationship with __________________ in your work?
(Circle one of the numbers below.)

None All
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

During the time span within which you have been working with __________________ in this position, how do you perceive the effectiveness of __________________ in his role as an administrator?
(Circle one of the numbers below.)

Not Effective Very Effective
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Do you feel your leadership style is similar to or different from __________________'s leadership style?
(Circle one of the below.)

SIMILAR TO DIFFERENT FROM
Questionnaire for Subordinates

NAME: ____________________________________________

SCHOOL DISTRICT: _______________________________________

POSITION: _____________________________________________

NUMBER OF YEARS IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT AND IN THIS POSITION,

INCLUDING THE PRESENT YEAR: __________

IS THIS YOUR FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION? ___________

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN TERMS OF YOUR

PRESENT SITUATION AND POSITION:

DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP STYLE—Leadership style is
the consistent manner in which actions are performed in
helping a group move towards goals acceptable to its members.

Use the above definition as a guide to answer the fol-

lowing question:

During the time span within which you have been
working with ____________________ in this
position, how do you rate the influence you feel
_____________________________ has had upon your

leadership style?

(Circle one of the numbers below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Much Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0   1   2   3   4   5   6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
During the time span within which you have been working with ________________ in this position, what part of your job satisfaction in your role comes directly from your relationship with ________________ in your work?

(Circle one of the numbers below.)

None

All

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

During the time span within which you have been working with ________________ in this position, how do you perceive the effectiveness of ________________ in his role as an administrator?

(Circle one of the numbers below.)

Not Effective

Very Effective

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

Do you feel your leadership style is similar to or different from ________________'s leadership style?

(Circle one of the below.)

SIMILAR TO

DIFFERENT FROM
APPENDIX C

COLLECTED DATA
### TABLE 1C.—Results of the Management Style Diagnosis Test for each of the pairs of superordinate/subordinate administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Number</th>
<th>Superordinate Style</th>
<th>Subordinate Style</th>
<th>Pair Number</th>
<th>Superordinate Style</th>
<th>Subordinate Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Number</td>
<td>No. of Years Together</td>
<td>Pair Number</td>
<td>No. of Years Together</td>
<td>Pair Number</td>
<td>No. of Years Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Number</td>
<td>Sub. Rating</td>
<td>Super. Rating</td>
<td>Number Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5C.—Ratings of effectiveness in role (of paired administrator by other administrator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>