POSTSECONDARY DATA PROCESSING
ADVISORY COMMITTEES: ORGANIZATION, OPERATION,
EFFECTIVENESS, AND LEADERSHIP STYLE

by

Patricia Raynes Clemmer

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Vocational and Technical Education

APPROVED:

_____
F. Marion Asche, Chairman

_____   _____
Jeffrey R. Stewart, Jr.   Daisy L. Stewart

_____   _____
Charles P. Bilbrey   Patrick A. O'Reilly

May, 1989

Blacksburg, Virginia

POSTSECONDARY DATA PROCESSING
ADVISORY COMMITTEES; ORGANIZATION, OPERATION,
EFFECTIVENESS, AND LEADERSHIP STYLE

by

Patricia Raynes Clemmer

Committee Chairman: F. Marion Asche
Vocational and Technical Education

(ABSTRACT)

The purposes of this study were to identify which advisory committee functions data processing committees are performing, determine how effectively these functions are being performed, and assess the relationship between leadership style and advisory committee effectiveness. Two-year postsecondary schools in the Southeast Region of the United States were studied for an academic year.

Descriptive statistic techniques were used to tabulate the operations and organization data of committee members and division heads. Mean scores on performed advisory committee functions determined the effectiveness level for each committee as rated by advisory committee members and business or technology division heads. The Leader Behavior Analysis II-Self provided leadership style for the chairperson.

Data processing advisory committees reported the most participation in identifying occupational skills, recommending content of the program, determining course relevancy, and evaluating on-going programs. The lowest

reported participation was dealing with instruction for the disadvantaged and elimination of sex bias. Committee members felt they were most effective identifying occupational skills, recommending employment standards, and determining course relevancy. Division heads reported communication with the community was the most effective function the advisory committee performed.

Committees in this study did not conform on several aspects to the modal pattern for craft advisory committees in the literature--committee size, terms of appointment, and orientation of committee members. Forty-seven percent of the committees reported eight members or more and 33% appoint members for indefinite terms. Orientation of committee members was neglected by 26% of the committees. Many committees were inactive or nonexistent.

The study results indicated a relationship between committee leadership style and Factor II-Developing Curriculum items on the effectiveness instrument; this association was significant at the .05 level. However, no significant relationship could be shown between leadership style and effectiveness of the committee.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to two very special people:

My son P. J. for his understanding even when he missed spending the time with me

My husband Tom for his love, encouragement, and support that made it all possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I - THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The dynamic quality of vocational education is more apparent now than ever before. Growth in industry and business and developments in techniques and equipment in data processing make the data processing craft advisory committee indispensable. Data processing teachers cannot know all the factors which would contribute to a meaningful program for the individual and society; they must rely on community involvement for assistance in meeting the challenges of this field.

The purpose of this study was to identify which advisory committee functions data processing committees are performing, determine how effectively these functions are being performed, and assess the relationship between leadership style and advisory committee effectiveness. It also provided a description of the organization and operation of craft advisory committees in data processing.

Advisory committees have been in use for most of the twentieth century; even before that, citizens participated in the organization of education in the colonial period. Massachusetts had mandatory advisory committees for vocational agriculture as early as 1911 (Bible, 1961). The Vocational Education Act of 1963 established a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education as well as state

advisory committees for vocational education. Advisory
committees for vocational and technical education have had
phenomenal growth since the 1963 act (Land, 1971). The
Education Amendments of 1976 mandated the establishment and
role of vocational advisory councils at the local level.
This is the level most closely associated with each
particular subject field. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational
Act of 1984 eliminated the requirement for the local level
advisory committee, but retained the state level committee.
Even though federal legislation no longer mandates local
level advisory committees, most states still require their
use.

Advisory committees fall into three major types:
general advisory committees, occupational advisory
committees, and joint apprenticeship committees (Riendeau,
1977; Cochran, Phelps and Cochran, 1980). After reviewing
the literature on advisory committees, it is clear that it
is difficult, if not impossible, to place committees and
councils into mutually exclusive categories. Gallon and
Wattenbarger (1976) in writing about the nature of
committees conclude "A particular committee may be
identified by one of the categories, but may be assigned
responsibilities involving several of these activities" (p.
13). McQuay and Watters (1980), Bergman (1979), Carroll
(1981), VanAusdle and Peterson (1979), and Cochran et al.

(1980) discuss, and at times interchange, the words council and committee when referring to craft advisory committees. Lists of functions and organizational strategies which are similar for both can be found; often the same ideas are presented and attributed to councils and committees.

Basically, the general advisory committee meets periodically to review the occupational programs offered by a school. Its function is to offer advice to determine overall policies and types of occupational education. The joint apprenticeship committee has administrative authority regarding apprenticeship standards and on-the-job training. According to Riendeau (1977) this committee is usually organized by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U. S. Department of Labor.

The occupational advisory committee offers advice on instructional programs in specific areas or occupations. This committee is referred to by various names: craft, occupational, program, and trade. Riendeau (1977) states this committee performs the following activities for a specific occupational education area:

1. Lists specific skills and suggests related and technical information for the instructional program

2. Recommends personnel from business and industry as instructors

3. Helps to evaluate the instructional program

4. Suggests improvements for the public relations program at the school

5. Assists in recruiting students, providing internships, and placing graduates

6. Keeps the school informed on changes in and needs of the labor market

7. Provides means for the school to inform the community of occupational programs

8. Serves as communication channel between school and occupational groups in the community (pp. 4-5).

Beamer (1980) identified keeping up to date with the types and levels of skills employees need to possess as a major problem for the agricultural education program. Cole (1980) addressed developing effective advisory committees for extension programs by "providing community leadership in the process of planned change" (p. 9). Advisory committees are a viable method of ensuring that programs are relevant to community needs; yet, little research has been done to show just what factors make an advisory committee effective and to relate leadership as a key component to the effectiveness of that committee.

The occupational advisory committee is the topic of this research study. Research has been conducted to determine functions, practices, and organization of advisory

committees (Armfield, 1981; Waldheim, 1978; Smith and Holt, 1980; Elias and Behymer, 1979; Cochran et al. 1980). Resources are available on how to establish and work with advisory committees (Parks, 1982; Riendeau, 1977; Basualdo, 1976; White, 1977). Fewer studies have been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of advisory committees. Most of these studies have found that committees are not very effective in serving occupational education (Ledford, 1981: Danenburg, Keene, and Miller, 1975; Kaupp, 1979; Armfield, 1981; Latham, 1981). Schultz, Watson, and Giese (1980) concluded from factor mean scores that post-secondary business program advisory committee members and instructors perceived committees ineffective with respect to planning and evaluating programs and only slightly effective for developing curriculum. In placing students and promoting programs, Schultz et al. (1980) found that the committees were neither effective nor ineffective. The minimal amount of research in the area of effectiveness of program advisory committees and the lack of any research specifically in the data processing area led to this study. Researchers have expressed the need for further research on evaluation and effectiveness of advisory committees (Schultz et al., 1980; Parks, 1982; Kaupp, 1979; Land, 1971; Waldheim, 1978; Bartolomei, 1984) and research has shown that the leadership of a committee has a role in the effectiveness of

that committee (Bartolomei, 1984; Huska, 1980; Cochran et al. 1980; Riendeau, 1977; Yusuf, 1983; Dunn, 1983).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to identify post-secondary data processing advisory committees in the southeastern region of the United States (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida), determine the degree of effectiveness of each active committee, and assess the relationship of leadership style to advisory committee effectiveness. It also provided a description of the organization and operation of craft advisory committees in data processing in this region.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered by this study:

1. How are postsecondary data processing advisory committees in the southeastern region of the United States organized and operated?

2. What is the relative effectiveness of data processing advisory committees based on selected procedures and functional standards?

3. What is the relationship of effectiveness of data processing advisory committees to leadership styles?

Research data about factors contributing to effective organization and operation of data processing advisory committees at the post-secondary level is negligible (Armfield, 1981). Data about this problem in vocational education are limited and the need for relevant knowledge about effectiveness in advisory committees is necessary if educators are to make the best use of these committees. Folley (1974) wrote that "Community colleges must have a close partnership with potential employers and utilize their technical-occupational knowledge in order to provide students the skills, techniques, and knowledge necessary for entrance into their occupational choice" (p. 21). Because leadership style has been identified as a factor related to committee effectiveness, this study was undertaken to identify particular leadership styles which may be associated with effective data processing advisory committees at the post-secondary level.

Significance of the Problem

For nearly a century business and industry representatives and community members have been involved in vocational education via advisory committees. The vocational programs have been advised of labor trends and improved by these community volunteers. According to Waldheim (1978) "the notion of community involvement has

been accepted . . . . Accordingly we find that advisory councils are often used, but seldom evaluated, in terms of their own organization and operation" (p. 3).

Essentially, program advisory committees create an effect on the vocational education program, but measurement devices to gauge the effectiveness of the committee itself are limited. One can say that the goal is to evaluate whether an advisory committee is effective or not, but the problem occurs when one attempts to determine how to evaluate effectiveness. Measures of organization guidelines and procedures exist, but these are not necessarily measures of effectiveness.

A limited amount of research on the organization of data processing advisory committees and how they operate has been conducted; most of the literature is opinion and experience, not research based. By collecting data about the demographics of craft committees, a representative picture of data processing committees in the southeastern region of the United States may be developed. This could serve as a guideline for newly formed committees or for evaluation purposes for existing committees.

This investigation was conducted to better understand the relationship between leadership styles and effectiveness of data processing advisory committees and to determine the

organization and operation features of data processing advisory committees. The study provides descriptive information for future reference and work to assist vocational educators in organizing, selecting, and interacting with craft advisory committees.

Assumption

The following assumption was made for the purpose of this study:

Research has shown that certain operations and functions performed by craft advisory committees lead to greater effectiveness; therefore, it is assumed in this study that the higher the score for effectiveness on the Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees instrument, the more effective the committee.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was confined to data processing advisory committees at the postsecondary level in the Southeastern Region of the American Technical Education Association.

2. The study included only data processing programs operating during the 1986-1987 academic year.

Definition of Terms

1. <u>Craft advisory committee</u>: "The advisory groups
   that serve a single program in a trade, occupation,
   or cluster of occupations are referred to as
   occupational or craft advisory committees. These
   terms are used interchangeably to denote that the
   committee's major activities are the identifi-
   cation, development, and operation of the total
   instructional program of a particular occupation
   such as data processing. . . ." Cochran, et al.,
   1980, p. 53).

2. <u>Effectiveness</u>: The degree to which a craft
   advisory committee operates and performs functions
   indicative of productivity as measured by an
   average mean score on the Organization and
   Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees
   instrument.

3. <u>General advisory committee or council</u>: "A general
   advisory committee oversees all vocational programs
   in a specific school district or post-secondary
   institution" (Bartolomei, 1984, p. 9).

4. <u>Leadership style</u>: The style of the advisory
   committee chairperson based on the situational
   leadership model of Hersey and Blanchard. Leader
   behavior is mapped based on task behavior

(directive) and relationship behavior
(supportive) and categorized as telling (S1),
selling (S2), participating (S3), or delegating
(S4) using twenty multiple-choice typical job
situations that involve a leader.

CHAPTER II - A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature that was relevant to craft advisory committees at the post-secondary level. The functions of effective advisory committees, the organizational structure and purposes of craft advisory committees, and the leadership styles associated with them are discussed in this chapter.

Purposes and Functions of Effective
Craft Advisory Committees

This section presents the purposes and functions indicative of effective craft advisory committees as reported in the review of the literature. Researchers have grouped the functions in various ways, but they are presented here in seven categories (Cochran et al., 1980). Purposes for craft advisory committees are discussed first.

Purposes for Craft Advisory Committees

Advisory committee members are individuals selected from outside the education field who are willing to give their time and assistance in advising school officials regarding a school program. These people are selected for their specific knowledge and expertise in the given field (McQuay and Watters, 1980). Thus a joint effort is made by the school and the community toward providing young people the best education for occupational competency. Educators

can then give the most useful information and provide the

most representative equipment for their students.

VanAusdle and Peterson (1979) provide the following

list of reasons for vocational education advisory

committees:

1. To provide quality education,

2. To provide the best employees possible, and

3. To meet federal and state requirements (p. 6).

More specifically, Shinn (1975) reports that

The advisory committee should be a

sounding board for ideas, suggestions, and

advice on operating procedures. It is this

committee that should provide the direct and

definite conditions that are followed within

the actual program (p. 252).

Vocational education needs to be responsive to the needs and

desires of the community (Anderson, 1983). The advisory

committee can serve to link the school to the community. By

reviewing programs to ensure that curriculum and equipment

are state of the art, lab and classroom facilities are

appropriate, and instructors are technically competent, the

craft advisory committee keeps the school program in tune

with business and industry in the community. Nerden (1977)

points out that "advisory committees are essential to

vocational education because of the dynamic changes taking place in the nation's occupation structure" (p. 27).

In addition to providing technical assistance with program needs, the advisory committee can give prestige to the program and gain support for the program. Members are in a position to improve public relations for the school program and may be able to assist the program in financial matters through contributions or donations.

Clasby et al. (1977) reported three objectives of state and federal policymakers for providing advisory committees:

1. decreasing citizen cynicism, apathy, mistrust of government and public institutions, and restiveness about their costs;

2. combatting growing centralization and professional and bureaucratic control of schools; and

3. improving the quality of schools (p. 217).

Nerden (1977) agrees the use of advisory committees "results in better understanding of the vocational programs and their contributions" (p. 27). Citizen participation can make important contributions to attaining these objectives.

Curriculum Content Advisement Function

Curriculum content advisement involves reviewing objectives and program goals, instructional goals and objectives, and instructional activities and materials (Danenburg et al., 1975; Parry-Hill, 1981; Dieffenderfer,

1977; Huska, 1980). McQuay and Watters (1980) add that the craft advisory committee should "review objectives and competencies of a program and <u>advise</u> the institution as to whether they are realistic and within the scope of the program" (p. 3).

The craft advisory committee should provide realistic advice on what is current in business and industry so the program is relevant to what is needed of students and graduates on the job (Huska, 1980; Riendeau, 1977; Dieffenderfer, 1977). VanAusdle and Peterson (1979) and Wheeler (1981) report a function of the committee is to assist in surveys of local labor market trends and work force projections to determine employment needs and opportunities, employment standards and skills, equipment requirements, and available entry-level occupations and positions. The literature supports this as a function of the craft advisory committee.

Not only are goals and objectives reviewed, but the advisory committee should also assist in the formulation of goals and objectives as well as make recommendations on policies and the vocational program (Parry-Hill, 1981; Dieffenderfer, 1977; Henry and Omvig, 1981; Huska, 1980). Cochran et al. (1980) add the need for curriculum articulation and student organization involvement by the members of the advisory committee. The course content of

any program should be congruent to the other school

programs' and articulation is necessary for prerequisite as

well as advanced courses.

Establishing and maintaining a current library of

visual aids, magazines, books, models, and other exhibits

and membership in industrial organizations are functions for

the craft advisory committee member ("Maintain an

Occupational," 1985; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979;

Dieffenderfer, 1977). Cochran et al. (1980) write more

specifically that the craft committee should review

the technical recency and accuracy of the materials and

resources available (p. 66).

Equipment, Facilities, and Instructional Resources Function

This function involves the members of the advisory

committee in reviewing equipment, facilities, and

instructional resources used in the program to ensure they

are safe, adequate, and representative of business.

Riendeau (1977), McQuay and Watters (1980), Light (1982),

VanAusdle and Peterson (1979), Shinn, (1975), and Cochran et

al. (1980) list reviewing and helping to obtain equipment

and teaching materials as a major responsibility of the

craft advisory committee. The members of the craft

committee should decide if the present facilities provide a

proper learning environment for all students, including

disadvantaged and handicapped. Providing financial support

and donations may be of great use to the program in securing
needed equipment and supplies.

Reviewing facilities, tools, and equipment for
obsolescence is very important to a data processing program.
Carroll (1981) writes the craft advisory committee should
"recommend improvements consistent with advancements in the
state of the art" (p. 19). The craft advisory committee
reviews facilities in terms of the needs of employers; the
committee members may assist in forecasting trends and help
cite future developments based on their knowledge and
experience and by conducting surveys of the local employers.

Community Resource Coordination Function

As a community resource liaison, the craft advisory
committee members coordinate among the school, business,
industry, health agencies, and community groups. The
members may attend meetings to show support for vocational
education (VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979) or visit other
councils both in and out of the community to determine their
involvement and actions (Price, 1977).

The advisory committee may assist in the preparation
and review of budget requests. It also may lend assistance
by supporting grants and external funding from agencies,
industry, and local, state, and national legislative bodies
(Danenburg et al., 1975; McQuay and Watters, 1980; Huska,
1980; Price, 1977; Wheeler, 1981; Henry and Omvig, 1981).

The craft advisory committee may secure funding for instructors to attend professional and industrial meetings, workshops, and seminars on the regional or national level. The committee members might also obtain membership for instructors in industry organizations (Dieffenderfer, 1977; "Maintain an Occupational," 1985). This allows instructors direct access to industry and business workers.

Another area of community coordination for the craft advisory committee members is to provide competent resource individuals to relate knowledge pertaining to the job to classes (Light, 1982; Dieffenderfer, 1977; Shinn, 1975). These outside speakers or guest instructors provide credible experiences for students.

The craft advisory committee members may also be used as speakers themselves to address trade and civic groups (VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). This gives members a chance to relate opportunities for trained people to obtain industry jobs.

The craft committee may arrange field trips and plant visits for students, instructors, and counselors ("Guide for Organizing," 1977; Carroll, 1981; Dieffenderfer, 1977; "Maintain an Occupational," 1985; Riendeau, 1977; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). This provides motivation as well as valuable information to participants about job sites, working conditions, equipment, work habits, and ideals.

Career Guidance and Placement Services Function

One of the first activities involved in this function is getting students into the program. The advisory committee members may assist in screening students applying for admission to courses or to the program ("Advisory Committee Handbook," 1979; "Community Involvement," 1977; Danenburg et al., 1975; Henry and Omvig, 1981; Huska, 1980; Light, 1982; Parry-Hill, 1981; Rivera and DeSanctis, 1981; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). This interaction may be encouragement and support ("Advisory Committee Handbook," 1979); the development of student selection criteria ("Community Involvement," 1977; Huska, 1980; Light, 1982); or information concerning desirable attitudes, education, and experience necessary for success (VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979).

The craft advisory committee members provide guidance literature to the teacher, counselors, and students ("Guide for Organizing," 1977; "Maintain an Occupational," 1985) and assist with coordinating planning and action to avoid unneeded duplication of programs and services (Price, 1977; Light, 1982; Huska, 1980). They may also coordinate educational programs with other related programs in the community (Huska, 1980; "Guide for Organizing," 1977) as well as within the college (Light, 1982).

Employment information such as job descriptions and standards for entry-level positions may be provided by craft advisory committee members. They may also provide information about skills and attitudes to enhance careers (Danenburg et al., 1975; Huska, 1980; Henry and Omvig, 1981; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). The committee members may assist in the establishment of standards of proficiency for students and measurements that assure the competencies are met (Carroll, 1981; Light, 1982; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979).

Other than information about jobs, the committee members may provide information about occupational opportunities for internships and employment positions for graduates (Carroll, 1981; Danenburg et al., 1975; Dieffenderfer, 1977; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). Students may be assisted in obtaining part-time employment during the school year as well as summer employment. Guidance may be given students in the cooperative education program concerning wages and hours they may work.

The committee members may assist with the development of adult continuing education courses, apprenticeship programs, and on-the-job related instruction for upgrading workers, retraining workers, and for lifelong learning pursuits (Light, 1982; "Maintain an Occupational," 1985; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). Information may also be

provided concerning evening courses to workers in specific occupations.

Another aspect of the guidance and placement function is job placement for graduates. Members may identify job openings and assist graduates to secure employment (Danenburg et al., 1975; Huska, 1980; Parry-Hill, 1981; Carroll, 1981; Wheeler, 1981; Light, 1982).

Help for students may be provided in the form of scholarships, prizes, and awards for outstanding students and faculty. The committee may establish a local program where none exists or assist in development of criteria for awards ("Guide for Organizing," 1977; Huska, 1980; "Maintain an Occupational," 1985; Parry-Hill, 1981).

Program Evaluation Function

The craft advisory committee may assist in evaluation of the program by reviewing the program evaluation report and answering questions about equipment available, the needs of the community, and the needs of the students. Members of the committee may recommend criteria for evaluation or develop evaluation instruments. Accomplishment of goals and priorities would be evaluated to see if revision is necessary. ("Guide for Organizing," 1977; "Community Involvement," 1977; Huska, 1980; Light, 1982; "Maintain an Occupational," 1985; McQuay and Watters, 1980; Parry-Hill, 1981; Price, 1977; Riendeau, 1977).

The program length, sequence in which content is presented, and the time distribution of coursework are topics of concern to the craft advisory committee in evaluating a program. The curriculum is reviewed for obsolescence and appropriateness in training individuals to enter the work field or to flow into higher learning ("Advisory Committee Handbook," 1979; Carroll, 1981; Henry and Omvig, 1981; Light, 1982; McQuay and Watters, 1980; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979; Wheeler, 1981).

Community Public-Relations Function

Price (1977), Riendeau (1977), Shinn (1975), and others report acting as a communication link between the school and community occupational groups and the public as a function of the craft advisory committee. The committee members are in an excellent position to endorse vocational education and specific programs and to assist in the development of community understanding and support of the program.

Through contact with business and industry, professional clubs and organizations, civic groups, and trade groups, members of the advisory committee can help gain support for vocational education programs. Members of the craft committee can serve as speakers to address groups and provide news releases to industrial magazines or newsletters ("Maintain an Occupational," 1985; Danenburg et al., 1975; Dieffenderfer, 1977). In addition to providing

news releases, the advisory committee members may evaluate
the department's public relations policies and actions
(Dieffenderfer, 1977).

The craft committee members can sell a program to the
community by encouraging young people and parents to
consider a particular field or program (Huska, 1980;
VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979). They can give prestige and
respect to the school, community, and vocational program.

Professional Development Function

The craft advisory committee members may assist in
establishing qualifications for faculty and recommend
qualified teachers (Danenburg et al., 1975; Huska, 1980;
Carroll, 1981; McQuay and Watters, 1980; Riendeau, 1977;
Parry-Hill, 1981). The members are in an excellent position
in the community to know competent personnel from business
and industry and may even assist in the selection process
(Light, 1982; McQuay and Watters, 1980; VanAusdle and
Peterson, 1979).

The committee may assist in evaluating the teacher's
performance (Danenburg et al., 1975) and in providing the
teacher with technical assistance. Technical assistance may
be in the form of providing opportunities to upgrade the
teacher's technical skills and knowledge through summer
employment or other work experience to help the teacher

remain competent with changing technology or inservice
teacher training clinics or workshops.

Organizational Structure of Advisory Committees

There is much written concerning the manner in which an
advisory committee should be organized. In this section,
the organizational structure of an advisory committee is
presented with reference to the selection of committee
members, orientation of committee members, advisory com-
mittee meetings, and committee structure and term of
membership.

Selection of Committee Members

Cochran et al. (1980), McQuay and Watters (1980), Light
(1982), and VanAusdle and Peterson (1979) state that a list
of qualified candidates for advisory committee membership
should be developed which is representative of the
community. These candidates should have the ability and
willingness to participate and cooperate. Shinn (1975)
recommends that committee members be selected on the basis
of the following qualifications:

- be presently engaged in or connected with the work
  community in positions directly related to your
  program;

- be interested in and enthusiastic about your
  program's activities;

- be willing to give of their time to attend regularly
  scheduled meetings, make visitations, and serve on
  advisory committee-appointed committees;

- have a wide variety of educational and work
  experience backgrounds;

- be willing and capable of providing positive input at
  meetings (p. 252).

Land (1971) lists factors under the two groups

community representation and personal qualifications as

criteria for his theoretical model used to select advisory

committee members:

Community representation criteria

   Type of business or industry

   Employer or employee representative

   Geographic area represented

   Representative of the general public

Personal qualification criteria

   Individual characteristics, such as leadership,

      character, experience, etc.

   Available time of individual members (p. 52).

Orientation of Committee Members

A handbook, published by the Alabama State Department

of Education, Guide for Organizing and Utilizing Local

Vocational Education Advisory Councils (1977) states "The

effectiveness of an advisory council will be in part

dependent upon the type and amount of information made

available to it and how members perceive their role" (p. 4).

Schultz et al. (1980) concluded that councils not performing

functions indicative of an effective council "may be a

reflection of inadequate orientation to the roles and functions of advisory councils" (p. 10). Orientation information may be made available through oral presentations, guest speakers, and handbooks.

A study of 47 school systems utilizing advisory councils in Colorado by Williams as cited in Waldheim (1978) found a direct correlation between the more successful councils and good council organization; one success factor was adequate orientation of members. Riendeau (1977), Cochran et al. (1980), Carroll (1981), and VanAusdle and Peterson (1979) agree that the first meeting of the committee is an ideal time to orient each new member. A copy of the advisory committee handbook could be distributed and time taken to discuss:

1. an overview of the total educational program,

2. the career and occupational programs,

3. the role of the advisory committee,

4. the recent accomplishments of the committee,

5. the responsibilities and duties of committee members,

6. a list of advisory committees and of their members, and

7. the organizational structure and meeting plans.

Armfield (1981) stated that "It was unrealistic to expect new committee members to have full knowledge of the

educational program with which they would be involved" (p. 27). He further states that "an orientation session should be planned to allow committee members to become better informed of their duties" (p. 27). Gallon and Wattenbarger (1976) found data to support "the theory that basic to the effective use of a committee is the specification of its role" (p. 23). Danenburg et al. (1975) recommended that "specialized committee members need more orientation regarding the discharge of their responsibilities in all areas" (p. 16a). Oldham (1973), Oastler (1975), Behymer (1979), Wehmeier (1980), Light (1982), and Rinehart (1982) concur on inservice training to make committees more effective. Most writers feel that the first meeting, and more if needed, should be devoted to orientation.

Committee Size

It is agreed among writers that the size of the craft advisory committee should be small. Land (1971) found that craft committee membership ranged from four to 16 members according to five guides (AVA, 1950; King, 1960; Riendeau, 1967; Western New York School Study Council, 1968; AVA, 1969) on advisory committees. His research showed committee sizes were small, ranging from 2 to 14 members with a median size of 6. He found a size of 7 members to be the most popular. Nagel (1973) recommended an odd number of members, either 5 or 7, in order to be effective while

Cochran et al. (1980) suggested 5 to 8 but also stated the need to consider the purpose of the committee, the size of the program, the size of the community, and which groups are to be represented. The American Vocational Association (1969) suggested that committee size be 4 to 6 members. Riendeau (1977) reported small committees (five to ten members) could meet more frequently.

It seems that five to seven members for the craft advisory committee would serve most programs most effectively based on the ease of getting small groups together quickly and not having factions form within the committee. Nerden (1977) writes that the "committee should not be so large and unwieldy that it becomes a conference rather than an informal procedure for eliciting the best intelligence from the group" (p. 29). Riendeau (1977) summed up the issue by relating size to effectiveness:

> Finally, however, the effectiveness of the advisory committee, regardless of its size, depends on the nature of the organization and the leadership at the school. Under appropriate leadership, thirty-five-person committees have been known to perform wonders for occupational education programs, while five-person committees have collapsed under weak leadership (p. 14).

Membership Term

Most advisory committee writers feel that some regular system of replacement of committee members is best. Danenburg et al. (1975), Dieffenderfer (1977), Anderson (1983), Light (1982), Riendeau (1977), Rogers (1979), Cochran et al., (1980) agree on a three-year membership term for advisory committee members, while Nagel's (1973) findings are that members are generally appointed to two- or three-year terms. The most popular plan involves rotation, with one third of the members changing each year. Wehmeier (1980) found the use of staggered membership terms to be positively related to effective secondary vocational education committees. A new committee might draw for the term of membership for each member for the first time; ongoing committees would select members for three-year terms. This plan gives the committee continuity through memberships from the past and fresh ideas and approaches through the new members.

Whether members can serve consecutive terms draws conflicting views. Shinn (1975) recommends that members be appointed for only one-year terms with reappointment if a member is productive and willing to serve another term. McQuay and Watters (1980) report that reappointment should be a possibility while the Advisory Committee Handbook of Bergen Community College (1979) states that "A person who

has served a term should be ineligible for re-appointment until one year has elapsed following expiration of his or her previous term." Anderson (1983) specifies that a member cannot serve more than two consecutive terms.

Riendeau (1977) and Light (1982) feel the issue of reappointment should not force an outstanding member to leave the committee. The advantages of denying reappointment seem to outweigh the disadvantages. Riendeau specifies that whatever the method used to fill vacancies, the school administrator, not the committee members being replaced, should select the replacement so self-perpetuation of the committee by members naming their own successors is avoided.

Most writers agree that giving many community members opportunity to serve on an advisory committee creates a positive atmosphere for the program while injecting new life and approaches into the program. The three-year staggered rotation plan with members being eligible to serve another term after a year's lapse is a popular plan.

Number of Meetings

According to Riendeau (1977) and Cochran et al. (1980), the number of meetings should be related to real problems that challenge the group. AVA's guides Vocational Advisory Committees, 1950, and The Advisory Committee and Vocational Education, 1969, state that only two or three meetings a

year are not enough. Nagel (1973), Wehmeier (1980), and Light (1982) recommended that effective vocational advisory committee members should meet at least three times in an academic year while King (1960) suggested craft committees should meet at least once a month.

Most authorities agreed that meetings should be held only when pertinent questions are to be discussed and committee members can feel they have contributed worthwhile information. Meetings should be scheduled far enough in advance so attendance will be excellent.

Minutes of Committee Meetings

Minutes of committee meetings should be maintained as a historical record of the meeting, as a source of orientation for new members, as a means of providing regular reports to members, and as a basis for forming recommendations made by the committee (Cochran et al., 1980). Nagel (1973), McQuay and Watters (1980), Danenburg at al. (1975), and Light (1982) agree that minutes should be sent to committee members as a means of improving communications. Riendeau (1977) lists information which should be included within the minutes:

1. Date, time, and place of the meeting,

2. Name of presiding officer,

3. Names of those in attendance,

4. Name of the secretary,

5.   Dates of significant correspondence or other

documents considered at the meeting, and

6.   Important decisions and recommendations (p. 35).

Minutes should be filed at the institution and be available

to authorized personnel for review for as long as five years

(Riendeau).

Agenda for Meetings

A written agenda should be mailed to committee members

before each advisory committee meeting (Cochran et al.,

1980; Riendeau, 1977; Nerden, 1977; Rogers, 1979; Danenburg

et al., 1975).   Riendeau defines the agenda as "the plan for

the meeting in terms of items to be taken up and the time

schedule" (p. 29).   Agendas should be mailed approximately

one week (Light, 1982) to 21 days (McQuay and Watters, 1980)

prior to the meeting.   Landry (1973) adds that every agenda

should be "open and discussed prior to the meeting" (p. 6)

to permit additions, deletions, clarifications, and to

reduce uneasiness among committee members.   The agenda may

also serve as a reminder of a committee meeting.

Selection of Committee Chairperson

According to Cochran et al., (1980), VanAusdle and

Peterson (1979), Nerden (1977), and Light (1982), the

committee chairperson should be selected from the community

and he should be elected by the committee.   Riendeau (1977)

states that the chairperson may be either a lay person or a
school representative. Oastler (1975) reported that about
one half of the committees in his study elected the
chairperson from the membership and that if there is a
chairperson from industry, industry will likely express its
concerns and develop its rules and regulations concerning
the program (p. 23). Land (1971) found the "generally
agreed-upon policy of the theoretical model is that the
chairman be a layman, elected from the ranks by members of
the committee" (p. 21).

Committee Leadership

Committee leadership has been emphasized in the
literature on advisory committee effectiveness (Bartolomei,
1984). Gallon and Wattenbarger (1976) write that the
chairperson occupies a most strategic position; the
chairperson must understand group processes, know the
objectives of the committee, and understand the problems it
investigates (p. 14). Bregman (1979) goes further when he
states "The quality of local leadership will determine the
degree of success and participation" (p. 10). Williams (as
cited in Waldheim, 1978) found a direct correlation between
the more successful committees and good committee
organization and role characteristics in his study of 47
school systems in Colorado. One of the success components
was good leadership. Bartolomei's (1984) research

decisively demonstrated that the role of the chairperson (taken as a whole), chair personality, and chair coordination have a significant effect on committee effectiveness (p. 106). Huska (1980), Riendeau (1977), AVA (1969), and Cochran et al. (1980) concur that the role of the chairperson is extremely important to the success of the committee.

Leadership has been described as an art and is defined by Plunkett (1975) as "the ability to get work done with and through others while simultaneously winning their respect, confidence, loyalty, and willing cooperation" (p. 141). He writes that it is the second half of the definition that distinguishes a leader from a nonleader. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) define leadership as attempting to influence the behavior of someone else (p. 106). They further specify leadership is "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" and a function of the leader, the follower, and other situational variables (p. 83).

Duties of the Chairperson

To carry out the responsibilities of the position, the chairperson must perform certain duties. Cochran et al. (1980) list the following responsibilities of the chairperson:

1. Establish meeting dates and call the meeting to order,

2. Plan the meeting agenda with the individual(s) receiving advice from the committee,

3. Develop a sociable, relaxed, and rewarding atmosphere conducive to productive discussion and dialogue,

4. Plan committee activities and provide sufficient background information as needed,

5. Maintain the necessary personal contacts with members and school personnel,

6. Approve all announcements, notices, and other information sent to committee members,

7. Preside over all meetings, lead discussions, and bring closure on key points of discussion (p. 247).

It is the chairperson who determines strategies for getting work done, assigns tasks, and follows up on work. Riendeau (1977) adds that it is the responsibility of the chairperson to see that "the meetings start promptly, proceed effectively, and close when the designated closing time has been reached" (p. 31).

Personal Qualifications

Authorities on advisory committees often list basic attitudes, relationships, tools, and qualities for effective committee leadership. Riendeau (1977) reports that the

leader should attempt to be interested and sincere; be a good listener; be fair, courteous, and patient; and keep goals in mind (p. 21). He adds that the "ideal" leader would also possess tact, impartiality, poise, a sense of humor, and the ability to anticipate touchy subjects and deal with them (p. 21). Cochran et al. (1980) add being flexible, rational, and diagnostic to these traits and sum leadership qualities into empathy, self-awareness, and objectivity (p. 265).

Leadership Styles

Styles of leadership have been defined in different ways. Plunkett (1975) reports four primary styles: (1) autocratic, (2) bureaucratic, (3) democratic, and .(4) spectator (p. 146). This is a basic traditional business approach to leadership; each of these styles is briefly explained and then related to situational leadership as developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982).

The autocratic style is typified by the dictator who holds power and does not delegate to subordinates. This style is usually restricted to situations where subordinates are unfamiliar with the tasks to be accomplished or where time is too short to rely on explanation and group processes. Plunkett (1975) also restricts this style to stubborn or difficult situations where subordinates do not

respond to another style. This would seem to be an unlikely style for effective advisory committee work.

The bureaucratic style is typified by the use of rules, regulations, and policy by the leader. This style is useful when following procedures and rules strictly is necessary such as in research work, training in recordkeeping and filing, or when enforcing safety for routine, highly repetitive operations (Plunkett, 1975, p. 148). The bureaucratic style promotes strong work habits but little motivation for subordinates.

The democratic style promotes the idea of group decisions and sharing authority; this style is often called consultative, general, or participative. It is best used with those who are highly skilled or highly experienced at their jobs and where time is available for group participation. Cooperation and group spirit are promoted through this people-oriented approach.

The spectator style allows everyone to be treated as an individual; subordinates are treated as experts in their field. This works well with highly skilled, experienced, and educated people or when using outside experts as consultants. This style usually promotes high levels of individual output, independence, and pride.

Hersey and Blanchard base situational leadership on an "interplay among (1) the amount of guidance and direction

(task behavior) a leader gives; (2) the amount of socioemotional support (relationship behavior) a leader gives; and (3) the readiness ('maturity') level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function, or objective" (p. 150). This concept gives leaders an understanding of the relationship between the level of maturity of their followers and an effective style of leadership. Each of their four styles--telling, selling, participating, and delegating--is a combination of direction provided by the leader (task behavior) and communication between the leader and subordinate (relationship behavior) (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p. 152).

The telling style (S1) is high on direction, control, and close supervision. It is used with people who are both unable and unwilling to take responsibility to do something; they are not competent or skilled because they have not been trained and are not confident or secure attempting the task (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p. 153). This style is low in the areas of support and communication from the leader. This style would closely parallel the autocratic style defined by Plunkett.

The selling style (S2) is a directing and supporting style of leadership. It is useful with people who do not have the necessary skills or knowledge but are willing to take responsibility; these people are confident but lack

ability at this time. The leader provides support through two-way communication and explanation to reinforce the willingness and enthusiasm while still providing most of the direction for the task (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p. 153). The followers are given the reason and explanation for decisions and rules and are thus more inclined to perform as directed. The selling style involves high task behavior and high relationship behavior; it does not closely parallel any of the styles Plunkett described.

The participating style (S3) is a supportive, non-directive approach useful with people who are able but unwilling to do what the leader wants; these people may lack confidence or they are insecure and need motivation (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p. 153). The leader needs to use two-way communication and share decision making with the subordinate; thus the style involves high relationship behavior and low task behavior. It closely parallels the democratic style of Plunkett.

The delegating style (S4) is useful with people who are both able and willing or confident to take responsibility; these persons, when given a problem, are capable of working with little direction or support. The delegating style involves low relationship behavior and low task behavior. It closely parallels the spectator style Plunkett defines.

<u>Style Effectiveness</u>

Authorities on leadership recognize that certain styles are more effective in some situations. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) use their situational leadership theory to assess the maturity level of the follower(s) and then have the leader behave as the model prescribes. According to Landry (1973) the functional leadership approach best fits the needs of a democratic group situation so the group's output will be maximized and each member's talents will be utilized. This approach encourages members to focus on the progress of the group and to participate in the group. Each member of the committee needs to perform the function needed by the group at any particular time; leadership is not a matter of who holds the position. Hagmann (1973) found that educators felt the use of democratic leadership in the craft advisory committee meeting was important while lay advisory committee members emphasized the use of authoritarian leadership. Such conflicts in research are not unique to advisory committees; Hersey and Blanchard (1982) report on studies with conflicting results and provide situational leadership as a way to understand research findings which seem incompatible with each other (p. 167).

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter has reviewed the literature relevant to craft advisory committees. Most of the literature on craft

advisory committees consists of publications which discuss functions, activities, organizational structure, and the rationale for establishing advisory committees. This literature review has been dominated by experience related publications and handbooks which are not research based.

Research on the characteristics, activities, and functions of local advisory committees has been conducted by Armfield (1981), Waldheim (1979), Behymer (1977), Danenburg et al. (1975), Oastler (1975), and Land (1971). Fewer studies have evaluated effectiveness of local advisory committees (Bartolomei, 1984; Latham, 1981; Schultz et al., 1980; Danenburg et al., 1975; Nagel, 1973). These studies provide minimal data based on research.

CHAPTER III - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

· The purpose of this study was to describe how postsecondary data processing advisory committees in the Southeast Region of the American Technical Education Association are organized and operated, to provide an estimate of the effectiveness of data processing advisory committees based on selected procedures and functional standards, and to assess the relationship of effectiveness of data processing advisory committees to leadership styles of the chairpersons of those committees. The findings provide a knowledge base for vocational educators to use in upgrading the level of effectiveness of current advisory committees and serve as a basis for new committee development.

Description of Research Methodology

Descriptive research is used "to describe systematically a situation or area of interest factually and accurately" (Isaac and Michael, 1985, p. 42). Van Dalen and Meyer (1966) state that the purpose of survey studies is to "collect detailed descriptions of existing phenomena with the intent of employing the data . . . to make more intelligent plans for improving them" (p. 207). Descriptive survey research was used for this study to (a) obtain and assess data about active postsecondary data

processing advisory committees, (b) obtain responses to the questionnaires, and (c) categorize these data.

To help offset the most common disadvantage of the mailed questionnaire (Isaac and Michael; 1985)--low response rate--a modified approach of the total design method as outlined by Dillman (1977) was followed.

Procedures

Phase One. The first part of the design involved a folded postcard questionnaire (see Appendix A) which was mailed along with a cover letter (see Appendix B) explaining the purpose and benefits of the survey to the chairperson of the data processing department of all two-year postsecondary schools in the Southeast Region of the American Technical Education Association. The postcard was designed to be easy to complete and return. The returned postcard indicated whether the data processing program had utilized an advisory committee for the 1986-1987 academic year, how many times the committee met during that academic year, composition of the committee, the name and address of the department head, and whether or not the department head was willing to participate further in the study. A committee was considered active if it had met at least twice during the academic year 1986-87 under the leadership of the same committee chairperson.

The cover letter provided information concerning how the instruments should be distributed and the approximate time involved to complete the instruments. The department head was asked to be the contact person for response follow up. This meant the department head was willing to contact an advisory committee member by telephone and ask that the survey be completed and returned if a response had not yet been received by the researcher.

If the department head decided his advisory committee would not participate in the study, the department head was asked to make the appropriate response on the card and sign and return it within one week. This mailing encompassed 143 postsecondary data processing programs in public community, junior, and technical schools as identified by each state's Council of Higher Education (or equivalent): 23 from Virginia, 30 from North Carolina, 15 from South Carolina, 28 from Georgia, and 47 from Florida.

After a period of two weeks, a follow-up postcard (see Appendix C) was mailed as a reminder to those department heads who had not responded asking for a response within one week. The postcard was written as a thank you for those who had returned their questionnaires, but as a reminder to those who had not (Dillman, 1977).

The returned cards were sorted into two separate categories: (1) programs with committees willing to

participate and (2) programs either without active committees or unwilling to participate. This phase resulted in information needed to complete a mailing list for the second phase of the study.

The second follow-up was a telephone call to nonrespondent data processing department heads. The call was made to ask the department head about receiving the survey participation request letter. If it had not been received, an explanation of the study was given and a verbal response secured at this time. This phase resulted in the mailing list of advisory committees willing to participate in the study.

Phase Two. A package of instructions, cover letters, and questionnaires (see Appendix D) was then mailed to the school if the advisory committee was active and willing to participate. The cover letter was prepared to convince the reader that the survey instrument was worthy of completion. An appeal was made that each individual's contribution was important in solving the problem of identifying advisory committee practices, activities, and leadership style to optimize the use of the advisory committee. The survey was identified by a number which was explained in the letter.

The Descriptive Information on the Data Processing Committee instrument gathered data on the operating procedures and structure of participating advisory

committees using a detailed questionnaire. This instrument was sent to data processing department heads for completion because they would be better informed concerning the data requested.

This phase also gathered data on leadership style of the chairperson using the Leader Behavior Analysis II-Self (LBAII-Self) (Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., 1985) (see letters in Appendix E). The LBAII was completed by each advisory committee chairperson to provide information which would identify leadership style of the respondent. Each chairperson also completed a brief descriptive information survey.

The advisory committee members provided information on committee effectiveness and functions performed by the advisory committee. If the committee performed a function during the academic year, members were asked to rate the function using a five point scale for very ineffective to very effective. This survey (Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees) consisted of twenty-one items. This survey was also completed by business division heads.

After a period of about four weeks, a follow-up letter (see Appendix F) was mailed to each school requesting contact be made with nonrespondents. The code numbers for nonrespondents were included so the school would know which

surveys had not been received and they could contact those committee members.

Population

The population for this study was data processing advisory committees at the postsecondary level in the Southeast Region of the American Technical Education Association. Only two-year community, junior, and technical colleges with data processing or computer science programs as identified by the director of the council of higher education (or equivalent in each state) were used to provide responses to the committee organization, functions, and leadership style data being investigated.

Instruments

Four instruments were used to obtain data in this study: (a) the Data Processing Advisory Committee Data was a postcard questionnaire used for initial contact information to determine the existence of active committees, (b) the Descriptive Information on the Data Processing Committee was used to collect data on operating procedures and structure of the committees, (c) the Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees was used to collect data concerning the functions committees performed and the effectiveness of those functions, and (d) the Leader Behavior Analysis II-Self was

used to assess the leadership style of the advisory committee chairperson. These instruments are described in the following sections.

Data Processing Advisory Committee Data Instrument. The data processing or computer programming department heads were asked to provide the initial information about the committee, as well as the name and address, office hours and telephone number of the department head. This questionnaire was in the form of a postcard; it was designed to be easy to complete and return. It was printed on card stock in a fold-over style and was self-addressed and postage paid. Its results would provide the mailing list for the next phase of the study.

It was accompanied by a cover letter on quality bond paper explaining the study and requesting the assistance of the department head to distribute the survey instruments on committee functions and effectiveness and leadership style to be used in the next phase of the study. The department head was also asked to participate in the follow up of advisory committee members, if necessary, by placing a telephone call to request completion and mailing of the survey. It was stressed that this would be easy to do and not require much of the valuable time of the department head.

<u>Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory</u>
<u>Committees Instrument</u>. A review of the literature revealed
operating procedures and functions indicative of effective
advisory committees. Several instruments designed to
measure council and committee effectiveness were found.
Gallon and Wattenbarger (1976), Waldheim (1978), and Dunn
(1983) all investigated the effectiveness of advisory
councils in vocational education. Danenburg (1975), Oastler
(1975), Schultz et al. (1980), Behymer (1979), and
Bartolomei (1985) studied effectiveness in vocational craft
advisory committees. Land (1971) identified functions
indicative of effectiveness in vocational education advisory
councils and craft advisory committees in Utah.

Based on instruments reviewed from the literature, the
Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory
Committees survey was developed. The survey instrument was
based on a section of a questionnaire designed by Schultz et
al. (1980) for postsecondary vocational program advisory
committees in Iowa which contained 23 items on local
advisory committee functions. Dunn (1983) revised this
instrument to contain 21 items which were the basis for the
survey used in this research. The items were reworded
resulting in 21 Likert-type committee effectiveness items
designed to obtain descriptive data on organization and
operation procedures.

Evidence of content validity was provided by Schultz et al. (1980) through a principal components analysis used to extract the maximum amount of variance as each factor was calculated. Initial factors were extracted so they were independent (or orthogonal) from one another. Kerlinger (1973) defines factor analysis as "a method for determining the number and nature of the underlying variables among larger numbers of measures" (p. 659). The Kaiser Criterion was used to determine the number of factors; the eigenvalue (characteristic root) had to be greater than one for a factor to be retained and the resulting factors were then rotated using varimax procedures (Schultz et al., 1980). The varimax rotation was used to obtain the most parsimonious, the simplest or best, factor structure; it is an orthogonal rotation performed to maximize the variance of the squared loadings for each factor. The initial number of factors remains the same and the factors are still orthogonal.

The factor analysis resulted in four factors: I--planning and evaluating programs; II--developing curriculum; III--placing students; and IV--promoting programs. These four factors accounted for 88.9 percent of the total variance in committee effectiveness and had reliability coefficients using the Spearman Brown procedure of .96, .93, .70, and .83, respectively (Schultz et al., 1980, p. 7).

Descriptive Information on Data Processing Advisory

Committees Instrument. The Descriptive Information on Data

Processing Advisory Committees questionnaire was completed

by data processing department heads. A cover letter on

quality bond paper explaining the 17-item survey and return

procedures along with a preaddressed, stamped, return

envelope accompanied each questionnaire. This questionnaire

consists of items taken from Section IV of the Local

Advisory Committee Study (Schultz et al., 1980). Items

related to vocational committees in a general sense were

omitted and rewording was done where necessary to avoid

terms related to high schools.

Leadership Style Instrument. The Leader Behavior

Analysis II-Self (LBAII-Self) was designed to determine

leadership style. This instrument was given to committee

chairpersons for completion. Hersey and Blanchard's

situational leadership theory was the theoretical framework

for the LBAII-Self which was designed to measure style,

style flexibility, and style effectiveness. Permission to

use this instrument for research purposes was obtained from

Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., in California.

Two forms of the LBAII exist: (a) LBAII-Self measures the

leader's self-perception of his or her own behavior and (b)

LBAII-Other reflects the perceptions of the leader's

subordinates, peers, or superiors. Haley (1983) calculated

Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for the LBAII-Self are S1 - .83, S2 - .62, S3 - .69, and S4 - .84. (Haley, 1983). The time requirement for completion of the scale is approximately fifteen minutes and it contains twenty leadership situations; respondents must read the situation and choose from four alternative actions the one which would best describe their behavior in that situation. The four alternatives provide a high task and low relationship behavior (telling style), a high task and high relationship behavior (selling style), a high relationship and low task behavior (participating style), and a low relationship and low task behavior (delegating style).

Data Collection

The Data Processing Advisory Committee Data instrument was mailed to all public two-year community, junior, and technical colleges in the five states comprising the Southeast Region of the American Technical Education Association. It was mailed to the data processing or computer programming department chairperson for completion. Returns of these questionnaires resulted in a list of those schools having active data processing or computer programming advisory committees along with the name and address of the head of the department and an indication of willingness to participate in the distribution and follow up for the study. Active advisory committees were those

which had been in existence during the 1986-1987 academic
year and had met at least twice during that time. This list
was used to prepare the mailing list for the next phase of
the investigation.

The second phase involved sending a package of
questionnaires to those schools identified by the first
instrument. Their purpose was to determine the
effectiveness of the committees, to ascertain what functions
the committees had performed, to collect organization and
operations data about the committees, and to assess the
leadership styles of the chairpersons.

The Descriptive Information on the Data Processing
Advisory Committee survey was to be completed by the data
processing department head. The survey was returned
directly to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped
envelope provided.

The leadership style survey was completed by the
advisory committee chairperson to identify leadership style.
The LBAII-Self by Blanchard, Hambleton, Forsyth, and Zigarmi
(1985) was developed to measure leader behavior based on
one's own perceptions. This instrument was sent by the
department head to the chairperson and forwarded directly to
the researcher in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

The Organization and Operation of Data Processing
Advisory Committees survey was completed by each advisory

committee member. This survey consisted of 21 items to be checked by committee members if the committee participated in the activity during the academic year. A second rating for effectiveness was then given for each function the committee participated in. Each committee member received a cover letter and stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the survey to the researcher.

This survey was also completed by the division heads at each school whose copies were on blue paper to easily distinguish them from members' copies. Division heads checked each function the advisory committee performed and then rated the effectiveness of the committee on that function.

Data Analysis

Data analysis of the descriptive data consisted of tabulating the responses using descriptive statistic techniques: frequency counts, percentages, and means. These data were utilized to prepare a profile of respondents who participated in the study with respect to the organization and operation of data processing advisory committees.

Using the results of the Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees instrument the relative degree of effectiveness of committees was determined through the computation of a mean score for each of the 21 items and

a composite mean score of committee effectiveness for each
committee (Parks, 1982; Salvatoriello, 1979; Gallon and
Wattenbarger, 1976; Oastler, 1975). The total average score
for each committee was computed by adding the means for the
21 items for each committee member together and then finding
the average. Responses to the questionnaire items were on a
scale of 1 to 5, ranking the activity or function as
follows:

1 - Very ineffective

2 - Ineffective

3 - Neither effective nor ineffective

4 - Effective

5 - Very effective

The committee was considered effective if the composite mean
score was 4.0 or higher. The mean scores for each of the
four factors contributing to effectiveness were also
computed and examined in relation to leadership style for
the committee.

As a check on the reliability of the effectiveness
scores, the committee members' scores for effectiveness were
compared to the division heads' scores. The Spearman rho
correlation coefficient was calculated on the ranked
averages for the two groups.

The LBAII Scoring Directions (Blanchard, Hambleton,
Forsyth, and Zigarmi, 1985) were used to provide feedback on

leadership style. A primary leadership style was determined by combining responses to the 20 questions into style categories. The style with the most selections was the primary style. If a primary style did not emerge, the case was dropped from the computations.

To relate effectiveness of data processing advisory committees to leadership styles, the effectiveness mean scores for committees were ranked into two categories (effective and neutral). The committee was considered effective if the composite mean score was 4.0 or above and neutral if the score was above 2.0 and below 4.0. If there were scores of 2.0 and below, a third (low) category would have been formed. From these categories a Chi Square test of independence was performed using a two by two contingency table. Correlation coefficients were then computed to measure the degree of relationship between leadership style and effectiveness scores for committees.

CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of a five-state survey of data processing advisory committees at two-year, postsecondary institutions. The data were obtained from survey questionnaires mailed to data processing department heads at participating schools; the surveys were distributed by the department heads to committee members and division heads. Each committee member returned the completed instrument to the researcher. The description and analysis of these data are presented in five sections: overview of the study returns, survey results for research questions one through three, and summary.

Overview of Study Returns

On November 9, 1987, 143 letters requesting participation in the study were mailed; on November 30, 1987, follow-up postcards were mailed to 95 nonrespondents. (The total response breakdown for the five state area after each phase of the study is presented in Table 1.) After this follow-up contact, responses totaled 64 (45%) with 31 committees (48%) agreeing to participate. Telephone contacts were begun on January 28, 1988, and continued through February 2, 1988; this brought total responses to 110 (77%) with 51 committees (46% of the total respondents) agreeing to participate in the study.

Of the 59 responding but not participating committees, 40 (68%) reported no active data processing advisory committee during the academic year and 19 (32%) chose not to participate with no explanation given.

Of the 51 committees agreeing to participate, 36 (71%) provided usable responses. A committee's response was deemed usable when at least 75% of the members and the committee chairperson responded. After agreeing to participate, 15 committees were lost from the study, seven of these due to inadequate member response rate. Four committees returned the complete survey package after receipt, two committees had the chairperson for the year of the study resign and move from the geographic area, and two committees responded they had been inactive for the year of the study after receiving the survey package.

After collecting the surveys, the data were analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques.

Committee Descriptive Information

Descriptive information on each committee was supplied by the data processing department head in each school. A representative picture of data processing advisory committees in the southeastern region of the United States was developed.

Twenty-three (64%) of the responding committees have been in existence for 6 to 7 years with the remainder

Table 1

Participation Rates by State During Study Phases

	FLORIDA	GEORGIA	NORTH CAROLINA	SOUTH CAROLINA	VIRGINIA	TOTALS
PHASE ONE						
Request for Participation						
Contacts	47	28	30	15	23	143
Responses	13	5	9	6	15	48
Agreed to Participate	3	2	7	3	7	22
Not Active	5	3	2	2	7	19
Will Not Participate	5	0	0	1	1	7
Postcard Follow-up						
Contacts	34	23	21	9	8	95
Responses	3	5	3	1	4	16
Agreed to Participate	3	2	2	0	2	9
Not Active	0	3	0	0	1	4
Will Not Participate	0	0	1	1	1	3
Telephone Follow-up						
Contacts	17	9	11	7	2	46
Agreed to Participate	7	3	7	2	1	20
Not Active	6	5	3	2	1	17
Will Not Participate	4	1	1	3	0	9
Phase One Summary						
Response Number	33	19	23	14	21	110
Agreed to Participate	13	7	16	5	10	51
Not Active	11	11	5	4	9	40
Did Not Participate	9	1	2	5	2	19
PHASE TWO						
Questionnaire Package						
Agreed to Participate	13	7	16	5	10	51
Participated	8	5	11	4	8	36

fewer than 5 years. Twenty-two (61%) of the committees had
6 to 10 members, 8 (22%) had 11 or more members, and 6
committees (17%) had fewer than 6 members. Twelve (33%) of
the committees reported that they appoint committee members
for 3-year terms, 12 (33%) for indefinite terms, 9 (25%) for
2-year terms, 3 (8%) for a 1-year term. Twenty-seven (79%)
of the committees have staggered appointments providing for
overlapping membership with 32 (94%) committees allowing
members to succeed themselves.

The data processing department faculty appoint the
advisory committee members in 17 (40%) of the responding
schools, the data processing department head appoints
members to the committee in 12 (29%), the business or
technical division head appoints in 2 (5%), the school
president in 9 (21%), the advisory committee in 1 (2%), and
the college board in 1 (2%). Some schools marked more than
one response for this item, so the responses total more than
the total number of responding committees.

A majority (23 or 68%) of the committees elect the
chairperson from the membership. Seven (22%) of the data
processing department heads or faculty assume the role of
chairperson, 2 (5%) are appointed by the college president,
1 (3%) is appointed by the school dean, and 1 (3%) is
appointed by the head of the business or technical
division.

Responses for the following items concerning meeting notification, length of meeting, and prearrangement totaled only 34; two cases were lost from each item because of missing data. Seventeen committees (50%) report that members receive notification of meetings 14 to 21 days before the meeting, 7 committees (21%) receive notification 10 days before the meeting, 6 committees (18%) reported members receive notification as much as 20 to 30 days before the meeting, and 4 (12%) reported notification less than 10 days before a meeting. The preponderance (30 or 88%) of committees meet for one and one half to two hours at each session. The remainder reported meeting for one hour (2 committees or 6%) or for over two hours (2 committees or 6%). Forty-four percent of committees (15) report they meet both by a pre-established schedule and on a when-called basis while 32% (11) normally meet by pre-established schedule and 24% (8) normally meet only when called for a meeting.

Oral presentation was reported by 18 committees (48%) as the orientation technique most frequently used to train new committee members. Eight committees (21%) reported distribution and review of handbook and 2 committees (5%) reported audio-visual presentation were used to train new committee members. Ten of the committees (26%) responded that no organized orientation was used for new members.

These totals are larger than the number of cases because some committees responded more than once.

If an orientation was provided, the department head was asked to indicate all methods of orientation included; this item also resulted in larger totals than if each committee responded only once. The role of the committee was covered by 20 committees (56%) followed by program goals and objectives (18 committees or 50%) and committee goals and objectives (17 committees or 47%). Eleven committees (31%) include school goals and objectives in the orientation of new members, 10 (29%) cover recent committee activities, 9 (25%) incorporate vocational education objectives, and 4 (11%) include applicable state and federal laws. Twelve committees (33%) did not provide a response to this item.

The data processing department head received recommendations from committees in 14 (40%) of the colleges and the business or technical division head in 11 (31%) of the colleges. College presidents, data processing instructors, deans, and vice presidents of academic affairs or instructional affairs were other personnel who were sent recommendations from the committees.

Committee members in 30 colleges (83%) were recognized for their efforts by letters of thanks and 10 colleges (28%) use certificates or awards. Special recognition events (3

colleges or 8%) and news releases (2 colleges or 6%) were also used to express appreciation for contributions by advisory committee members. A number of committees reported more than one form of recognition.

Thirty-one of the responding committees (81%) would like to receive technical assistance on advisory committees from data processing department faculty. Six committees (19%) would like to receive technical assistance from vocational education advisory councils.

Results of the ranking by department heads for preferred methods for delivering technical assistance to committee members are reported in Table 2. The Other category was ranked first by 14 (39%) of the department heads. The Other item requested that the respondent specify what should be included; hardware and software representatives and professionals from the workplace were listed. Statewide conferences were ranked second with a mean of 4.61 for 18 department heads (50%). Newsletters were ranked fifth by 21 of the department heads (58%) and handbooks were sixth as ranked by 23 of the department heads (64%).

Chairperson Background

Data processing advisory committee chairpersons provided background information on themselves. Of the responding chairpersons, 76% reported they had served on an

Table 2

Preferred Method for Delivering Technical Assistance

to Advisory Committees

Item	n	Mean Rank
Other	14	5.00
Statewide conferences	18	4.61
Regional conferences in the state	22	4.27
Multi-media materials	18	3.83
No assistance needed	26	3.08
Newsletters	21	2.67
Handbooks	23	2.52

Note. Methods were ranked by respondents using a

scale from 1 to 7 with 1 being the most preferred.

advisory committee before their current role as chair-
person; 24% reported they had not served on a committee
before. Their average number of years of experience in the
data processing field was 12.8. The highest percentage of
chairpersons had management or administration degrees (42%)
with the Other category a close second (33%). The Other
category included high school graduates and accounting,
foreign language, engineering, physics, English, and MBA
degrees. Those with education degrees in data processing
(15%) were third and computer science degrees were fourth
(9%).

Current job positions reported were management or
administration (47%), computer analyst (22%), data
processing teacher (22%), and the Other category (9%)
included consultants, accountants, and nuclear physics
researchers. The type of organization where chairpersons
were employed included education (33%), service industry
(21%), manufacturing (21%), public service (9%), data
processing service center (6%), and sales (3%). The Other
category (6%) included consulting and a nuclear research
facility.

The size of the businesses where chairpersons were
employed ranged from small-medium to very large. There were
no responses for the 1 to 30 employees (small size)
category. About one quarter (27%) of the respondents work

in businesses with 51 to 200 employees and 73% work in businesses with more than 200 employees.

Committee chairpersons reported the number of civic organizations to which they belong. Forty-four percent reported they belong to 2 civic organizations, 26% belong to 1, 24% belong to more than 3, and 6% do not belong to any civic organizations. No chairpersons reported belonging to 3 civic organizations.

Effectiveness Data

The functions advisory committees perform and the relative effectiveness of the committee on each were rated by committee members using the Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees instrument. The percentages of committee members and division heads reporting their committee participation on 21 advisory committee functions during the academic year 1986-1987 is reported in Table 3. Identify occupational skills (item 3) ranked first for the most participation by committees as identified by committee members and division heads; Item 4, Recommend content of the program, was ranked second by committee members, but Item 10, Recommend employment standards was ranked second by division heads for participation. Both committee members and division heads rated item 17, Assist in development of instruction for

Table 3

Participation of Committee Members in Advisory

Committee Functions

Item No.	Item	Participation Identified By			
		Members		Division Heads	
		Number	%	Number	%
3	Identify occupational skills	244	78	33	94
4	Recommend content of program	243	78	30	86
5	Determine course relevancy	235	75	29	83
19	Evaluate on-going programs	235	75	31	89
10	Recommend employment standards	233	74	32	91
1	Develop program objectives	202	65	30	86
6	Identify area labor market needs	198	63	29	83
15	Establish cooper. relationships	185	59	26	74
12	Give advice about equipment	179	57	30	86
16	Keep voc. instructors informed	169	54	23	66
2	Establish sequence of courses	134	43	22	63
9	Identify co-op training sites	128	41	19	54
14	Communicate with community	106	34	18	51
8	Assist in placement of graduates	102	33	21	60
21	Develop continuing ed. programs	71	23	6	17
13	Select instructional materials	70	22	10	29
11	Assist in planning facilities	55	18	6	17
7	Help recruit students for program	51	16	7	20
20	Advise on program budget	46	15	6	17
17	Instruction for disadvantaged	26	8	3	9
18	Eliminate sex bias in voc. programs	24	8	2	6

disadvantaged and handicapped students and item 18, Help in elimination of sex bias in vocational programs as receiving the lease participation by committees.

Division heads reported more participation than committee members did on 18 of the 21 items (86%) on the instrument. Only 10 of the 21 items (48%) were reported by more than half of the committee members as functions participated in by their committee for the academic year. More than half of the division heads reported advisory committee participation on 14 (67%) of the items.

In addition to reporting which functions the committee worked on, members and division heads evaluated their effectiveness on these functions. Functions rated effective by committee members and division heads are reported in Table 4 and functions rated neither effective nor ineffective are in Table 5.

Committee members rated 11 of the 21 items on the instrument 4.0 or above (effective) and 10 received above 2.0 but less than 4.0 (neutral). None of the items received an average of 2.0 or less from either committee members or division heads.

The data processing advisory committee members reported an overall average for effectiveness of 4.04 for the 21 items on the Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory Committees instrument; business division heads

Table 4

Functions Rated Effective by Advisory

Committee Members and Business Division Heads

		Committee Members		Division Heads	
Item No.	Item	Per-cent[a]	Mean Effect-iveness	Per-cent[a]	Mean Effect-iveness
3	Identify occupational skills	78	4.23	94	4.18
10	Recommend employment standards	74	4.21	91	4.21
5	Determine course relevancy	75	4.20	83	4.17
4	Recommend content of programs	78	4.12	86	4.10
19	Evaluate on-going programs	75	4.12	89	4.06
6	Identify labor market needs	63	4.11	83	4.24
15	Cooperative relationships	59	4.11	74	4.19
2	Establish sequence of courses	43	4.11	63	4.13
1	Develop program objectives	65	4.10	86	3.96
16	Keep voc. instructors informed	54	4.06	66	4.08
14	Communicate with community	34	4.01	51	4.27

[a]Percent refers to the proportion of committee members or division heads indicating participation in that function.

Table 5

Functions Given Neutral Effectiveness Ratings by Advisory

Committee Members Compared to Business Division Heads

Item No.	Item	Committee Members		Division Heads	
		Per- cent*	Mean Effect- iveness	Per- cent*	Mean Effect- iveness
12	Give advice about equipment	57	3.84	86	4.10
9	Identify co-op training sites	41	3.81	54	3.89
13	Select instructional materials	22	3.75	29	3.90
11	Assist in planning facilities	18	3.62	17	4.16
21	Develop contin. ed. programs	23	3.50	17	4.00
8	Place graduates	33	3.48	21	3.80
7	Recruit students for program	16	3.31	20	3.28
20	Advise on program budget	15	3.23	17	4.16
18	Eliminate sex bias	8	2.84	6	4.00
17	Assist w/instr. for disad.	8	2.83	9	3.33

*Percent refers to the proportion of committee members or division heads

indicating participation in that function.

reported an overall average of 4.08 for effectiveness using

the same instrument. Committee members rated 11 of the

items in the effective range, but division heads rated 15 of

the items effective. Only one item was rated effective by

committee members and in the neither effective nor

ineffective range by division heads--item 1, Develop program

objectives.

Data processing advisory committee members thought they

were most effective helping with the identification of

occupational skills needed by program graduates (4.23, item

3) while division heads rated that item fifth with a 4.18

for overall effectiveness. Division heads felt the advisory

committee members were most effective in communicating with

the community about the vocational program (4.27, item 14)

and rated identifying area labor market needs (4.24, item 6)

second; committee members placed item 10--Recommend

employment standards--second with a 4.21 average

effectiveness rating and item 5--Determine course relevancy-

-third with a 4.20 effectiveness rating. Items 10 and 5

were placed third (4.21) and sixth (4.17), respectively, by

the division heads.

Committee members rated 10 of the items in the neutral

range for effectiveness. This means the item received lower

than a 4.0 and higher than a 2.0 rating (neither effective

nor ineffective) for overall effectiveness. Several of

these items (Nos. 11, 12, 18, 20, 21) received effective

ratings from division heads.

Of the 21 items on the survey, committee members gave 6

of them higher effectiveness ratings (29%) than the division

heads (See Table 6). Four of these items (Nos. 1, 3, 4, and

5) are in the second factor--Developing Curriculum--as

determined by Schultz et al. (1980). Item 2 is also in

Factor II and was rated effective by both members and

division heads but division heads gave it a higher

effectiveness rating. One item (item 10) was rated the same

by members and division heads; this item is also in the

second factor.

The remaining 14 items (67%) were given higher

effectiveness ratings by division heads; 7 of the 8 items

(88%) in Factor I--Planning and Evaluating Programs were

from this category. Division heads gave higher

effectiveness ratings than members did to all of the items

in Factor III--Placing Students and Factor IV--Promoting

Programs.

A Spearman rho correlation coefficient was computed on

the ranked effectiveness ratings of committee members and

division heads for the 36 committees. The correlation

coefficient of .61 indicated a moderate positive relation-

ship; this coefficient is statistically significant at the

.01 level.

Table 6

Factor Items Rated Higher by Committee Members

or Division Heads

Factor	Item No.	Item	Rated Higher By[a]
I. Planning and Evaluating Programs	11.	Plan facilities	D
	12.	Advise about equipment	D
	13.	Select materials	D
	17.	Plan for sp. needs students	D
	18.	Eliminate sex bias	D
	19.	Evaluate programs	C
	20.	Advise on budget	D
	21.	Develop continuing education	D
II. Developing Curriculum	1.	Develop objectives	C
	2.	Establish course sequence	C
	3.	Identify needed skills	C
	4.	Recommend content	C
	5.	Determine course relevancy	C
	10.	Recommend employ. standards	(Rated the Same)
III. Placing Students	6.	Identify labor market needs	D
	8.	Place graduates	D
	9.	Identify training sites	D
IV. Promoting Programs	7.	Recruit students	D
	14.	Communicate with community	D
	15.	Link school and community	D
	16.	Inform instructors of new methods	D

[a]C = Committee members and D = Division heads.

Factor mean scores for the committees are reported in
Table 7. The mean scores for Factors I, III, and IV
indicate that both committee members and division heads
perceive their committees to be neither effective nor
ineffective in these areas; for all three factors division
heads had a higher mean than committee members. The mean
scores for Factor II, however, are in the effective range
for both committee members and division heads, but
division heads had a slightly lower mean than the
committee members.

Leadership Style and Effectiveness

Question three assessed the effectiveness of data
processing advisory committees related to leadership style
of the committee chairperson. Originally, a three by four
contingency table was to be constructed using high,
medium, and low levels of effectiveness as the first
variable and the four categories of leadership style for
the second variable. However, the data yielded only
effective (4.0 and above) and neutral (above 2.0 and below
4.0) levels for effectiveness of committees and only three
categories of leadership style (no S4, delegating styles)
which would give a two by three table. This size table
would mean some cells contain too few cases. The S1,
telling style and S2, selling style are leadership styles
characterized by high task or directive behavior. The

Table 7

Factor Means for Advisory Committees

	Factor	Means	
		Committee Members	Division Heads
I.	Planning and Evaluating Programs	3.47	3.96
II.	Developing Curriculum	4.16	4.13
III.	Placing Students	3.80	3.98
IV.	Promoting Programs	3.87	3.96

leader defines roles and directs individuals with specific instructions and close supervision in these styles. Since the S1 and S2 styles are similar in task behavior, the two categories were combined. This resulted in the use of a two by two table.

After the leadership styles were categorized, 35 cases resulted. One case was lost because the chairperson did not have one primary leadership style.

The average means for all committees in each leadership category are reported in Table 8. The number of committees included in each cell is also shown. The S3 leadership style (participating style) has the greatest number and also the highest effectiveness average (4.14); the participating leadership style has a 3.87 average in the neutral effectiveness range and 11 cases.

The chi square test of statistical significance was applied to determine whether a relationship existed between the style of leadership of the chairperson and the overall effectiveness of the committee. A significant relationship between leadership style of the chairperson and effectiveness of the committee as rated by committee members could not be supported. The chi square value was 1.22 which was not significant at the .05 level. The contingency coefficient of .18 indicated a weak positive association between variables.

Table 8

Effectiveness Means by Leadership Style

for All Committees as Reported by Members

	Leadership Style			
	S1 & S2 [a]		S3 [b]	
Effectiveness Level	Mean	n	Mean	n
Effective	4.03	2	4.31	17
Neutral	3.48	5	3.87	11

[a]S1 refers to the telling leadership style and S2 refers to the selling style. [b]S3 refers to the participating leadership style.

The effectiveness average for each of the four factors in the questionnaire was also tested with leadership style to see if any relationship existed. Only Factor II—Developing Curriculum—resulted in a significant relationship with leadership style. The chi square value of 5.65 with one degree of freedom was sig- nificant at the .05 level; the contingency coefficient of .48 indicates a low to moderate positive association between leadership style and the Factor II responses for committee members.

Summary

This chapter presented the findings of the study with regard to functions advisory committees perform, their effectiveness as rated by committee members and division heads, committee organization and operations data, committee leadership styles for the chairpersons, and the association between leadership styles and committee effectiveness. Comparisons were made between committee members and business division heads on the performance of functions and effectiveness.

The findings indicate highest participation included identifying occupational skills, recommending content of the program, determining course relevancy, and evaluating on-going programs. The items rated as having the lowest participation were dealing with instruction for the

disadvantaged and elimination of sex bias in vocational programs.

Committee members felt they were most effective identifying occupational skills, recommending employment standards, and determining course relevancy. Assisting in the development of instruction for disadvantaged and handicapped and helping in the elimination of sex bias in vocational programs were functions rated least effective by committee members.

The study results indicate a relationship between committee leadership style and Factor II items. This association was significant at the .05 level. No significant relationship could be shown between leadership style and effectiveness of the committee.

CHAPTER V - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to ascertain how data processing advisory committees operate, how they are organized, what functions they perform, how effective the members and business division heads believe the committees are, and whether there is any relationship between the leadership style of the chairperson and the effectiveness of the committee. Little research has been undertaken in these areas on vocational education advisory committees; none was found on data processing advisory committees and the relationship between leadership style and effectiveness of the committee.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are derived from the study of data processing advisory committees in the southeastern region of the United States.

1. **Data processing committees in this study do not conform in several aspects to the modal pattern for craft advisory committees recommended in the literature.**

Data processing advisory committee organization and operations characteristics vary from guidelines presented in the literature on such items as committee size, terms of appointment, and orientation of committee members. According to the literature, committee size for the craft committee should be between five and seven members (Nagel,

1973; Cochran et al., 1980; Riendeau, 1977); 47 percent of the craft committees responding in this study have more than eight members. This large a committee is more the size for a general vocational education committee.

This study revealed 33% of the data processing advisory committees appoint committee members for indefinite terms. Three-year appointments are the recommended maximum advisable length of time for a committee appointment according to the literature (Danenburg at al., 1975; Dieffenderfer, 1977; Anderson, 1983; Light, 1982). Thirty-three percent of the committees reported member appointments are three years and 25% have two-year appointments. Seventy-nine percent reported have staggered appointments where members overlap and rotate years on the committee.

Appointment of advisory committee members was made by the faculty or head of the department in 69% of the responding schools in this study. Committee members chosen by the faculty may work more cooperatively and suggest needed recommendations for the department. Riendeau (1977) feels that school personnel should select members for committee appointment so self-perpetuation of the committee by members does not occur.

The selection of the chairperson by the advisory committee members is consistent with the literature.

Authorities agree the chairperson should be elected by the committee members (Cochran et al., 1980; VanAusdle and Peterson, 1979; Nerden, 1977; Land, 1971; Light, 1982). This would give the members an initial sense of accomplishment and commitment.

Orientation of new committee members was neglected by more than one-fourth (26%) of the committees responding. Schultz et. al (1980) reported 39% of council members indicated no orientation was provided. Since orientation of members is important to the effectiveness of the committee (Schultz et al., 1980; Gallon and Wattenbarger, 1976; Behymer, 1979; Wehmeier, 1980; Light, 1982; Rinehart, 1082), it is unclear why so many committees ignore instructing new members on their role and purpose.

When orientation was used, oral presentation was the most frequently used technique as reported by 48% of committee members. Schultz et. al (1980) found similar results with vocational councils.

2. **Data processing advisory committee members reported they perform functions related to developing curriculum more than other functions.**

Five of the six functions in Factor II--Developing Curriculum--were five of the top six functions advisory committee members reported they participated in during the academic year of the study. Evaluating programs (item 19)

was also given a high participation rating; this task is closely related to maintaining a relevant curriculum.

However, committee members did not report participation in functions that are current issues in vocational education such as instruction for disadvantaged and elimination of sex bias in programs. Only 8% of committee members reported participation in these functions and they rated their performance in the neither effective nor ineffective (neutral) range. Bartolomei (1984) found similar results in Michigan secondary schools.

3. **Data processing programs in postsecondary schools are not taking advantage of the potential benefits the craft advisory committee offers.**

Seventy-three percent of the responding schools not participating in the study reported no active advisory committee for the data processing program. Existing committees are not meeting as often as recommended in the literature. Authorities recommend that effective advisory committee members should meet at least three times in an academic year (Nagel, 1973; Wehmeier, 1980; Light, 1982) and King (1960) suggested craft committees should meet at least once a month. Nerden (1977) points out that "advisory committees are essential to vocational education because of the dynamic changes taking place in the nation's occupation structure" (p. 27). The craft advisory committee can

provide realistic advice on current trends and practices in business and industry. This is not possible where an active committee does not exist or does not meet.

4. Responding committee members consider their work effective on committee functions in the areas of developing curriculum and promoting programs.

Committee members felt they were effective with all six functions composing Factor II--Developing Curriculum--and effective with three of the four functions in Factor IV-- Promoting Programs. The mean scores for Factors I, III, and IV were in the neither effective nor ineffective range (3.96, 3.98, 3.96). These findings are similar to those found by Danenburg, Keene, and Miller (1975) in Florida, by Land (1971) in Utah, and by Schultz, Watson and Giese (1980) in Iowa for vocational committees.

5. There was a significant relationship between leadership style and Factor II--Developing Curriculum.

This study found a significant association between committee leadership style and the Factor II effectiveness mean of 4.16. Committee members rated their participation on all six items in Factor II effective.

Discussion

The first implication drawn from this study concerns the quality of preservice and inservice education post- secondary data processing advisory committee members

receive. The infrequency of committee meetings and the
number of inactive committees suggests a need for local
advisory committees to strengthen their operational
activities. Even where there are existing committees,
their efforts are not rated as effective (4.0 or above) by
committee members on several functions. The perception of
lack of effectiveness may be a reflection of inadequate
orientation to the functions and purposes of advisory
committees. In some schools, the craft advisory
committee may be appointed only to meet legislative
mandates and the level of functioning and effectiveness is
not perceived important.

The discrepancy between reports from committee
members and division heads on what the committee does is
a second concern. Division heads reported more
participation on functions than committee members on
every function except Developing continuing education
programs (item 21), Assisting in planning facilities (item
11), and Helping to eliminate sex bias in vocational
programs (item 18).

Advisory committees are not performing some
functions representative of effective committees. The
literature supports the 21 functions in this study as
indicative of effective committees; 52% of these
functions are not reported as being performed by more than

half the committee members. Division heads reported more
participation; more than half the division heads reported
participation on 67% (14) of the functions. This could be
an effect of the fact that the study covered only one
academic year; not all committees may have worked on all
functions in the same year.

Even though committees do not seem to be performing
some functions indicative of effective committees and they
do not see their efforts as effective on some factors (if
effective is 4.0 or above), no committee saw itself as
ineffective. There were no committee effectiveness means
below the "Neither Effective nor Ineffective" rating.
This may be because only committees who saw themselves as
rather effective were willing to participate in the study.
Even though the Factors I, III, and IV effectiveness means
were not considered effective (4.0 or above), the
committee members' scores (3.47, 3.80, 3.87) were very
close to 4.0; division heads' scores were even higher
(3.96, 3.98, 3.96). Division heads saw their advisory
committees as more effective than committee members did on
14 (67%) of the 21 items.

If 3.5 to 4.5 were considered the area for the 4.0
effectiveness range, both committee members' and division
heads' effectiveness means except for item 7, Help
recruit students for the program and item 17, Assist in

development of instruction for disadvantaged and

handicapped students would have been considered effec-

tive; for committee members item 18, Help in elimination

of sex bias in vocational programs and item 20, Advise on

adequacy of the program budget would have had effective

ratings.

The association between leadership style and

effectiveness was not supported as significant. Previous

studies indicating a connection between committee

effectiveness and leadership did not report on the aspect

of leadership style. Leadership was shown to have an

effect on advisory committee effectiveness (Bartolomei,

1985; Waldheim, 1979; Dunn, 1983) but an association

between leadership style and effectiveness has not been

studied previously. The association shown here may not be

statistically significant because of the restricted range

of values. Hinkle (1979) reports that as a group "becomes

increasingly homogeneous on one or both variables, the

absolute value of the correlation coefficient tends to be

smaller" (p. 82). The narrow range of scores and

leadership styles may account for the lack of a sta-

tistically reliable relationship in this study.

The majority of chairpersons were classified as

exhibiting the leadership style S3 (participating). This

style is a nondirective and supportive style useful with

people who are able to do the tasks (Hersey and

Blanchard, 1982, p. 153); it is a cooperative and people-

oriented approach which allows for group participation and

cooperation. This would seem to be a good style for the

chairperson of an advisory committee since the members

come to the committee with skills which have placed them

on the committee and may only need guidance and

encouragement to complete tasks. With no organized

orientation reported by 26% of the committee members,

support and communication from the chairperson are

necessary for members to know what to do and to receive

clarification when questions arise.

There were no S4 (delegating) styles found in this

study. This may be because of the low relationship and

low task behavior associated with this style. Advisory

committee members need more support and more direction

than this leadership style gives. There were few S1

(telling) and S2 (selling) styles. These styles are

characterized by high directive or task behavior; the

performers are not competent or skilled enough at this

time and need supervision and control. This situation

would not seem applicable for craft advisory committee

members who are chosen for their skills and knowledge and

have expressed a willingness and commitment to serve.

Recommendations

This study has led the researcher to the following recommendations:

1. Further research should be conducted into:

   a. how members contribute to the committee effectiveness of craft advisory committees.

   b. components of committee operations and organization to determine how these factors relate to effectiveness.

   c. the area of leadership style or leadership and committee effectiveness.

   d. why division heads and committee members have different perceptions of effectiveness.

2. A replication of the present study on evaluation of occupational advisory committees should be undertaken in other regions of the United States.

3. Staff development is needed in areas of new policy--eliminating sex bias and planning for special needs students.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee Handbook. (1979). Parasus, NJ: Bergen
    Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service
    No. ED 165 835)

American Vocational Association. (1950). Vocational
    Advisory Committees. Washington, D.C.: American
    Vocational Association.

American Vocational Association. (1969). Vocational
    Advisory Committees. Washington, D.C.: American
    Vocational Association.

American Vocational Association. (1969). The advisory
    committee and vocational education. Washington, D.C.:
    American Vocational Association.

Anderson, W. (1983). Vocational education advisory
    committees. Sacramento, California: Office of the
    Chancellor, California Community Colleges. (ERIC
    Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 769)

Armfield, G. W. (1982). A Descriptive Study of Curriculum
    Advisory Committees in Local North Carolina Community
    Colleges: Their Organization, Practices, and Functions.
    (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
    and State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts
    International, 42, 4423A.

Bartolomei, M. M. (1985). Effectiveness of Occupational
    Advisory Committees in Michigan. (Doctoral
    dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1984).
    Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2077A.

Basualdo, E. A. (1976). Advisory committees in vocational-
    technical education programs. Memphis: State Technical
    Institute at Memphis. (ERIC Document Reproduction
    Service No. ED 123 372)

Beamer, R. W. (1980, July). Advisory councils--a mechanism
    for coping. The Agricultural Education Magazine. pp.
    7-8.

Behymer, J. (1979, Winter). Functions of vocational
    advisory committees as perceived by committee members
    and local administrators. Journal of Industrial
    Teacher Education, 16, 19-26.

Bible, B. L. (1961, October). Advisory committee members want to know their responsibilities. The Agricultural Education Magazine. pp. 81-82.

Blanchard K. H., Hambleton, R. K., Forsyth, D., & Zigarmi. (1985). Leader Behavior Analysis II: Scoring Directions. Escondido, CA: Blanchard Training and Development.

Blanchard, K. H., Hambleton, R. K., Forsyth, D., & Zigarmi. (1985). Leader Behavior Analysis II-Self: Perceptions of Leadership Style. Escondido, CA: Blanchard Tranining and Development.

Bregman, R. A. (1979). A model for planning vocational education at the local level. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 543)

Carroll, R. E. (1981). Advanced concepts in structuring and utilizing local advisory councils and craft committees. Harrisburg, Penn.: Pennsylvania State Advisory Council for Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 479)

Clasby, M., Cunningham, L. L., Davies, D., & Goettel, R. J. (1977). School advisory committees. Improving education in Florida: A reassessment (pp. 214-295). Tallahassee: Florida State Legislature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 172 353)

Cochran, L. H., Phelps, L. A., & Cochran L. L. (1980). Advisory committees in action. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cole, J. M. (1980, July). Developing effective advisory councils. Journal of Extension, 18, 9-13.

Community involvement in vocational education. (1977). Washington, D. C.: Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 247)

Danenburg, W. P., Keene, T. W., & Miller R. S. (1975). An evaluation of advisory committee effectiveness. Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 122 081)

Delves, A. R. & Watts, J. (1979, Autumn). A year of evaluation. Forum for the discussion of new trends in education. pp. 27-29.

Dieffenderfer, R. A. (1977). Handbook section 2. Advisory committees: utilizing business, industry, labor advisory committees. Business-industry-labor linkages: A handbook for improving personnel development programs. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Douglas, C. L. (1973). A study to determine the perceived effectiveness of technical and vocational program advisory committees in Texas community colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 7649A.

Dunn, B. P. (1983). Management practices associated with effective postsecondary general advisory committees for occupation education. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1769A.

Elias, J. & Behymer, J. (1979, Fall). Vocational advisory councils: A ranking of their activities. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 1, 293-299.

Folley, V. L. (1974, April). Some facts about curriculum advisory committees. Community and Junior College Journal, 44, 20-22.

Gallon, D. P. & Wattenbarger, J. L. (1976). District coordinating councils for vocational-technical and adult education: Guidelines for implementation. Gainesville: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 124 260)

Gilli, A. C., Sr. (Ed.). (1978, October). Improving vocational education through utilization of advisory committees. Houston: Texas Southern University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 479)

Guide for organizing and utilizing local vocational education advisory councils. (1977). Montgomery: Alabama State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 117)

Guidelines for occupational program assessment. (1980). Phoenix: Maricopa County Community College District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 358)

Hagmann, L. A. (1973). A comparison of selected factors in the operation of craft/occupational advisory committees. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 3248A.

Haley, M. J. (1984). The Relationship Between External and Internal Locus of Control Beliefs, Self-Monitoring and Leadership Style Adaptability. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 3563B-3564B.

Henry, S. & Omvig, C. P. (1981). Learning center handbook. Lexington: Kentucky University, Division of Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 106)

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc._

Hinkle, Dennis E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1979). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Huska, S. L. (1980). How to approach, develop, vitalize, improve, structure, establish local advisory councils on vocational education. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Advisory Council on Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 480)

Isaac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1985). Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: EdITS.

Kaupp, D. R. (1979). Beliefs held toward local advisory committee functions in publicly funded vocational schools in Massachusetts. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 2029A.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

King, S. W. (1960). Organization and Effective Use of Advisory Committees. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education.

Kraska, M. F. (1980, Winter). Vocational and technical education: The citizen-employer link. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 2, 455-461.

Land, M. H. (1971). The status of advisory committees for vocational and technical education in Utah with comparison of the structure and functions to a theoretical model. (Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 3745A.

Landry, L. P. (1973). A school improvement-accountability process kit. PAK No. 1.3--Establishing commitment and leadership. Denver: Colorado State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 141 907)

Latham, P. L. (1981). An investigation of the impact of citizen advisory committees on vocational education in South Carolina. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2104A.

Ledford, B. J. (1981). The role and scope pf advisory committees in the Tennessee area vocational-technical schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2104A.

Light, J. J. (1982). A practitioner's guide to using and meeting with advisory groups. Columbus, OH: National Postsecondary Alliance. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 140)

Maintain an occupational advisory committee. Module A-5 of category A--Program planning, development, and evaluation. Professional teacher education module series (2nd ed.). (1985). Columbus: Ohio State University, National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 669)

McQuay, P. L. & Watters, E. A. (1980). Advisory councils: Role, function, status, responsibility and operation. Williamsport, PA: Williamsport Area Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 788)

Nagel, J. (1973). Characteristics of effective vocational education occupational advisory committees. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 3254A-3255A.

Nerden, J. T. (1977, January). Advisory committees in vocational education; A powerful incentive to program improvement. American Vocational Journal, 52, 27-29.

Norton, R. E., Ross, K. L., Garcia, G., & Hobart, B. (1977). <u>Organize and work with a local vocational education advisory council</u>. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 164 749)

Oastler, J. (1975). <u>Buffering action of advisory committees in tech programs</u>. Glen Ellyn, IL: College of Dupage. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 107 317)

Oldham, N. B. (1973). <u>Citizens advisory committees</u>. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

Parks, M. B. (1982). Functions of state advisory councils on vocational education: Importance and need for inservice development as perceived by state advisory council chairpersons, executive directors and state directors of vocational education. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1981). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>42</u>, 4428A.

Parry-Hill, J. W., Jr. (1981). <u>Highlights from two recent studies on the use of citizen advisory groups in the North Carolina community colleges</u>. Raleigh: North Carolina State Advisory Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210 054)

Plunkett, W. R. (1975). <u>Supervision: the direction of people at work</u>. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown.

Price, N. C. (1977). <u>School community councils and advisory boards: A notebook for administrators</u>. Burlingame, CA: Association of California School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 583)

Riendeau, A. J. (1967). <u>The role of the advisory committee in occupational education in the junior college</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Riendeau, A. J. (1977). <u>Advisory committees for occupational education: A guide to organization and operation</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rinehart, R. L. (1982, April). <u>Industry-college cooperation: New components, barriers and strategies</u>. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. St. Louis, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 739)

Rivera, W. M. & DeSanctis, V. (1981, September). Adult continuing education and the federal advisory committees. Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 5, pp. 8-9.

Rogan, W. B., Jr. (1973). An evaluation of local vocational advisory councils in Michigan. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 1187A-1188A.

Rogers, R. A. (1979, October). Your advisory committee-- your partner in agricultural education. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 52, p. 90.

Salvatoriello, M. B. (1979). Local special needs advisory councils: An evaluation of effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 1410A-1411A.

Schultz, J. B., Watson, D., & Giese, H. (1980). Effectiveness of postsecondary vocational education advisory councils (Journal paper no. 238). Ames: Iowa State University, Home Economics Research Institute.

Shinn, L. (1975, March). Is an advisory committee necessary? The Balance Sheet, 56, pp. 252-253.

Smith, E. G. & Holt, N. L. (1980, Winter). State evaluation of vocational education programs: A national study of evaluation procedures and practices. The Journal of Vocational Education Research, 5(1), 17-39.

VanAntwerp, D. & Sexton, M. J. (1980, April). Honest participatory management with community councils. Community Education Journal, 7(3), 24-26.

VanAusdle, S. L. & Peterson, J. (1979). Handbook for advisory committees in occupational education at Walla Walla Community College. Walla Walla, WA: Walla Walla Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 187 370)

Van Dalen, D. B. & Meyer, W. J. (1966). Understanding educational research. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Waldheim, G. P. (1979). An analysis of the organization and operation of advisory councils used in the administration of approved secondary vocational

education programs within New York state. (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 1437A.

Wehmeier, R. A. (1980). The vocational education teacher's perceptions of the effectiveness of local vocational education advisory committees in Indiana. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 496A.

Wheeler, J. D. (1981). Organization of vocational education. Vocational education curriculum specialist, Module 3. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 119)

White, R. H. (1977). The little book on local VOC/TEC education advisory councils; A guide. Columbia: South Carolina State Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 141 505)

Winegar, G. (1978). Common core curriculum for vocational education. Category B: Cooperative relationship. B-2: Advisory councils. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 163 256)

Yusuf, C. M. (1984). The relationship between the administrator's representational style and the level of participation of the advisory committee in selected midwestern ESEA Title VII projects. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2649A-2650A.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Data Processing Advisory Committee Data

1. Do you have an appointed advisory committee for your data processing program?

_____ (1) Yes _____ (2) No

If you responded NO to the above item, please omit questions 2-7 and answer Item 8.
If you responded YES to the above item, please next answer items 2 through 8.

2. How many times did the advisory committee meet during 1986-1987?

_____ times

3. Please provide some information about the composition of your advisory committee. How many members represent each of the following groups? (exclude ex officio members)

_____ (1) Professional School Employee

_____ (2) Employer or Self Employed Person

_____ (3) Employee

_____ (4) Student or Program Graduate

_____ (5) Parent or Guardian

_____ (6) Other (Specify) _____

_____ Total Number of Members

4. Is the advisory committee chaired by:

_____ (1) Professional school employee

_____ (2) Lay member of the committee

5. Give the name of chairperson for the 1986-1987 year. _____

_____

6. How long has the chairperson held that office? _____ years

7. Are you willing to participate further in the study? _____ _____
                                                    yes   no

8. Please provide your address, phone number, and office hours.

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone _____
                   (Area Code)

Office Hours _____

Please fill in your name and return this form even if you are not going to participate further in the study.

Appendix B

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL EDUCATION

November 9, 1987

DATA PROCESSING ADVISORY COMMITTEES STUDY

As you know, much has been written about the operating procedures for occupational advisory committees. However, there has been no attention given to the relationships between the data processing advisory committee's organization and operation, effectiveness, and leadership style. If these relationships were identified, data processing educators would have guidelines to assist them in establishing and maintaining a more effective craft advisory committee.

The study has been designed so the researcher does not need to know the respondent committee member's identity and in no way will the school, advisory committee, or member's identity be revealed. The identification number on the enclosed card is for mailing purposes only. This is so your name will be checked off when you return the card. The following procedures will be used to ensure anonymity:

1. I will mail an envelope of surveys to you.
2. You will distribute the surveys to committee members.
3. Committee members will return surveys directly to me.
4. If I do not hear from a member, I will contact you by telephone to follow up.

Since the number of data processing advisory committees in your state is limited, your assistance is crucial for an unbiased view of how committees are now functioning. For the results to represent your committee, please complete and return the enclosed response card with your affirmative reply. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can answer any questions.

Your assistance is appreciated.

PATRICIA R. CLEMMER
P. O. Box 398
Dayton, VA 22821
(703) 879-9542

P. MARION ASCHE
Associate Professor

Enclosure

Appendix C

November 30, 1987

Recently you were mailed a questionnaire concerning participation of your advisory committee members in a study aimed to identify advisory committee operation and organization procedures, effectiveness, and leadership style.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because there are so few data processing advisory committees, it is extremely important that your survey be included if the results are to accurately represent data processing committees.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it was misplaced, please call me collect (703-879-9542) and I will send another one to you.

Thanks

Appendix D

February 8, 1988

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the survey of data
processing advisory committees. This survey will contribute
information which will lead to guidelines for more effective
operation, organization, and leadership of advisory committees
as well as statistical data on present committee structure.

The study is not an evaluation of individual committees--
responses will be used for statistical analysis only. Your
responses are strictly confidential and will not be identified
in the report; the identification number on each questionnaire
is for mailing and follow-up purposes.

Each questionnaire will take only a few minutes of the
respondent's time and can be returned in the self-addressed,
stamped envelope. Please follow the instructions on the
enclosed sheet for distribution and completion of the
questionnaires.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Patricia R. Clemmer   F. Marion Asche
P. O. Box 398   Graduate Advisor
Dayton, VA 22821
703/879-9542

Enclosures

Your participation was delayed by Christmas holidays and
followups. I hope this is not an inconvenience.

DISTRIBUTION INSTRUCTIONS

1. Each survey is to be completed for the 1986-1987 academic school year.

2. Each advisory committee member should respond to each item for the 1986-1987 year to the best of his/her recollection and ability.

3. Distribute the surveys as follows:

   a. Business Division Head
      and
      Each Data Processing Advisory Committee Member

        receives

           Organization and Operation of Data Processing Advisory
              Committees

   b. Data Processing Department Head

        receives

           Descriptive Information on the Data Processing Committee

   c. Data Processing Advisory Committee Chairperson

        receives

           Data Processing Advisory Committee Chairperson's
              Background
           and
           Leader Behavior Analysis II-Self

4. Each respondent should complete and mail his survey(s) in the stamped, self-addressed return envelope provided within one week.

5. The identification number on each survey will be used for follow-up purposes only. You may wish to note the number on the survey and the committee member who receives that survey. If I do not receive a survey, I shall contact you and ask you to call the member who has that number and ask that it be mailed.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL EDUCATION

February 9, 1988

Data Processing Advisory Committee Members

DATA PROCESSING ADVISORY COMMITTEES SURVEY

The Data Processing Department of
has agreed to participate in this study. Your cooperation
will contribute information which will lead to guidelines for
more effective operation, organization, and leadership of
advisory committees as well as statistical data on present
committee structure.

The study is not an evaluation of individual committees—
responses will be used for statistical analysis only. Your
responses are strictly confidential and will not be
identified in the study; the identification number on each
questionnaire is for mailing and follow-up purposes only.
This is so your number will be checked off when you return
your survey.

Since the number of data processing advisory committees in
your state is limited, your assistance is crucial for an
unbiased view of how committees are now functioning. The
questionnaire covers the 1986-1987 school year and will take
only a few minutes of your time to complete. Please do so
within the next week and return the questionnaire in the
self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Your assistance is appreciated.

PATRICIA R. CLEMMER   F. MARION ASCHE
P. O. Box 398   Graduate Advisor
Dayton, VA 22821
703/879-9542

Enclosure

Organization and Operation of
Data Processing Advisory Committees

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about the functions your advisory committee performs. Please respond to each statement twice. First check the column on the left if your committee participated in the activity during the 1986-1987 academic school year. Then circle the number at the right to indicate your committee's effectiveness on that function.

1986-1987
Participation

		Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Effective	Very effective
_____	1. Develop objectives for program	1	2	3	4	5
_____	2. Establish sequence of courses for program	1	2	3	4	5
_____	3. Help with the identification of occupational skills . . needed by program graduates	1	2	3	4	5
_____	4. Recommend content of the training program	1	2	3	4	5
_____	5. Determine relevancy of courses being offered	1	2	3	4	5
_____	6. Identify area labor market needs	1	2	3	4	5
_____	7. Help recruit students for program	1	2	3	4	5
_____	8. Assist in placement of graduates	1	2	3	4	5
_____	9. Identify training sites for students in co-op programs .	1	2	3	4	5
_____	10. Recommend standards students need to meet to be . . . . employable	1	2	3	4	5
_____	11. Assist in planning facilities	1	2	3	4	5
_____	12. Assist in follow-up of graduates	1	2	3	4	5
_____	13. Aid in selection of instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5
_____	14. Communicate with the community about the vocational . . program	1	2	3	4	5
_____	15. Establish cooperative relationships between school and . industry	1	2	3	4	5
_____	16. Keep vocational instructors informed of new methods . . used in trades or occupations	1	2	3	4	5
_____	17. Assist in development of instruction for disadvantaged . and handicapped students	1	2	3	4	5
_____	18. Help in elimination of sex bias in vocational programs .	1	2	3	4	5
_____	19. Evaluate on-going programs	1	2	3	4	5
_____	20. Advise on adequacy of program budget	1	2	3	4	5
_____	21. Assist in development of continuing education programs . for adults	1	2	3	4	5

Descriptive Information on the
Data Processing Committee

Please answer the following questions. Circle the appropriate number or supply the answer on the line.

1. Approximately how long has the committee been in existence?
    1   One year or less
    2   Two to three years
    3   Four to five years
    4   Six to seven years
    5   Eight to nine years
    6   Ten years or more

2. How many members are on the committee?_____ (Please specify)

3. The length of appointment for committee members is:
    1   One year
    2   Two years
    3   Three years
    4   Four years
    5   Indefinite

4. Are lengths of appointments staggered, providing overlapping membership?
    1   Yes
    2   No

5. May the committee members succeed themselves?
    1   Yes
    2   No

6. Who appoints the membership of your advisory committee?
    1   Advisory Committee
    2   College Board
    3   School President
    4   Business/Technical Division Head
    5   Department Head
    6   Department faculty member(s)

7. How is the chairperson of your committee selected?
    1   Elected by committee
    2   Appointed by college president
    3   Appointed by college board
    4   Appointed by school dean
    5   Appointed by head of business/technical division
    6   Appointed by data processing department head
    7   Appointed by data processing faculty
    8   Assumed by data processing department faculty or head

8. How far in advance are members notified of meetings? _____ Days

9. How long are your average committee meetings? _____ Hours

10. The committee normally meets according to a pre-established schedule _____ or on a when-called basis _____, or both _____

11. Which technique is most often used to orient new committee members?
    1 No organized orientation
    2 Audio-visual presentation
    3 Distribute and review handbook
    4 Oral presentation
    5 Other (Specify)_____

12. If an orientation is provided, which of the following are included?
    (Circle all which are included.)
    1 School goals and objectives
    2 Program goals and objectives
    3 Vocational education objectives
    4 Committee goals and objectives
    5 Role of the committee
    6 Recent committee activities
    7 Applicable state and federal laws
    8 Other (Specify) _____

13. To whom does the committee usually forward its recommendations?
    1 College Board
    2 College President
    3 Business/Technical Division Head
    4 Data Processing Department Head
    5 Other (Specify) _____

14. How are committee members recognized for their contributions to the committee efforts? (Circle all which apply.)
    1 Special recognition event
    2 Certificates or awards
    3 News releases
    4 Letters of thanks
    5 Other (Specify)_____

15. From whom would you most like to receive technical assistance on advisory committees?
    1 Data Processing Department faculty
    2 Teacher training institutions
    3 Vocational Education Advisory Council
    4 Other (Specify) _____

16. Rank from 1 to 7 your preference for the method of delivering technical assistance to your advisory committee.
    _____ Regional conferences in the state
    _____ Statewide conferences
    _____ Newsletters
    _____ Multi-media materials
    _____ Handbooks
    _____ Other (Specify) _____
    _____ No assistance needed

Data Processing Advisory Committee
Chairperson's Background

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about the chairperson's background. Please provide your answer on the line or check the appropriate line beside your answer.

1. Have you served on an advisory committee before your current role as chairperson?_____Yes _____No

2. How many years of experience in the data processing field do you possess? _____ years

3. What is your educational background?

    _____ Education degree in data processing
    _____ Computer science degree
    _____ Management/administration degree
    _____ Other, please specify_____

4. Which of the following is your current job position?

    _____ Management/administration
    _____ Computer programmer
    _____ Computer analyst
    _____ Computer operator
    _____ Data Processing teacher
    _____ Other, please specify_____ _____

5. In what type of organization are you employed?

    _____ Service industry
    _____ Manufacturing
    _____ Sales organization
    _____ Public service (health, social service, government)
    _____ Data processing service center
    _____ Education
    _____ Other, please specify_____

6. What is the size of the business in which you are employed?

    _____ Small (1-30 employees)
    _____ Small-Medium (51-200 employees)
    _____ Medium-Large (201-500)
    _____ Large (501-1500 employees)
    _____ Very large (over 1501 employees)

7. To how many civic organizations do you belong?

    ____ 0
    ____ 1
    ____ 2
    ____ 3
    ____ more than 3

Appendix E

Blanchard Training
and Development, Inc.

April 3, 1987

Ms. Patricia Clemmer
P. O. Box 382
Dayton, VA 22821

Dear Patricia:

We're delighted you're considering the LBA in your research. We usually
grant permission to use the instruments with three stipulations:

1. All instruments are to be marked "For Research Only." They
    should not be sold or used for any commercial purposes.

2. That Blanchard Training and Development, Inc. get a copy of
    all papers, manuscripts or dissertations stemming from the
    research. We would like a full bound copy of your dissertation.

3. Upon publication of any findings, the instrument is to be given
    full credit and noted as to where it can be obtained.

If you can meet these stipulations, we would be glad to provide you with
enough copies of the instrument to do your research.

Included in your request were the alpha coefficients for the LBA. They
are as follows, and can be documented in the Haley dissertation.

Alpha coefficients for the LBA Self are: S1 - .83, S2 - .62, S3 - .69,
and S4 - .84.

Alpha coefficients for the LBA Other are: S1 - .51, S2 - .49, S3 -.49,
and S4 - .56.

S1 and S2 scores on a test of significance definitely correspond to
the LBDQ structure dimension at the .0001 level. The S2 and S3 styles
correspond to the LBDQ's relationships dimension at the .0001 level.

If there is any way in which I can help you further, please don't hesitate
to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Dr. Drea Zigarmi
Vice President
Corporate Development/Research

DZ/cg

Enclosures

P.O. Box 398
Dayton, VA 22821
September 30, 1987

Dr. Drea Zigarmi
Vice President
Corporate Development/Research
Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.
125 State Place
Escondido, CA 92025

Dear Dr. Zigarmi

My committee has approved the use of the LBA for my study; and I am ready to begin mailing the necessary surveys. I would like your permission to use the LBAII-Self. The three stipulations you specified in your letter last April are agreeable to me:

1. The instruments may be marked "For Research Only." They will not be sold or used for commercial purposes.

2. You will be provided with a bound copy of my dissertation.

3. The instrument will be given full credit and noted as to where it can be obtained.

My research will require approximately 150 copies. Would you please grant my request to use the LBAII-Self for educational research and forward copies. If there is any additional information I can provide, you may write or call me at (703) 879-9542.

Sincerely

Patricia R. Clemmer

Appendix F

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL EDUCATION

March 15, 1988

Approximately four weeks ago you should have received a package of questionnaires for your data processing advisory committee members. These surveys were to be completed by the advisory committee members for your data processing program and returned directly to me.

To assure anonymity, the questionnaires were coded to be distributed by your school. The surveys for members having numbers   have not yet been received; would you please telephone the person who has each of these numbers and request that person to complete and return the survey as soon as possible.

Since the number of committees in your state is very small, your participation is appreciated and each return is vital. If any questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement may be obtained by telephoning me collect at (703) 879-9542.

Thank you for your time, interest, and assistance.

Sincerely,

Patricia R. Clemmer   F. Marion Asche
P. O. Box 398   Graduate Advisor
Dayton, VA 22821

VITA

The vita has been removed from
the scanned document