

A STUDY OF THE LEADER BEHAVIOR OF THE ADULT EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION
IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
AS PERCEIVED BY TWO REFERENCE GROUPS

by

Hercules Pinkney, Jr.

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
in
Educational Administration

APPROVED:

G. I. Earthman, Chairman

D. E. Hinkle

L. F. Goyen

M. D. Alexander

W. M. Worner

June, 1975

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Many persons contributed special efforts to the conduct and final written form of this study. The author is extremely grateful to the Chairman and members of his Advisory Committee, Drs. Glenn I. Earthman, Dennis E. Hinkle, Michael D. Alexander, and Wayne M. Worner of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University faculty and Dr. Loren F. Goyen of the Federal City College faculty, Washington, D. C., respectively for their advice and editorial comments. Dr. Hinkle also guided the construction of the study design and directed the statistical tabulations and computations through the Computer Center at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Dr. Karl T. Hereford, Dean of the College of Education and Dr. Jim C. Fortune both of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Dr. Andrew W. Halpin (retired) and Dr. Alan F. Brown of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the University of Toronto, all provided additional advisement and inspiration.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Ralph M. Stogdill, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, for his assistance and cooperation in granting permission to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in this study.

Special recognition is extended to Mr. Alvin E. Gross, Supervisory Director of Adult Education and Summer Schools, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, the ten adult education administrators and their instructional staffs for their combined

support and cooperation without which this study could not have been completed.

Finally, the author is indebted to the typist and proofreader for their skills and dedication which contributed tremendously to the final product.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF STUDY	2
THE PROBLEM	3
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS	5
OUTLINE OF STUDY	7
2. RELATED LITERATURE	9
Great Man Approach	9
Traitist Approach	10
Situational Approach	11
Behavioral Approach	12
Satisfaction	19
Effectiveness	20
Other Organizational Variables	22
CONCLUSION	24
Opposing Views	25
Implication for Present Study	27
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	28
HYPOTHESES	28

Chapter	Page
THE STUDY POPULATION	29
DELIMITATION OF STUDY	30
THE INSTRUMENT	30
PROCEDURE	32
Scoring	34
Research Design and Statistical Methodology	35
4. REPORT OF FINDINGS	37
LEADER BEHAVIOR OF ADMINISTRATORS: REAL	38
LEADER BEHAVIOR OF ADMINISTRATORS: IDEAL	40
ADMINISTRATORS' SELF-DESCRIPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR: REAL AND IDEAL	42
INSTRUCTORS' DESCRIPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR: REAL AND IDEAL	45
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	50
SUMMARY	50
CONCLUSIONS	51
RECOMMENDATIONS	52
IMPLICATIONS	54
REFERENCES	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63
APPENDIX	70
A. Letter of Permission	70
B. The Questionnaire	71
C. The Record Sheet	82
D. The Scoring Key	83

VITA 84

ABSTRACT

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Means and Standard Deviations of Administrators' and Instructors' Descriptions of the Real Leader Behavior of Administrators	39
2.	Means and Standard Deviations of Administrators' and Instructors' Descriptions of the Ideal Leader Behavior of Administrators	41
3.	Means and t Ratios of Mean Differences in Real and Ideal Behavior of Administrators' Self-Descriptions	43
4.	Instructors' Descriptions of Administrators' Leader Behavior: Real and Ideal	46

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of interest in the field of education has been generated in recent years over leadership studies. Researchers and practitioners have evidenced a growing awareness not only about leadership but also with leadership behavior (Onofrio, 1:1). No discussion of leadership or leader behavior would be complete without a basic understanding of the concept of role. Associated with every position or status in a social system, such as a public school system, there is a set of socially-defined expectations concerning what is appropriate behavior for a person occupying a leadership position. These expectations constitute a "behavioral model" for the incumbent of a position, providing him with a pattern to which he may adjust his own behavior. In addition, to the extent that the occupant conforms to these expectations, he permits other persons with whom he interacts to anticipate his behavior in prescribed situations and thus enables the interacting individuals to function collectively as an integrated unit. The concept of role thus encompasses both role expectations and role behavior (Stogdell, Scott, and Jaynes, 2:1).

Within this framework, the adult education administrator in the Public School System of the District of Columbia, as the officially designated leader in charge of the adult education program in his specific community, is confronted by major sets of responsibilities. He is responsible to his superiors, his students, his community,

but just as importantly, he also must be responsive to his own staff.

Many authors of studies of social systems support the above position that the leader's behavior is influenced by the expectations of significant others - influential groups and/or individuals. Halpin, for instance, in his discussion of "How Leaders Behave" postulated that the staff imposes upon the administrator expectations of how he should behave as a leader. When the expectations of the staff are essentially similar to those held by the administrator, he (the administrator) probably encounters less difficulty in orienting his behavior to them. To the extent that the expectations held by the staff and the administrator are incompatible, he is placed in a position of potential role-conflict. Should he respond principally to the expectations of his staff; or should he "be his own man" and persist in his own style of leadership irrespective of what the staff may wish? (3:112)

These are practical questions that plague most school administrators and were of particular concern to the researcher with respect to the leader behavior of the adult education administrator in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to obtain information to aid in a better understanding of the nature of the leader behavior of the adult education administrator. This understanding coupled with leadership training seems to be a reasonable approach to strengthening the administrator's supervisory competencies and skills.

From the broader view, the researcher found that there were volumes of studies which dealt with leadership behavior in various social systems, however, there was a general lack of information and research findings specifically in the area of adult education leader behavior. The result has been that research in allied fields continues to be the "launching-pad" for decisions affecting adult education programs. This, according to Griffith, includes the adoption of leadership criteria (4:76).

As evidence of the void of research findings, the researcher was able to identify only one published study which dealt specifically with the leader behavior of directors of adult education. This statewide study involving 11 adult basic education centers in Illinois sought new information on the behavior of full-time directors of adult basic education (Stotts, 5:1). Consequently, it also provided the impetus for this study to contribute additional empirical evidence to an understanding of the leader behavior of adult education administrators and to provide information to serve as a basis for future studies in adult education administration.

THE PROBLEM

This study was designed to ascertain the degree of divergence or congruence between the perceptions of actual and idealized leader behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrators themselves and their instructional staffs in the Public School System of the District of Columbia. More specifically, this study was intended to show the relationship

between "what is" the leader behavior of the administrators of adult education as compared to "what should be" their leader behavior as perceived by the two definer groups.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

A study of the Adult Education Program of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia conducted by an evaluation team in September, 1974 revealed, in part, that:

. . . The greatest weaknesses are in the areas of supervision and supporting service, and funding Supervision is a weak area throughout the system including the Adult Regular, Adult Basic, Vocational Adult, Community Schools and the two programs for speakers of other languages (Parker and others, 6:44).

Among the evaluation team's recommendations three seem pertinent to this study:

(1). . . establish a clear statement of long-term goals for Adult Education. Such a statement, properly orchestrated at the several levels, could clarify and make visible the goals of the program(s) and create a climate for positive input into an expansion effort (7:47).

(2) That a handbook be prepared for increasing staff understanding of the commitment to the goals and procedures of the adult education effort in the D. C. Public Schools (8:48).

(3) That the recruitment, training, and continuing education of the adult educators be made an integral part of the District's total staff development effort (9:48).

The above conclusion and recommendations of the evaluation team appear to be focused on improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the adult education program. The recommendations also seem to suggest, at least in part, that a need exists for approaches to (1) improve the quantity and quality of supervision, (2) establish

and clarify goals for increased understanding of goals, and (3) derive improved recruitment and training criteria from continuing education and staff development efforts.

Within the above framework, the present study is of importance when considering the leader behavior of the adult education administrator in the adult education program in terms of organizational effectiveness and efficiency. According to Barnard's theory, the mark of organizational effectiveness is indicated by congruence between actual behavior of incumbents and role expectations (10:42,92). Likewise, according to Getzels, proper functioning of role relationships in a social system depends on the degree of congruence in the perceptions and expectations of several complementary role incumbents (11:318). The results of the present study could conceivably serve as a basis for the faculty-adult education administrator consensus as a function of the leader behavior of the adult education administrator. With this consensus the likelihood of establishing, as well as clarifying goals, could be greatly enhanced. Additionally, recruitment and training criteria for the adult education administrator could possibly emerge.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions are presented here for a clearer understanding of their usage throughout this study:

An up-to-date and representative definition of leadership was developed by Ralph M. Stogdill who perceived it as, "the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction." (12:411).

It follows that initiating structure refers to "the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure." (Halpin, 13:112). One who leads must, of necessity, engage in an act of initiating structure in interaction as part of solving mutual problems (Halpin, 14:171). Halpin, however, found that the most effective educational administrators were those who rated high in both consideration and especially high or initiating structure. Consideration refers to "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationship between the leader and the members of his staff." (Halpin, 15:86).

Halpin's conclusion was based on a series of studies of the leader behavior of leaders in various social systems. A social system by definition is a system of the actions of individuals, the principal units of which are roles and constellations of roles. It is a system of differentiated roles. Internal differentiation, which is a fundamental property of all systems, requires integration to realize certain shared collective goals through collaborated activity (Parsons and Shils, 16:197).

Role, as referred to in this study, encompasses the duties or obligations and rights of an incumbent's position in relation to the roles of other positions in the social system (Satorn, 17:1)

Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (18:338) contend that normally, in any social system, a role incumbent identifies himself with certain groups as his reference groups and tends to use

the groups as a standard for self-evaluation and as a source of his personal values and goals. The reference groups accordingly influence the role behavior of a role incumbent. Thus, the leader behavior of a role incumbent, at least in part, is a response to the perception of expectations others hold for him.

It was not the intention of the researcher to imply that two factors (initiating structure and consideration) are sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behavior. A discussion of other possible variables with accompanying definitions is presented in Chapter III under a section on the development of the questionnaire to be used in the present study.

OUTLINE OF STUDY

The preceding discussion was intended to provide a framework for an investigation into the leader behavior of the adult education administrator in the Public School System of the District of Columbia, and to establish the importance of acquiring a better understanding of his leader behavior.

The historical development of four approaches to the study of leadership were reviewed in Chapter II. Additionally, a review of representative studies supporting the approach relevant to the present investigation were presented. These studies were discussed with respect to their contribution to an understanding of various relationships between certain organizational variables and leader behavior and the possible consequences of such relationships.

A detailed discussion of the research design and methodology

of this study was presented in Chapter III. This discussion began with a listing of the hypotheses followed by a delimitation of the scope of the investigation. Additionally, a brief history of the development of the instrument used in the study was included. The chapter also included a discussion of the procedures utilized in obtaining and analyzing the study data.

The findings of this investigation, based on the analyses of data, were reported in Chapter IV. This report included tables, and a narrative explanation of the analyzed data.

Finally, a summary, concluding statements, recommendations and implications of the study were presented in Chapter V.

Chapter II

RELATED LITERATURE

Leader behavior is perhaps the most thoroughly investigated organizational variable having a potential impact on employee performance (Evans, 19). This emphasis on investigations of leader behavior grew out of leadership studies which may be traced historically according to four approaches: the great man, traitist, situational and behavioral approaches.

Great Man Approach

The bulk of the early literature on leadership was characterized by analyses of lives of great men. Many biographical analyses and autobiographical materials treated the leadership phenomena extensively but very few of the authors made explicit criteria for the selection of the "great men" for study. Thus, the great man approach was based on two basic foundations. First, that men had a free will, therefore history was a struggle to decide the course of the future. Second, that men learned from the examples of the great man (Cunningham and Gephart, 20:47). The advocates of this approach stressed these two principles in their discussions of the role of great men in the history of mankind. Great men, according to the theorists, seemed to have had superhuman control over the fate of their respective generations. They could "turn the tide of history." There also existed an explicit morality of the Great Man Theory which suggested that "if mankind could learn how they ought, or ought not, to act from great men, then mankind would act accordingly (21:47).

In the field of education only limited scholarly effort has been directed toward analysis of leadership by utilizing the great man approach. Such studies as have been done tend more to "enshrine leaders than to explain leadership." (Cunningham and Gephart, 22:3)

It was reasonable to conclude that proponents of the great man approach believed that leaders acquired unique qualities which set them apart from others. It followed then that if the leader was endowed with superior qualities that differentiate him from his followers, it should have been possible to identify those qualities (Stogdill, 23:17). This assumption gave rise to the trait approach to the study of leadership.

Traitist Approach

The traitist approach grew out of the great man approach and was based on the common recognition that a leader's behavior was determined in part by his unique personality structure (24:2).

The trait approach initially amounted to little more than a listing of emotionally positive terms as necessary conditions of successful leadership. This conclusion was not based on any vigorous empirical evidence and therefore became discredited over time (Cummings and Schwab, 25:40).

Certain studies, utilizing the trait approach, conducted in similar settings yielded contradictory results, and because the studies failed to reveal a universally applicable pattern of traits typical of leaders in all settings, some researchers reacted negatively to the traitist approach (Cunningham and Gephart, 26:3). The notion then emerged that there were several patterns of personality variables which

differentiated leaders from followers and that such patterns were situationally relevant.

Situational Approach

Recognizing the shortcomings of the trait approach to the study of leadership researchers started to concentrate on sociological variables within certain groups and situations. Basically, this approach, identified as the situational approach, maintained that leadership was determined not so much by the characteristics of individuals as by the requirements of social situations. The focus of this approach was that "human behavior always occurred phenomenologically within some situation." (Cunningham and Gephart, 27:141). This behavior was determined or influenced by the forces operative in the situation as these were perceived by individuals within groups.

The situational approach encompassed several variables which were related to: (1) the characteristics of groups, (2) work situations that evoked certain leadership styles, (3) characteristics of high production and low production groups, (4) conflicts that stemmed from differing expectations for behavior among leaders, their followers, and their superiors, (5) leader behavior as affected by school size, type, and location and school district size and type and (6) staff acceptance of administrative leadership (28:141,142).

Several categories of methods were utilized to study these variables. The more widely used methods included: (1) observation of behavior in leaderless situations in small informal groups, (2) observation of behavior in structured formal groups, (3) questionnaire studies, (4) interview approaches, (5) simulation techniques, (6) panel techniques,

and (7) decision analyses (Cunningham and Gephart, 29:142,143).

Utilizing these methods of study, generalizations regarding emergent leadership, permissive leadership, persuasive leadership, and potential leadership emerged (30:3).

In spite of these useful generalizations it became obvious that if the analyses of leadership were limited only to situational factors, then the study of leadership, per se, would become fruitless. This notion emerged due to an issue such as the transferability of leaders being difficult to explain. Consequently, there was a gradual withdrawal from both the traitist and situational approaches, and a shift of emphasis toward the analysis of the behavior of leaders (31:3).

Behavioral Approach

A fourth approach, the behavioral approach, differed from both the traitist and the situational approaches in a number of ways. First, the behavioral approach focused upon observed behavior rather than upon a capacity for leadership which might be inferred from this behavior. Secondly, the approach did not assume that the leader behavior exhibited by a leader in one group situation carried over into other group situations. Finally, the behavioral approach did not assert that leader behavior was determined either innately or situationally (Halpin, 32:81-83). Thus, the behavioral approach tended to focus on a search for significant behavioral dimensions to be used in describing and delineating leader behavior. This more recent approach to the study of leadership recognized that both psychological and sociological factors, as well as individual and situational factors, were behavioral determinants (Cunningham and Gephart, 33:4).

The behavioral approach used in this study, was first systematically pursued in the business environment by members of the Michigan Survey Research Center. The results of a series of studies by the Center suggested that major dimensions of leader behavior involved "employee-centeredness" and "production-centeredness." The former dimension was characterized by general supervision while the latter dimension emphasized close specific supervision. The results of these studies generated support, though limited, for the proposition that employee-centered supervision was superior as far as favorable employee attitudes and productivity were concerned (Cummings and Schwab, 34:41).

Another team of researchers at the Ohio State University have been conducting leadership studies since 1945 aimed at measuring "consideration," (behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, etc.), a concept analogous to "employee-centeredness" and "initiating structure," (behavior describing the delineation of the relationships between a leader and members of the work group) a concept analogous to "production-centeredness." These two dimensions were delineated from a factor analysis of data obtained by use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), a prototype of the instrument used in the present study, which assesses the behavior of leaders in various social systems (Halpin, 35:126,127).

To further the development of this instrument for utilization in leadership research, the Ohio State Leadership Studies team later involved the efforts of several disciplines, and had as one of its principal objectives the testing of hypotheses concerning the situa-

tional determination of leader behavior. This group of researchers hypothesized that performance in a position of leadership was determined, in large part, by demands made upon the position (Shartle, 36:1).

A large number of studies investigating the relationship between performance and the initiating structure and consideration dimensions of leader behavior have been conducted. In general, these studies suggested a frequent, but by no means universal, positive relationship between a leader's performance and consideration.

It did not seem reasonable to the Ohio State researchers that two factors (initiating structure and consideration) accounted for all of the observable variance in leader behavior. Thus, additional dimensions (sub-scales) were later hypothesized and tested. These latter sub-scales are discussed further in Chapter III.

The behavioral approach to the study of leadership also served as the basis for a great deal of the research at the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago where three distinctive behavioral styles were identified: normative, personal, and transactional. The normative style, (sometimes referred to as nomothetic style) focused on the normative dimension of behavior and therefore on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectations. The personal style, (also called idiographic style), placed emphasis on the personal dimension of behavior and, accordingly, on the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need disposition. The transactional style centered on a need for moving toward the normative style under one set of circumstances and toward the personal style under a different set of circumstances. Numerous researchers in

the field of education, including Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, found this classification of behavioral styles useful in analyzing, understanding, and predicting behavior (Cunningham and Gephart, 37:5).

Studies utilizing the behavioral approach have resulted in a number of generalizations with respect to leader behavior. Four of these generalizations were reportedly pertinent to leadership studies in the field of education: (1) educational leaders are perceived to have unique leader behavior orientations, (2) preferences and expectations for leader behavior vary widely among reference groups, (3) leader or follower behavior is influenced by expectations of reference groups, and (4) confidence in leadership, satisfaction, effectiveness, and attitudes toward the work situation are all influenced by the degree of congruence in expectations for leader behavior. The generalizations provided a basis for the major assumption as to the significance of the present study, aiding in a better understanding of the leader behavior of the adult education administrator, and may be illustrated by a review of several studies which support the four generalizations.

An example of research findings which supported the first generalization was Halpin's (1957) study which described leader behavior in terms of initiating structure and consideration dimensions and delineated four distinct leader behavior styles as perceived by the leaders' reference groups (38:5). Duplications of Halpin's study by Everson (1959), investigated the leader behavior of school principals; Kock (1967), who focused on the leader behavior of elementary principals; Luckie's (1963) study of directors of instruction; and Verbeke's (1966) investigation of junior college academic deans'

leader behavior resulted in research findings which tended to support this generalization (Stogdill, 39).

Halpin's (1957) study of the leader behavior of school superintendents also provided empirical evidence to support the second generalization that preferences and expectations for leader behavior varied widely among reference groups. He found that school board members preferred leader behavior leaning toward "initiating structure" while subordinates preferred leaders who were perceived as being high on the "consideration" dimension (Halpin, 40:114-118). Likewise, Moser (1957) reported that principals were subject to different expectations from superintendents and from teachers. These differing expectations caused principals to behave in one way with the superintendent and in another way with teachers (Cunningham and Gephart, 41:148,149). Earlier, (1951), Guetzkow had found that the authoritarian leader was "accepted by relatively many followers and rejected by relatively many superiors." (42:149)

Gross and others (1958) have reported that the superintendent's role was subject to conflict in expectations from school boards on the one hand, and school staffs on the other. The superintendent's behavior tended to respond to these conflicting expectations (43).

The studies cited below lend substantial empirical support to the generalization that leader or follower behavior is influenced by expectations of reference groups. Sutker and others (1967), in a part of their study to assess the potential for role conflict associated with certain teachers' activities, found that the teachers usually ascribed the right to hold expectations of their activities to local

administrators and state board personnel (44).

Using the critical incident technique, Hampton (1969) assessed the consistency between actual on-the-job behaviors of Cooperative Extension agents and their expected or inferred tasks (45). The research approach also suggested an assumption on Hampton's part that behaviors were influenced by expectations. Similarly, Blumenthal (1969) studied how expectations of teachers and adult students affected inter-action between the two groups. Findings indicated that persons may conform to either of two incompatible expectations within the same system (46).

Two years later Wiggins (1971) reported a study of the behavior of 41 principals and a review of similar research provided evidence that the behavior of elementary school principals was developed more by expectations held for him (the principal) than by his personality, and that the roles and expectations associated with school administration were frequently incompatible with the personality and needs of the administrator (47:2-4).

In the same year, Jaffee's (1971) book, Effective Management Selection: The Analysis of Behavior of Simulation Techniques, presented a system by which feedback might be generated and used as a basis for organizational change. A behavioral approach was presented to questions of leader behavior and supervisory selection. In sum, the basic theme behind the book was that leadership and leader behavior did not exist independently of any given situation. Rather, leadership was dependent on the characteristics of the leader, the characteristics of the situation, and the characteristics and expectations of

the followers (48).

DeVries (1971) investigated the effects of shared values and expectations on the behavior of 290 faculty members representing 34 departments at a large graduate oriented university. Responses to a questionnaire indicated that the expectations faculty members had for a department head, those his colleagues had for themselves, and those of his employing institution predicted positively and significantly the behavior of respondents. He also found that behavioral conformity with collegial self expectations was significantly related to the degree of alienation (49:11). In further support of this generalization DeVries again in 1972 examined various sources of influence over 290 faculty members at a large public university. He again found that both the role expectations a faculty member had for himself and the role expectations of the employing organization predicted positively and significantly the role behavior of the respondents (50:52). Based on the assumption that behavior was influenced by expectations of others, Hollis, in the same year, undertook a study in an attempt to describe the relationship between the type of position a person held in a school system and his perception of role responsibility in initiating action to solve the educational problems of the system. His major finding was that there was widespread disagreement among school system personnel concerning role responsibility (51:6-9).

A recent review of literature related to leadership style by Barraclough (1973) included, among other findings, the conclusion that an administrator's leadership style was shaped in part by the role expectations as perceived by others (52).

The following studies supported the fourth generalization, that - confidence in leadership, satisfaction, effectiveness, and attitudes toward the work situation are all influenced by the degree of congruence in expectations for leader behavior.

Satisfaction

Moyer (1954) found from his study of teacher's attitudes and expectations that the more alike members of a teaching group were in terms of their attitudes toward leadership, the more alike they were in the amount of satisfaction derived from working in a school situation (Cunningham and Gephart, 53:149). Similar research findings were reported by Foa (1956) who studied foremen and workers in Israeli factories. He found that foreman and workers agreed on ideal behavior for a foreman, but did not agree on actual behavior. The smaller the difference between ideal and perceived behavior of foreman, the better satisfied the workers were with their foreman (54). Shelley's (1960) findings also indicated that agreement on the leadership structure was positively related to satisfaction with the group (55). Likewise, Heslin and Dunphy (1964) found that member satisfaction tended to be high when the degree of status consensus among members was high (56). Similar findings were reported by Kamano, Powell, and Martin in a (1966) study of nursing supervisors in which they found that those evaluated as superior by high-level administrators tended to rate leader behavior as conforming to follower expectations and that this was associated with follower job satisfaction (Stogdill, 57:331,332). Calder (1969), from a survey of about 150 teachers and

12 principals, reported that for teachers who valued other teachers as a reference group, agreement with other teachers was consistent with very high levels of satisfaction (58:59,60). Comparable results were reported by Chung (1970). Data obtained from self-report questionnaires distributed to teachers in 21 public schools in southeastern Michigan demonstrated that a high teacher-centered management style of leader behavior by public school principals (as perceived by teachers) and high job satisfaction of teachers were significantly related (59).

Effectiveness

Results from a number of studies suggested a positive correlation between congruence of expectations and the effectiveness, of a work group (how well an organization meets its goals). Havon and McGrath (1951) for instance, suggested that the leaders of highly effective groups either behaved as expected or were successful in inducing group members to form ideals similar to their behavior (60). Likewise, results obtained by Holden (1954) indicated that the greater the extent to which the leader's behavior conformed to member expectations (ideal), the greater the productivity of the group (Stogdill, 61:142). Pryer, Flint and Bass (1962) found that early agreement by leader and followers on the leader's behavior increased group effectiveness (62).

Latimer (1966) sought to discover if there were discrepancies in the perceptions of the principal's role held by 32 elementary school principals and their faculties. He found that inter-personal perceptions among personnel in 20 functioning elementary schools had

a positive relationship. Latimer, therefore, concluded that the schools were functioning efficiently in accordance with Barnard's theory of efficiency of organizations (63). A similar conclusion may have been drawn from Stamm's (1968) study in which he found that three reference groups (trustees, deans and faculty members) did not differ significantly with respect to the leader behavior of California Community-Junior College Presidents (64:24,25). He concluded that organizational efficiency was also measured in terms of group performance. In this regard Fussell and Carter (1970) explored role perceptions of junior 4-H leaders and identified certain factors in role performance. Among their findings were that task expectations and task performance were significantly related (65:10-12).

Certain researchers have associated the effectiveness of an organization to the success of that organization in terms of goal attainment. Duncan (1971) undertook an investigation to discover the extent of differing expectations and perceptions for the teacher role as viewed by two groups of educational leaders. His research findings prompted him to suggest that a more thorough understanding of superintendent and board members' views and feelings concerning the teacher role was a vital requirement for the successful superintendent and board member and consequently for the school system of 26 unified school districts in California (66). Comparable results were obtained by Ruark's (1973) investigation which was designed to determine to what extent there was a relationship of the perceived roles to the achievement of the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America goals and objectives. It was concluded that the major factor which

enhanced a club in becoming a high goal achievement club was one of consensus of positive perceptions relative to the goals of VICA (67).

Other Organizational Variables

Empirical studies also supported the proposition of a positive relationship between consensus of leader-follower perceptions of leader behavior expectations and an organizational variable such as morale; and on the other hand, a negative correlation with an organizational variable such as role conflict. Examples included the experiments of Lippitt and White (1943) which indicated that group morale was related to the behavior of the leader. Their studies went further to explain that groups under an authoritarian type of leadership provided a minimum of individual and group freedom of action. Group members under this kind of leadership usually reacted by a reduction of initiative and by a heightened dependence on the leader for the initiation of actions (Stogdill, 68:141). Stogdill (1952), based on research results postulated that morale was a multi-dimensional variable, and that these dimensions also included elements of group integration (69:108-120). Likewise, a year later Viteles (1953) found that morale tended to be defined in terms of sharing goals, striving for common purpose, and a feeling of togetherness (70).

More recently, Foskett (1967), to determine community attitudes toward the position of elementary school principal, gathered data in a Pacific Coast community through norm inventories. Findings indicated that conflicting views of the principal's role were held by the principals themselves and by the other populations studied. He suggested that the role ambiguity which resulted led to low

morale and in turn ineffective performance (71:88-90). Likewise, Shearon (1969) analyzed variance in county extension chairmen's (CEC) conformity to an administrative performance leadership (APL) concept of their role. Relationships between APL and agent morale and performance, CEC attributes, and CEC relationships with agents were assessed. Among his findings were that CEC conformity to an APL role concept appeared significantly related to agent morale and performance (72:24,25).

These studies seemed to have suggested that morale was high when the members of the work group were motivated to attain a goal and when they were operating under a optimum as opposed to minimum or maximum degree of role structure and leadership control.

The following studies were representative of the inverse relationship between consensus of expectations and role conflict. As early as 1956 Bates and Cloyd found that role description and norm conformity on the same items of behavior were highly related after recording the behaviors and opinions exhibited by the members of discussion groups (73). A decade later Corrigan and Garland (1966) reported that role conflicts, or contradictory role expectations which were held by student teachers, supervising teachers, college supervisors, and school administrators tended to interfere in the group's interactive relationships in student teaching programs and lessened the group's effectiveness (74).

The following year Cave (1967), in a study of 10 school districts, tested the hypotheses that clashes between school administrators and teachers' unions were due largely to the conflicting perceptions of the school administrator's leader behavior

as described by the administrator himself, the school board, and members of the teachers' union. According to the results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, (LBDQ) Form XII, obtained from the three reference groups in this study, and a quadrant analysis, six leader behavior dimensions contributed most to conflict (75). Similarly, Kaiser (1968) reported from a stratified random sample of vocational agriculture teachers, trade and industrial teachers, school administrators and state supervisors that the greatest potential for role conflict was in differing expectations of teacher behavior by state supervisors and school administrators (76:100-102).

Johnson, who also investigated role conflict (1970), attempted to predict the efficacy of role reversal for reducing distortions in perceptions of the opponent's position, increasing understanding of the opponent's positions, clarifying communication during negotiations, and inducing cooperative behavior in conflict situations. Results supported the hypothesis that accuracy of understanding of the opponent's position was related to the number of agreements reached in negotiations (77). Prokop's (1971) study of role conflict in student teaching also supported the proposition that role conflict decreased with increased consensus of expectations (78).

CONCLUSION

The historical treatment of the four approaches to the study of leadership - great man, traitist, situational and behavioral - seemed to indicate that each, during its respective reign, was based on the assumption that leaders and followers acknowledged their role dif-

ferentiation and that this differentiation was generally, mutually accepted. In other words, there appeared to be a consensus of role relationships existing between leaders and followers. This consensus has been associated with various organizational variables such as satisfaction, effectiveness, morale and role conflict. It was not the intent of this study to review the literature for every conceivable organizational variable, but rather to present a representative group of studies and variables as they relate to one another in a variety of organizational settings.

The behavioral approach, in particular, and the generalizations which were drawn from the studies cited, seem to provide empirical support of Barnard's theory of organizational effectiveness - the mark of organizational effectiveness is indicated by congruence between actual behavior of incumbents of roles and role expectations (79:44, 92); and likewise, to Getzels' proposition, that proper functioning of role relationships in a social system depends on the degree of congruence in the perceptions and expectations of several complementary role incumbents (80:318). It would, of course, be unfair to accept these theories completely, without reviewing certain opposing views.

Opposing Views

As with any set of generalizations or theories, all theorists and all research findings do not, and should not for the sake of growth, support the hypothesis that agreement between leader and follower as to the leader's role would be associated with successful follower adjustment (81).

Brayfield and Crockett, and Viteles, after reviewing the

available literature on morale, found that research results often failed to support the commonly hypothesized relationship between group effectiveness and morale (Stogdill, 82:239).

Other opposing research findings include Neary's (1967) investigation of the perceptions of the principal and staff with respect to the leader behavior of the principal. It was found that there was no relationship between the principal's perception of leader behavior and the staff's perception of leader behavior. It was also found that no relationship existed between the principal's perception of staff perceptions of leader behavior, and staff perceptions of leader behavior (Cunningham and Gephart, 83:149). Sokol and Marshall (1969) conducted a study to determine the magnitude and direction of the congruence of communicated expectations for teachers and students in the University City American Studies Program. What American Studies teachers communicated to students appeared to be the general orientation for student behavior and not expectations for well delimited behavioral operations (84).

Buchanan (1971) warned that any attempt to derive conclusions from the literature regarding leadership education would be limited due to the fact that much of the literature consisted of untested opinion and most empirical studies were based on information from one school or one school district and were therefore very limited (85).

Cummings and Schwab provided similar words of caution:

Studies which have shown relationships between various leader traits and success have usually been simple correlational studies. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is impossible to tell whether the traits determine success, success determines the traits, or whether some third variable(s) determines both success and the traits (86:41).

Implication for Present Study

In spite of the foregoing negative evidence, the general trend of results reviewed seemed to suggest positive correlation between leader behavior and perceived expectations when there is congruence of expectations by reference groups. Accepting this assumption within the framework of Barnard's and Getzel's postulations, the researcher, in the present study, sought to obtain an estimate of the effectiveness of the adult education administrator in the Public School System of the District of Columbia by determining the degree of congruence in the descriptions of his actual and ideal leader behavior as perceived by the administrator himself and his staff.

The researcher recalled the two part question raised in Chapter I: "Should he (the administrator) respond principally to the expectations of his staff; or should he 'be his own man' and persist in his own style of leadership irrespective of what the staff may wish?" and offered the following possible solution based on the preceding review of literature. To avoid possible role conflict, the effective administrator should either adjust his leadership style to approximate his staff's expectations or orient his staff's perceptions such that his style of leadership is more acceptable.

The research design and methodology of this investigation follows in Chapter III.

Chapter III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The problem of this study, as previously stated, was to determine the relationship between "what is" the leader behavior of the adult education administrator as compared to "what should be" his leader behavior as perceived by the adult education administrator himself and his staff. To accomplish this, the research was designed to ascertain the degree of divergence or congruence between the perceptions of actual and idealized leader behavior of the adult education administrator by testing certain null hypotheses.

HYPOTHESES

1. No differences exist between the perceptions of the actual leader behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrators themselves and their instructional staff.
2. No differences exist between the perceptions of the ideal leader behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrators themselves and their instructional staff.
3. No differences exist between the perceptions the adult education administrators hold for their own actual and ideal leader behavior.
4. No differences exist between the perceptions the instructional staff holds for the actual and ideal behavior of the adult education administrator.

THE STUDY POPULATION

In the Public School System of the District of Columbia only ten schools were designated "Regular Adult Education Centers" during the current academic year (Gross, 87). The administrator or director of each of the ten centers was the person with primary responsibilities for administering the regular adult education program - an evening principal hired specifically for administering the regular adult education program. Thus, only these principals were designated "Adult Education Administrators" for the purposes of this study.

Two other groups of adult education administrators could also be identified in the Public School System of the District of Columbia: (1) directors of specially funded adult basic and vocational education programs and (2) community-school coordinators. These two groups of adult education administrators were excluded from this study since they did not meet the necessary requirements (outlined above) to be classified as Adult Education Administrators.

The influential group segment of the study population consisted of the entire instructional staff of the ten operational centers, a total of ninety-six (96) part-time instructors. There were no full-time instructors in any of the ten centers.

Several other groups and individuals whose expectations might affect the leader behavior of the adult education administrator could also be identified: superordinates of the adult education administrator, other adult education units, area college and university professors, professional associations, business groups, religious groups, lay people, Federal and District agencies, the Congress and even the

President of the United States because of the school system's unique position in the Federal City. The inclusion of all or part of these groups and individuals was, however, beyond the scope of the researcher's investigation.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to the statements of the LBDQ questionnaire, Form XII, which represented two dimensions - actual and ideal - of the leader behavior of the adult education administrator. This study was not intended to deny or affirm the importance of any other dimensions not included in the questionnaire.

THE INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire used in the present study, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII, was the fourth revision of the instrument which grew out of the Ohio State University Leadership Studies mentioned earlier in Chapter II.

The instrument, often referred to as LBDQ, grew out of research conducted by Hemphill. He, along with Coons, constructed the original form and Halpin and Winer in reporting the development of an Air Force adaptation of this instrument, identified Initiating Structure and Consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior (Halpin, 88:88).

These two factorially defined sub-scales have been widely used in empirical research, particularly in military organizations by Halpin, industry by Day and Fleishman, and education by Halpin and Hemphill (Stogdill, 89:1).

As reported earlier, researchers felt that these two dimensions were not sufficient to describe all of the observable variance in leader behavior. The LBDQ was subsequently revised to include assessment of leadership behavior on the following 12 sub-scales:

1. Representation - speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
2. Demand Reconciliation - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
4. Persuasiveness - used persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
5. Initiation of Structure - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
6. Tolerance of Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. (10 items)
7. Role Assumption - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
8. Consideration - regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)
9. Production Emphasis - applied pressure for productive output. (10 items)
10. Predictive Accuracy - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. (5 items)
11. Integration - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts. (5 items)
12. Superior Orientation - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them in striving for higher status. (10 items) (Cunningham and Gephart 90:4).

By far the majority of the studies of leadership behavior in the field of education have utilized the LBDQ. Within a single year over 30 such studies were reported in dissertation abstracts. There

also has been a preponderance of such studies in business, industrial, and military settings (91:5). In fact, the only published study that the researcher could identify that specifically investigated the leader behavior of directors of adult education utilized the LBDQ (Stotts, 92:1).

PROCEDURE

To obtain the necessary information to complete the present study the following procedure was utilized:

Upon receiving written permission from the District of Columbia Public School System to conduct the study, an initial interview schedule was developed in cooperation with the Supervisor of Adult Education and the ten adult education administrators (See Appendix A). The Supervisor accompanied the researcher on all initial interviews to assist in establishing rapport between administrators and the researcher. A schedule for administering the questionnaires to administrators and staff was agreed upon during the initial interviews.

The LBDQ questionnaire form was then administered personally by the researcher to each of the adult education administrators and their instructional staffs as a group in each center. This procedure was followed in an attempt to receive a 100% return of completed questionnaires. It should be noted that the instrument was divided into two parts - Part I - Actual Behavior, which consisted of the 100 items based on the twelve sub-scales outlined earlier; and, Part II - Ideal Behavior, consisted of the same 100 items. Respondents were instructed to: (1) read each item carefully, (2) think about how

frequently the leader engaged in the behavior described by the item in Part I, then (3) decide whether he (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acted as described by the item, and (4) draw a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following the item to show the answer he wished to select to describe the actual - "is" behavior of their supervisor. An example appeared on each of the two sections of the questionnaire for their review. (See Appendix B).

The same instructions were given for Part II with the exception that the second time respondents were asked to respond as if they were describing their own "ideal" - as he should be - supervisor. Respondents were given the general purpose of the study but no reference whatsoever was made to the concepts of Initiating Structure, Consideration or any of the other ten sub-scales.

As a result of this procedure the following forty-eight (48) sub-scales, which correspond to commonly held descriptions of behavior of leaders in diverse fields of leadership were identified by the LBDQ - Form XII:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | LBDQ - Real, Self (Administrator) | Representation |
| 2. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Demand Reconciliation |
| 3. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Tolerance of Uncertainty |
| 4. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Persuasiveness |
| 5. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Initiation of Structure |
| 6. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Tolerance of Freedom |
| 7. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Role Assumption |
| 8. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Consideration |
| 9. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Production Emphasis |
| 10. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Predictive Accuracy |
| 11. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Integration |
| 12. | LBDQ - Real, Self | Superior Orientation |
| 13. | LBDQ - Real, Staff | Representation |
| 14. | LBDQ - Real, Staff | Demand Reconciliation |
| 15. | LBDQ - Real, Staff | Tolerance of Uncertainty |
| 16. | LBDQ - Real, Staff | Persuasiveness |

17.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Initiation of Structure
18.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Tolerance of Freedom
19.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Role Assumption
20.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Consideration
21.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Production Emphasis
22.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Predictive Accuracy
23.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Integration
24.	LBDQ - Real, Staff	Superior Orientation
25.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Representation
26.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Demand Reconciliation
27.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Tolerance of Uncertainty
28.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Persuasiveness
29.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Initiation of Structure
30.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Tolerance of Freedom
31.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Role Assumption
32.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Consideration
33.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Production Emphasis
34.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Predictive Accuracy
35.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Integration
36.	LBDQ - Ideal, Self	Superior Orientation
37.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Representation
38.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Demand Reconciliation
39.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Tolerance of Uncertainty
40.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Persuasiveness
41.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Initiation of Structure
42.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Tolerance of Freedom
43.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Role Assumption
44.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Consideration
45.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Production Emphasis
46.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Predictive Accuracy
47.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Integration
48.	LBDQ - Ideal, Staff	Superior Orientation

Scoring

It should be noted that "actual" was designated to describe Part I of the questionnaire; however, in reporting the scores on the twelve sub-scales in that section the word "real" was substituted.

The raw data collected from respondents consisted of responses from all usable questionnaires divided equally between LBDQ - Real and LBDQ - Ideal. Each questionnaire was scored on each of the twelve sub-scales. The LBDQ - Self scores, both Real and Ideal were secured directly from the administrators themselves. Each of the ten adult

education administrators received a score for each of the twelve sub-scales that expressed his description of his own behavior with respect to both the Real and Ideal dimensions. Their total self score was obtained by averaging the responses of all ten administrators. The staff scores were obtained by having all members of each adult education administrator's instructional staff describe the leader behavior of their supervisor in an analogous manner. Staff scores on each of the forty-eight sub-scales for both the Real and Ideal dimensions were also obtained by averaging the responses per category (sub-scale within a dimension) of the total number of responses in each center. Total staff (entire staff population) scores were obtained by averaging the responses per category of all ten centers.

The assignment of items to different sub-scales is indicated in the Record Sheet. (See Appendix C). For example, the Representation sub-scale consists of items 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41. The sum of the scores for those five items constituted the score for the sub-scale Representation. An analogous procedure was used to obtain the scores for each of the other sub-scales.

The scoring key utilized allowed for scoring the responses as follows: A, B, C, D, and E were assigned the values 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively for all items except 6, 12, 16, 26, 36, 42, 46, 53, 57, 61, 65, 66, 68, 71, 87, 91, 92, and 97 which were scored in reverse order - A, B, C, D, E: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, respectively. (See Appendix D).

Research Design and Statistical Methodology

The research design for testing the inter-group hypotheses, one and two, was a one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).

Multivariate analysis was employed due to the fact that each of the twelve sub-scales could not have been assumed to be independent of each other. In this analysis, a linear combination of the twelve sub-scales served as the dependent variable, and the differences between administrators and staff perceptions, the real and ideal perceptions, as well as the interaction among the two variables, was determined by using this linear combination of sub-scales. To further explore the inter-group data in a descriptive rather than an inferential sense, Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were performed on the twelve sub-tests. Univariate tests were employed on each of the sub-scales to determine the sub-scales which contributed to any difference that could be obtained.

Multiple correlated t-tests with $\alpha = .01$ (overall $\alpha = .1136$) were used to determine any differences that could be found when testing the two intra-group null hypotheses, three and four. The t values were derived from the algebraic formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2 - 2(s_1s_2r_{12})}{n}}}$$

An explanation of the formula and the statistical analyses procedures outlined above are reported in Chapter IV.

Chapter IV

REPORT OF FINDINGS

As previously stated, the problem of this study was to ascertain the degree of divergence or congruence between the perceptions of real and idealized behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrators themselves and their instructional staffs. A total of 106 Leader Behavior Description Questionnaires were administered to the two reference groups - administrators and instructors - in the ten adult education centers of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. The number of usable returns was 101 (95.28%) of all questionnaires distributed. Five returned questionnaires were incomplete and considered unusable. The usable returns contained the responses from all ten (100%) administrators and ninety-one (94.79%) instructors. Thus, a total of 101 (95%) of all questionnaires administered were used as the basic data for statistical analyses in this study.

The presentation of the findings of this study was organized into four sections constituting separate discussions of the four hypotheses stated in null form earlier in Chapter III. Tabled data were also included to assist in clarification of the discussions. To simplify reading and references, the data were combined into four tables, each of which contained the data applicable to the hypothesis under discussion.

LEADER BEHAVIOR OF ADMINISTRATORS: REAL

The data in Table 1 are the administrators' self-descriptions and the instructors' descriptions about real leader behavior on the twelve sub-scales of the LBDQ. In order to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the two reference groups on the linear combination of the twelve sub-scales, a one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was employed. The results of this multivariate analysis was that there was not a statistically significant difference between the two groups on the linear combination of the twelve sub-scales ($F= 1.086, P > .05$). Thus, based upon the research, the data was not such to reject null hypothesis one which stated: No differences exist between the perceptions of the actual leader behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrators themselves and their instructional staff. Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were also performed on the twelve sub-tests, one for each sub-test. The purpose of these analyses was to further explore the data in a descriptive rather than an inferential sense. The data indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the univariate sense between the two reference groups on the following sub-scales:

1. Representation
2. Initiation of Structure
3. Persuasiveness
4. Predictive Accuracy

These data indicated that administrators scaled their own leader behavior consistently higher than instructors on each of these four sub-scales. A comparison of the mean scores of the two reference

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Administrators' and
Instructors' Descriptions of the Real Leader
Behavior of Administrators

Variable	Administrators		Staff	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Representation	22.600	2.878	19.978	3.145
Demand Reconciliation	21.000	2.494	20.242	3.535
Tolerance of Uncertainty	38.800	4.050	36.978	5.262
Initiation of Structure	41.000	4.497	36.747	6.100
Persuasiveness	44.800	4.541	39.462	6.061
Tolerance of Freedom	44.100	4.864	41.593	5.333
Role Assumption	42.800	4.315	40.473	6.344
Consideration	44.400	3.502	41.934	5.647
Production Emphasis	36.700	6.001	34.956	4.899
Predictive Accuracy	20.400	3.134	17.923	3.045
Integration	22.300	2.669	20.143	3.831
Superior Orientation	40.300	3.802	37.154	5.243

groups supported this observation. (See Table 1). It should be noted however, that these latter analyses were for descriptive purposes only and that the overall conclusion was that there was no difference between the perceptions of the two reference groups on the real leader behavior of the adult education administrator based upon the linear combination of the twelve sub-scales of the LBDQ.

LEADER BEHAVIOR OF ADMINISTRATORS: IDEAL

Table 2 reports the data obtained in computations of information on the administrators' self-descriptions and the instructors' descriptions about the administrators' ideal leader behavior.

As with the real dimension the multivariate tests indicated no statistically significant difference between the reference groups on the linear combination of the twelve sub-scales ($F = 0.628$, $P < .05$). Univariate Analyses of Variance were also used for descriptive purposes only in testing null hypothesis two which stated: No differences exist between the perceptions of the ideal leader behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrators themselves and their instructional staff. The data indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two reference groups on only one sub-scale: Initiation of Structure. A comparison of mean scores on this sub-scale indicated that administrators scaled their own leader behavior higher than instructors on the ideal dimension. Again, these latter analyses were for descriptive purposes only, and the overall conclusion was that there was no difference between the two reference groups' descriptions of the

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Administrators'
And Instructors' Descriptions of the Ideal
Leader Behavior of Administrators

Variable	Administrators		Staff	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Representation	22.300	2.751	21.275	3.088
Demand Reconciliation	22.900	2.726	21.286	3.226
Tolerance of Uncertainty	40.100	5.322	39.242	6.178
Initiation of Structure	44.600	4.695	40.473	6.315
Persuasiveness	45.100	4.999	41.868	6.930
Tolerance of Freedom	42.800	4.022	41.692	5.880
Role Assumption	45.400	2.951	43.077	6.846
Consideration	45.400	3.026	43.538	5.556
Production Emphasis	37.500	8.631	36.890	6.371
Predictive Accuracy	21.900	2.846	19.758	3.497
Integration	23.400	2.319	22.143	3.043
Superior Orientation	42.800	5.203	40.044	6.912

ideal leader behavior of the adult education administrators. Thus, based upon the data, the researcher was not able to reject null hypothesis two.

ADMINISTRATORS' SELF-DESCRIPTIONS
OF LEADER BEHAVIOR:
REAL AND IDEAL

Multiple t-tests with $\alpha = .01$ (overall $\alpha = .1136$) were used to determine any intra-group differences on the administrators' self-descriptions of real and ideal leader behavior. The t values shown in Table 3 were derived from the algebraic formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2 - 2(s_1 s_2 r_{12})}{n}}}$$

Where:

\bar{X}_1 = Mean on the real dimension

\bar{X}_2 = Mean on the ideal dimension

s_1^2 = Variance on the real dimension

s_2^2 = Variance on the ideal dimension

$s_1 s_2 r_{12}$ = Correlation of variances

n = Number of respondents

Results of computations utilizing the formula above indicated significant differences at the .01 level of significance on only two variables:

1. Initiation of Structure
2. Predictive Accuracy

It follows that null hypothesis three which stated: No differences exist between the perceptions the adult education administrators

Table 3

Means and t Ratios of Mean Differences in Real and
Ideal Behavior of Administrators'
Self-Descriptions

Variable	Real	Ideal	t Ratio
	Mean	Mean	
Representation	22.6	22.3	.410
Demand Reconciliation	21.0	22.9	-3.243
Tolerance of Uncertainty	38.8	40.1	-1.090
Initiation of Structure	41.0	44.6	-9.925
Persuasiveness	44.8	45.1	-.402
Tolerance of Freedom	44.1	42.8	1.221
Role Assumption	42.8	45.4	-1.692
Consideration	44.4	45.4	-.211
Production Emphasis	36.7	37.5	-.725
Predictive Accuracy	20.4	21.9	-3.737
Integration	22.3	23.4	-.177
Superior Orientation	40.3	42.8	-1.643

$\alpha = .01$ (overall $\alpha = 1 - (1 - .01)^{12} = .1136$)

Critical Value of $t = \pm 3.25$

*Significant at the .01 level of significance

hold for their own actual and ideal leader behavior was not rejected on ten of the twelve variables at the .01 level of significance. Table 3 contains the statistical data in support of this observation.

One possible explanation of the significant t-ratio reported on Initiation of Structure for the real and ideal leader behavior of administrators' self-descriptions was that certain adult education administrators, to avoid being crowded by time, delegated a share of their authority and responsibility to assistant principals. Four of the ten adult education administrators had assistant principals. In such cases, the transfer of authority in itself was an essential aspect of Initiating Structure (Halpin, 93:119). The suggestion was, that while certain adult education administrators may have engaged in the practice of shared responsibility, the LBDQ - the instrument used in this study - depicted a one-man decision concept in its measurement of the variable Initiating Structure.

With respect to the significant t-ratio on Predictive Accuracy, the adult education administrator was quite likely at the mercy of the uncertainties of a slowly changing centralized organizational structure within the school system. The present public schools administration, in operation for a little more than a year, had been in the process of decentralizing the system. Adult education administrators, most of whom have had more than one year of tenure, were perhaps in a transition stage from centralization to decentralization. The on-going transition may have produced a number of uncertainties with respect to administrative processes and may have contributed to the Predictive Accuracy sub-scale scores obtained in this study.

INSTRUCTORS' DESCRIPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS'
LEADER BEHAVIOR: REAL AND IDEAL

The highest leader behavior expectations of the adult education administrator were depicted in the instructional staff's descriptions of their administrators' real and ideal behavior. Table 4 shows the statistical data to support this observation. As reported earlier, the univariate tests indicated differences on four of the twelve variables as real behavior as described by administrators and instructors. Mean scores in Table 1 for eight of the twelve variables were more nearly in agreement as compared to only two of twelve variables described by instructors as shown in Table 4.

Expectations by the instructors, reported as significant at the .01 level, included ten sub-scales on the adult education administrators' leader behavior. Null hypothesis four which stated: No differences exist between the perceptions the instructional staff holds for the actual and ideal behavior of the adult education administrator, was therefore rejected on ten variables. The variables were:

1. Representation
2. Demand Reconciliation
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty
4. Initiation of Structure
5. Persuasiveness
6. Role Assumption
7. Production Emphasis
8. Predictive Accuracy
9. Integration
10. Superior Orientation

A comparison of mean scores in Table 4 indicated that instructors scaled each of the ten variables higher on the ideal dimension than on the real dimension.

Table 4

Means and t Ratios of Mean Differences in Real and
Ideal Leader Behavior of Administrators:
Instructors' Descriptions

Variable	Real	Ideal	t Ratio	
	Mean	Mean		
Representation	19.978	21.275	-4.123	*
Demand Reconciliation	20.242	21.286	-2.690	*
Tolerance of Uncertainty	36.978	39.242	-4.421	*
Initiation of Structure	36.747	40.473	-6.017	*
Persuasiveness	39.462	41.868	-3.560	*
Tolerance of Freedom	41.593	41.692	-.239	
Role Assumption	40.473	43.077	-3.887	*
Consideration	41.934	43.538	-.841	
Production Emphasis	34.956	36.890	-2.978	*
Predictive Accuracy	17.923	19.758	-5.515	*
Integration	20.143	22.143	-5.623	*
Superior Orientation	37.154	40.044	-4.842	*

$\alpha = .01$ (Overall $\alpha = 1 - (1 - .01)^{12} = .1136$)

Critical Value of t = ± 2.60

*Significant at the .01 level of significance

Although significant differences were apparent on the ten variables, instructors, as a group, did endorse relatively high performance on real leader behavior as shown by the mean scores in Column 1 of Table 4. Predictive Accuracy was an exception; however, this same variable was also scaled lower on the ideal dimension.

Instructors in this study depicted higher criteria in the leader behavior of their adult education administrators. The generalizability of this observation however, offered no standards for judging effectiveness of leadership in the ten adult education centers with respect to Barnard's Theory of organizational effectiveness. Therefore, caution should be taken in any effort to generalize the findings in terms of the effectiveness of the adult education administrators serving under a supervising director who was a middle echelon administrator (fourth level from Superintendent) with responsibilities to the public school system in the broader specializations of adult education and summer schools programs.

This proposition raised the issue of the usefulness or importance of the information and subsequent findings of the present study. The researcher submits that the information obtained from the data in this study was significant because the instructors were in the unique position to observe the leader behavior of their respective adult education administrator on practically a daily basis from close range. Additionally, it was the instructors along with their adult education administrators who worked cooperatively in the same closed environment of the adult education center. No other group in the Public School System of the District of Columbia

had a similar relationship where observation of overt leader behavior of the adult education administrator had more direct implications for student success. Unfortunately, the instructors were six levels down the organizational ladder from where the top level decisions were made affecting program policies and funds necessary for student success in the individual adult education centers.

The above postulation coupled with the expectations of the adult education administrators' leader behavior, as depicted by the data in Table 4, pointed to the need for a study of communications between all levels of administration, an increased understanding of organizational structure, greater participation in the establishment and clarification of goals, and a broader inquiry into the decision-making processes with respect to responsibility, recruitment and training criteria in the school system. It seemed apparent to the researcher that instructor expectations of their adult education administrators' leader behavior, while higher than their descriptions of real behavior, were more likely attributable to a lack of instructor knowledge of the administrative processes of the school system.

Perhaps the Washington, D. C. Adult Education Evaluation Team's conclusion -

. . . The greatest weaknesses are in the areas of supervision and supporting service, and funding Supervision is a weak area throughout the system including the Adult Regular, Adult Basic, Vocational Adult, Community Schools and the two programs for speakers of other languages (Parker and others, 94:44). -

and recommendations cited in Chapter I -

(1) . . . establish a clear statement of long-term goals for Adult Education. Such a statement, properly orchestrated at

the several levels, could clarify and make visible the goals of the program(s) and create a climate for positive input into an expansion effort.

(2) That a handbook be prepared for increasing staff understanding of and commitment to the goals and procedures of the adult education effort in the D. C. Public Schools.

(3) That the recruitment, training, and continuing education of the adult educators be made an integral part of the District's total staff development effort (95:48). -

as well as the information gleaned from the findings of the present study relate to the researcher's proposition that incorporation of instructor understanding, participation in and commitment to the processes of administration, i.e., decision-making and goal setting, are among the prerequisites to improving the adult education program of the District of Columbia Public Schools.

Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

The problem of this study was to ascertain the degree of divergence or congruence between the actual and ideal perceptions of leader behavior of the adult education administrator held by the adult education administrator himself and his instructional staff.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII, was used to measure certain acts of leadership of the adult education administrators. The adult education administrators' self-opinions, as well as, the opinions of their instructional staffs were obtained on 200 items contained in the two parts (actual and ideal) of the instrument.

Twelve variables of leadership were measured regarding the leader behavior of ten adult education administrators of regular adult education centers. The data were gathered in ten separate sessions, following initial interviews of the adult education administrators at their respective centers. This information was requested on the basis of how "does" the adult education administrator behave (real behavior) and how he "should" behave (ideal behavior). A total of ninety-one instructors and ten adult education administrators participated in the ten group interviews.

Two inter-group hypotheses and two intra-group hypotheses in null form were tested for significance through three analyses of variance procedures. A one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance

revealed no significant differences when the two inter-group null hypotheses were tested. Hypotheses one and two, however, were rejected in part, as significant differences appeared on four "real" variables and only one "ideal" variable when a one-way Univariate Analysis of Variance was employed. Multiple correlated t-tests were used to test hypotheses three and four, the two intra-group hypotheses. Each was rejected in part, as significant differences appeared on only two variables of self-descriptions and on ten variables of instructors' descriptions of administrators' real and ideal behavior. The means, standard deviations, and t-values were obtained from the raw data and presented in table form.

On the variable of Initiation of Structure, significant differences were found on all four hypotheses of this study. The Predictive Accuracy variable tested for significance revealed differences in three hypotheses. In the measurement of differences about how an adult education administrator "does" behave and how he "should" behave from the instructors' standpoint, however, significant differences appeared on ten of the twelve variables.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study were such that conclusions can be supported to the effect that:

1. Both reference groups were essentially in agreement about the adult education administrators' real and ideal behavior.

2. Differences of opinions were most apparent when real behavior was compared to ideal behaviors from instructors' descriptions of leader behavior. This observation was supported by comparing the mean scores obtained from the instructional staff's descriptions of their administrators' real and ideal behavior.
3. Both the expectations of the adult education administrators in describing their own leader behavior and the expectations of the instructors in describing their administrators' leader behavior were scaled slightly higher than descriptions by both groups on real leader behavior.
4. Administrators' expectations were considerably higher than those of instructors on ideal behavior.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations were limited to the purposes and significance of the study:

1. To aid in a better understanding of the nature of the adult education administrators' leader behavior.
2. To provide information to serve as a basis for future studies in adult education administration.
3. To provide an information basis for administrator - instructor consensus geared to the establishment and clarification of organizational goals and the development of recruitment and training criteria.

Since this study was an investigation of the differences in the perceptions of the adult education administrators' leader behavior as was observed (real) and as it should be (ideal), the recommendations were made on the basis of the findings of this study:

1. Since there was general agreement between the perceptions of instructors and administrators regarding administrators' leader behavior, it was assumed that communication had occurred regarding the role of the administrator. Therefore, it was recommended that there be continued communication between the two reference groups to reinforce their understanding of the role of the adult education administrator, particularly in the areas of agreement with respect to leader behavior.
2. To determine whether the lack of information was the reason for disparity in instructors' assessments of leader behavior, it was recommended that efforts (in-service training and increased communication) be directed toward resolving the disagreements between perceptions of real and ideal leader behavior. These efforts should be directed specifically toward the variables which were perceived as significantly different by the respondent groups in this study, i.e., Representation, Initiation of Structure, Persuasiveness, and Predictive Accuracy on the real dimension and the variable Initiation of Structure on the ideal dimension.

3. It was recommended that central office administrators evaluate the close association of the adult education administrators' real and ideal perceptions of leader behavior in light of attainment of the goals of the adult education program including training and recruitment of adult education administrators.
4. It was also recommended that in-service training be provided to instructors regarding the role of the administrator, specifically in the Initiation of Structure and Predictive Accuracy dimensions of leadership. This training should enable instructors to better understand these functions of administration and as a result provide a basis for the reduction of possible role conflict.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of the present study suggested certain implications for similar and future leadership studies in adult education. The following implications were apparent to the researcher:

1. The findings of this study may have implications for the training and recruitment of adult education administrators to the extent that there is agreement on those forms of leader behavior which instructors, adult education administrators and central office administrators consider most desirable and effective. It should be noted that data was not collected from

central office personnel.

2. Since the present inquiry was confined to the two reference groups focal to the adult education administrators' behavior in the internal administration of the adult education centers, all reference groups that could furnish criterion information were not exhausted; nor was the adult education administrators' behavior in external administration examined, i.e., community and public relations activities. This observation posits a need for a multiple-criteria approach to the study of the leader behavior effectiveness of the adult education administrator. Evaluation of the organizational climate, for example, could be correlated with the data obtained on an objective instrument such as the LBDQ. This means, however, that several independent objective criteria of the adult education administrator's effectiveness must first be established, and then determine the relationship between these criteria and selected predictor variables and the criteria themselves.
3. There was no attempt in the present study to examine the dynamics of the adult education administrators' leader behavior from the standpoint of role differentiation. Therefore, there are implications for future research in this area utilizing the methods of the present study coupled with certain case-study techniques.
4. In as much as there is a lack of ultimate criteria to

determine the effectiveness of adult education administrators, it is reasonable to tentatively accept "intermediate" criteria (congruence of LBDQ - real and ideal scores from reference groups) for evaluating the effectiveness of the adult education administrators. Barnard and Getzels' postulations as well as the relationship between leader behavior dimension scores and effectiveness cited earlier support this implication.

The twelve variables examined in the present study by no means account for all of the observable variance in leader behavior; and it was not within the preview of this study to imply that these variables constituted the ultimate criteria of leadership effectiveness. These criteria do, however, represent intermediate criteria useful in future leadership studies in adult education administration.

REFERENCES

10. Barnard, Chester I. The functions of the executive, 17th printing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- 79.
52. Barraclough, Terry. Management styles. ERIC Document ED 074 607. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1973.
73. Bates, A. P., and J. S. Cloyd. Toward the development of operations for defining group norms and member roles. Sociometry, Vol. 19, (1956).
46. Blumenthal, Sol. Changing expectations of teachers and students during one semester at an adult education institute. ERIC Document ED 048 534. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.
85. Buchanan, Paul C. Characteristics of research of leadership in education. ERIC Document ED 084 658. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.
58. Calder, Paula H. Role conflict and its correlates in an educational setting. ERIC Document ED 033 454. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.
75. Cave, David R. A critical study of the leader behavior of school administrators in conflict with teacher's unions. ERIC Document ED 015 520. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1967.
59. Chung, Ki-Suck. Teacher-centered management style of public school principals and job satisfaction of teachers. ERIC Document ED 042 259. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1970.
74. Corrigan, Dean, and Colden Garland. Studying role relationships. ERIC Document ED 027 249. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1966.
25. Cummings, L. L., and Donald P. Schwab. Performance in organizations: Determinants and appraisal. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.
- 34.
- 86.
20. Cunningham, Luvern I. and William J. Gephart (Eds.). Leadership: The science and art today. Itasca: R. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1973.
- 21.
- 22.

24.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
33.
37.
38.
41.
42.
53.
83.
90.
91.
81. Davis, F. J. Conceptions of official leader roles in the air force. Social Forces, Vol. 32, (1954).
49. DeVries, David L. Sources of influence on faculty behavior. ERIC Document ED 052 742. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.
50. _____. The relationship of role expectations to faculty behavior. ERIC Document ED 061 912. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1972.
66. Duncan, John W. Governing board-superintendent expectation and perception of the teacher role. ERIC Document ED 015 130. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.
19. Evans, M. G. The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. Organizational behavior and human performance. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970.
54. Foa, U. G. A test of the foreman- worker relationship. Personal Psychology, Vol. 9, (1956).
71. Foskett, John M. The normative world of the elementary school principal. Eugene: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.
65. Fussell, Polly L., and Cecil E. Carter. A research summary of a graduate study: An analysis of factors related to the role performance of 4-H junior leaders in selected Tennessee counties. ERIC Document ED 036 723. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1970.
11. Getzels, Jacob W. Conflict and role behavior in educational settings. In W. W. Charters and N. D. Gage (Eds.). Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1964

- 80.
4. Griffith, William S. The evolving role of the adult education director. In Nathan C. Shaw (Ed.). Administration of continuing education - A guide for administrators. Washington: National Association for Public School Adult Education, 1969.
43. Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in role analysis, 3rd printing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
87. Gross, Alvin. Personal interview. October 2, 1974.
14. Halpin, Andrew W. Administrative behavior in education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
3. _____. Theory and research in administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969.
- 13.
- 15.
- 32.
- 35.
- 40.
- 88.
- 93.
45. Hampton, Leonard A. An analysis of critical behaviors of cooperative extension agents in the performance of their jobs. ERIC Document ED 042 978. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.
60. Havron, M. D. and J. E. McGrath, The contribution of the leader to the effectiveness of small military group. In L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass, Leadership and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
56. Heslin, R., and D. Dunphy. Three dimensions of member satisfaction in small groups. Human Relations, Vol. 17, (1964).
51. Hollis, Coy F. Perceptions of school board members and school system personnel concerning role responsibility in initiating solutions. ERIC Document ED 082 317. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1972.
69. Hulett, J. E., and R. Stagner. Problems in social psychology. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1952.
48. Jaffe, Cabot L. Effective management selection: The analysis of behavior by simulation techniques. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1971.

77. Johnson, David W. The efficacy of role reversal: Warmth of inter-action, accuracy of understanding and the proposal of compromises. ERIC Document ED 044 729. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1970.
76. Kaiser, Charles H. An empirical analysis of role conflict and multiple allegiance among selected vocational teachers in Oklahoma. ERIC Document ED 022 053. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968.
18. Krech, David, R. S. Crutchfield, and E. L. Ballachey. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
63. Latimar, Lowell F. The role of the elementary school principal as perceived by the faculty and principal through selected role behavior. ERIC Order No. 67-4465. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1966.
1. Onofrio, John E. The public school principal in terms of today's leadership role expectations. ERIC Document ED 025 024. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968.
6. Parker, Mary R., and others. Evaluation of the adult education program of the public schools of the District of Columbia. Washington: An Evaluation Team, 1974.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 94.
- 95.
16. Parsons, Talcott, and Edward A. Shils (Eds.). Toward a general theory of action. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1951.
78. Prokop, Manfred. Role conflict in student teaching. ERIC Document ED 080 498. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.
62. Pryer, M. W., A. W. Flint, and B. M. Bass. Group effectiveness and consistency of leadership. Sociometry, Vol. 25, (1962).
67. Ruark, Billie J. An investigation of the relationship between perceptions of selected groups relative of the role of VICA and achievement of VICA goals. ERIC Document ED 087 876. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1973.
17. Satorn, Pingo. The provincial school superintendent in Thailand: A study of role perceptions and expectations. ERIC Document ED 059 543. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.

72. Shearon, Ronald W. Correlates of administrative professional leadership in the North Carolina agriculture extension service. ERIC Document ED 025 729. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.
55. Shelly, H. P. Status consensus, leadership and satisfaction with the group. Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 51, (1960).
84. Sokol, Alvin P. and Jon C. Marshall. The congruence of teacher expectations. ERIC Document ED 036 473. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.
64. Stamm, Harlan C. The role expectations of eighteen California community-junior college presidents comparative to three associative reference groups. ERIC Document ED 024 384. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968.
2. Stogdill, Ralph M., Ellis L. Scott, and William E. Jaynes. Leadership and role expectations. Research Monograph, No. 86. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1956.
39. _____, Individual behavior and group achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- 57.
- 61.
- 68.
- 69.
- 82.
- 89.
12. _____. Handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- 23.
36. Shartle, Carroll L. Introduction. In Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin Coons, (Eds.). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1973.
5. Stotts, Michael J. Field study of the perceptions of directors' leader behavior in Illinois basic education center. ERIC Document ED 027 480. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968.
- 92.
44. Sutker, Soloman and others, An exploratory analysis of the roles and role conflicts of vocational teachers in Oklahoma. ERIC Document ED 017 686. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1967.
70. Viteles, M. S. Motivation and morale in industry. New York: Norton Publishers, 1953.

47. Wiggins, Thomas W. What's in the script for principal behavior: Implications of some current research on the behavioral characteristics of principals. ERIC Document ED 057 445. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Books

- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive, 17th printing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Carver, Fred D., and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (eds.). Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.
- Cummings, L. L., and Donald P. Schwab. Performance in Organizations: Determinants and Appraisal. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.
- Cunningham, Luvern I. and William J. Gephart (eds.). Leadership: The Science and Art Today. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1973.
- Downton, James V. Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Evans, M. G. "The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Foskett, John M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal. Eugene: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.
- Gage, N. L., and W. W. Charters (eds.). Readings in the Social Psychology of Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964.
- Glass, Gene V., and Julian C. Stanley. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970.
- Griffith, William S. "The Evolving Role of the Adult Education Director," Administration of Continuing Education - A Guide for Administrators, ed. Nathan C. Shaw. Washington: National Association for Public School Adult Education, 1969.
- Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis, 3rd printing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

- _____. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969.
- Hodgson, Richard C., Daniel J. Levinson, and Abraham Zaleznik. The Executive Role Constellation. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1965.
- Hulett, J. E., and R. Stagner. Problems in Social Psychology. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1952.
- Jaffe, Cabot L. Effective Management Selection: The Analysis of Behavior by Simulation Techniques. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1971.
- Krech, David, R. S. Crutchfield, and E. L. Ballachey. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Edward A. Shils (eds.). Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1951.
- Petrullo, L., and B. M. Bass (eds.). Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- _____. Handbook of Leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- Taylor, Peter A. An Introduction to Statistical Methods. Itasca: F. E. Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Tead, Ordway. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951.
- United States Civil Service Commission. Training the Supervisor. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956.
- Verner, Coolie, and Thurman White (eds.). Administration of Adult Education. Washington: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1965.
- Viteles, M. S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York: Norton Publishers, 1953.

2. Collected Documents

- Parker, Mary R., and others. "Evaluation of the Adult Education Program of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia." Washington: An Evaluation Team, 1974. (Typewritten).

Strayer, George D. "Adult Education," The Report of a Survey of The Public Schools of the District of Columbia. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1949. (Xerox copy).

3. Interview

Gross, Alvin. Personal interview. October 2, 1974.

4. Monographs

Campbell, Donald T. Leadership and Its Effects Upon the Group, Research Monograph, No. 83. Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research. The Ohio State University, 1956.

Maclatchy, Josephine H. (ed.). Situational Factors in Leadership, Monograph No. 32. Columbus: The Bureau of Educational Research. The Ohio State University, 1949.

Seeman, Melvin. Social Status and Leadership: The Case of the School Executive, Monograph No. 35. Columbus: The Bureau of Educational Research and Services. The Ohio State University, 1960.

Scott, Ellis L. Leadership and Perceptions of Organization, Research Monograph, No. 82. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research. The Ohio State University, 1956.

Stogdill, Ralph M., and Carrol L. Shartle. Methods in the Study of Administrative Leadership, Research Monograph, No. 80. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research. The Ohio State University, 1955.

_____, Ellis L. Scott, and William E. Jaynes. Leadership and Role Expectations, Research Monograph, No. 86. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1956.

_____, and Alvin E. Coons (eds.). Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Research Monograph, No. 88. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1973.

Taves, Marvin J., Ronald G. Corwin, and Eugene J. Haas. Role Conception and Vocational Success and Satisfaction, Research Monograph, No. 112. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1963.

Yusuk, Ronald P. The Assessment of Employee Morale, Research Monograph, No. 99. Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1961.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Abstracts

Blumenthal, Sol. Changing Expectations of Teachers and Students During

One Semester at an Edult Education Institute. ERIC Document ED 048 534. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969. (Abstract).

Cave, David R., A Critical Study of the Leader Behavior of School Administrators in Conflict with Teacher's Unions ERIC Document ED 015 520. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1967. (Abstract).

Corrigan, Dean, and Colden Garland. Studying Role Relationships. ERIC Document ED 027 249. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1966. (Abstract).

Duncan, John W. Governing Board-Superintendent Expectation and Perception of the Teacher Role. ERIC Document ED 015 130. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971. (Doctoral Dissertation abstract).

Johnson, David W. The Efficacy of Role Reversal: Warmth of Interaction, Accuracy of Understanding and the Proposal of Compromises. ERIC Document ED 044 729. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1970. (Abstract).

Latimar, Lowell F. The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by the Faculty and Principal Through Selected Role Behavior. ERIC Order No. 67-4465. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1966. (Dissertation abstract).

Ruark, Billie J. An Investigation of the Relationship Between Perceptions of Selected Groups Relative of the Role of VICA and Achievement of VICA Goals. ERIC Document ED 087 876. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1973. (Abstract).

Sokol, Alvin P. and Jon C. Marshall. The Congruence of Teacher Expectations. ERIC Document ED 036 473. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969. (Abstract).

2. Books

Cummings, L. L., and Donald P. Schwab. Performance in Organizations: Determinants and Appraisal. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.

Cunningham, Luvern I. and William J. Gephart (eds.). Leadership: The Science and Art Today. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers Inc., 1973.

Stogdill, Ralph M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

_____. Handbook of Leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

3. Microfilms

- Bates, A. P., and J. S. Cloyd. "Toward the Development of Operations for Defining Group Norms and Member Roles," Sociometry, Vol. 19, 1956. (Microfilm)
- Brown, Alan F., and Barry D. Anderson. "Faculty Consensus As A Function of Leadership Frequency and Style," The Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 36, No. 2, Winter 1967. (Microfilm).
- Davis, F. J. "Conceptions of Official Leader Roles in the Air Force," Social Forces, Vol. 32, 1954. (Microfilm).
- Foa, U. G. "A Test of the Foreman-Worker Relationship," Personal Psychology, Vol. 9, 1956. (Microfilm).
- Heslin, R., and D. Dunphy. "Three Dimensions of Member Satisfaction in Small Groups," Human Relations, Vol. 17, 1964. (Microfilm)
- Pryer, M. W., A. W. Flint, and B. M. Bass. "Group Effectiveness and Consistency of Leadership," Sociometry, Vol. 25, 1962. (Microfilm).
- Shelly, H. P. "Status Consensus, Leadership and Satisfaction with the Group," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 51, 1960. (Microfilm).

4. Microfische

- Barraclough, Terry. Management Styles. ERIC Document ED 074 607. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1973. (Microfische).
- Buchanan, Paul C. Characteristics of Research of Leadership in Education. ERIC Document ED 084 658. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971. (Microfische).
- Calder, Paula H. Role Conflict and Its Correlates in an Educational Setting. ERIC Document ED 033 454. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969. (Microfische).
- Chung, Ki-Suck. Teacher-Centered Management Style of Public School Principals and Job Satisfaction of Teachers. ERIC Document ED 042 259. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1970. (Microfische).
- DeVries, David L. Sources of Influence on Faculty Behavior. ERIC Document ED 052 742. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971. (Microfische).
- _____. The Relationship of Role Expectations to Faculty Behavior. ERIC Document ED 061 912. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1972. (Microfische).

- Fussell, Polly L., and Cecil E. Carter. A Research Summary of a Graduate Study: An Analysis of Factors Related to the Role Performance of 4-H Junior Leaders in Selected Tennessee Counties. ERIC Document ED 036 723. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1970. (Microfische).
- Hampton, Leonard A. An Analysis of Critical Behaviors of Cooperative Extension Agents in the Performance of Their Jobs. ERIC Document ED 042 978. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969. (Microfische).
- Hollis, Coy F. Perceptions of School Board Members and School System Personnel Concerning Role Responsibility in Initiating Solutions. ERIC Document ED 082 317. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1972. (Microfische).
- Kaiser, Charles H. An Empirical Analysis of Role Conflict and Multiple Allegiance Among Selected Vocational Teachers in Oklahoma. ERIC Document ED 022 053. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968. (Microfische).
- Onofrio, John E. The Public School Principal in Terms of Today's Leadership Role Expectations. ERIC Document ED 025 024. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968. (Microfische).
- Prokop, Manfred. Role Conflict in Student Teaching. ERIC Document ED 080 498. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971. (Microfische).
- Satorn, Pingo. The Provincial School Superintendent in Thailand: A Study of Role Perceptions and Expectations. ERIC Document ED 059 543. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971. (Microfische).
- Shearon, Ronald W. Correlates of Administrative Professional Leadership in the North Carolina Agriculture Extension Service. ERIC Document ED 025 729. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1969. (Microfische).
- Stamm, Harlan C. The Role Expectations of Eighteen California Community-Junior College Presidents Comparative to Three Associative Reference Groups. ERIC Document ED 024 384. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968. (Microfische).
- Stotts, Michael J. Field Study of the Perceptions of Directors' Leader Behavior in Illinois Basic Education Center. ERIC Document ED 027 480. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1968. (Microfische).

Wiggins, Thomas W. What's in the Script for Principal Behavior? •
Implications of Some Current Research on the Behavioral
Characteristics of Principals. ERIC Document ED 057 445.
U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.
(Microfische).

APPENDIX A

**PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIVISION OF SUMMER SCHOOLS, CONTINUING EDUCATION AND URBAN SERVICE CORPS.
PRESIDENTIAL BUILDING
418 12TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004**

January 14, 1975

Mr. Hercules Pinkney
1430 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Dear Mr. Pinkney:

This is to confirm our conversation regarding permission for you to conduct your proposed study of all ten regular adult education centers of the Public School System of the District of Columbia.

Since all ten centers are under my direct supervision, I would be willing to assist you in the scheduling of interviews of principals and the administration of questionnaires.

I am desirous of your sharing the results of your study with us, particularly with the ten principals and me. We are very much interested in self improvement through staff development activities.

I look forward to meeting with you again soon to finalize the details of your study.

Sincerely,

Alvin E. Gross, Supervising
Director
Adult Education and Summer
Schools
Public Schools of the District of
Columbia

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—Form XII

Originated by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies
and revised by the
Bureau of Business Research

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

This questionnaire is in two parts. You are asked to respond to the items in Part One as to the "actual behavior" of your supervisor. Then respond to the same items in Part Two as to the "ideal behavior" of your supervisor.

Published by

Bureau of Business Research
College of Commerce and Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the teacher engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he (A) *always*, (B) *often*, (C) *occasionally*, (D) *seldom* or (E) *never* acts as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around *one* of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

- e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described..... A B C D E

Example: He never acts as described..... A B C D E

Example: He occasionally acts as described..... A B C D E

-
1. He acts as the spokesman of the group..... A B C D E
 2. He waits patiently for the results of a decision..... A B C D E
 3. He makes pep talks to stimulate the group..... A B C D E
 4. He lets group members know what is expected of them..... A B C D E
 5. He allows the members complete freedom in their work..... A B C D E
 6. He is hesitant about taking initiative in the group..... A B C D E
 7. He is friendly and approachable..... A B C D E
 8. He encourages overtime work..... A B C D E
 9. He makes accurate decisions..... A B C D E
 10. He gets along well with the people above him..... A B C D E
 11. He publicizes the activities of the group..... A B C D E
 12. He becomes anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next..... A B C D E

A — Always

B — Often

C — Occasionally

D — Seldom

E — Never

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. His arguments are convincing..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 14. He encourages the use of uniform procedures..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 15. He permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 16. He fails to take necessary action..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 18. He stresses being ahead of competing groups..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 19. He keeps the group working together as a team..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 20. He keeps the group in good standing with higher authority..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 21. He speaks as the representative of the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 22. He accepts defeat in stride..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 23. He argues persuasively for his point of view..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 24. He tries out his ideas in the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 25. He encourages initiative in the group members..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 26. He lets other persons take away his leadership in the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 27. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 28. He needles members for greater effort..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 29. He seems able to predict what is coming next..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 30. He is working hard for a promotion..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 31. He speaks for the group when visitors are present..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 32. He accepts delays without becoming upset..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 33. He is a very persuasive talker..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 34. He makes his attitudes clear to the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 35. He lets the members do their work the way they think best..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 36. He lets some members take advantage of him..... | A | B | C | D | E |

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

37. He treats all group members as his equals. A B C D E
38. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace. A B C D E
39. He settles conflicts when they occur in the group. A B C D E
40. His superiors act favorably on most of his suggestions. A B C D E
41. He represents the group at outside meetings. A B C D E
42. He becomes anxious when waiting for new developments. A B C D E
43. He is very skillful in an argument. A B C D E
44. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done. A B C D E
45. He assigns a task, then lets the members handle it. A B C D E
46. He is the leader of the group in name only. A B C D E
47. He gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
48. He pushes for increased production. A B C D E
49. Things usually turn out as he predicts. A B C D E
50. He enjoys the privileges of his position. A B C D E
51. He handles complex problems efficiently. A B C D E
52. He is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty. A B C D E
53. He is not a very convincing talker. A B C D E
54. He assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
55. He turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it. A B C D E
56. He backs down when he ought to stand firm. A B C D E
57. He keeps to himself. A B C D E
58. He asks the members to work harder. A B C D E
59. He is accurate in predicting the trend of events. A B C D E
60. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members. A B C D E

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

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 61. He gets swamped by details..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 62. He can wait just so long, then blows up..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 63. He speaks from a strong inner conviction..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 64. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members | A | B | C | D | E |
| 65. He is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 66. He lets some members have authority that he should keep..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 67. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 68. He permits the members to take it easy in their work..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 69. He sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 70. His word carries weight with his superiors..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 71. He gets things all tangled up..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 72. He remains calm when uncertain about coming events..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 73. He is an inspiring talker..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 74. He schedules the work to be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 75. He allows the group a high degree of initiative..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 76. He takes full charge when emergencies arise..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 77. He is willing to make changes..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 78. He drives hard when there is a job to be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 79. He helps group members settle their differences..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 80. He gets what he asks for from his superiors..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 81. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 82. He is able to delay action until the proper time occurs..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 83. He persuades others that his ideas are to their advantage..... | A | B | C | D | E |

A — Always

B — Often

C — Occasionally

D — Seldom

E — Never

84. He maintains definite standards of performance..... A B C D E
85. He trusts the members to exercise good judgment..... A B C D E
86. He overcomes attempts made to challenge his leadership..... A B C D E
87. He refuses to explain his actions..... A B C D E
88. He urges the group to beat its previous record..... A B C D E
89. He anticipates problems and plans for them..... A B C D E
90. He is working his way to the top..... A B C D E
91. He gets confused when too many demands are made of him..... A B C D E
92. He worries about the outcome of any new procedure..... A B C D E
93. He can inspire enthusiasm for a project..... A B C D E
94. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations..... A B C D E
95. He permits the group to set its own pace..... A B C D E
96. He is easily recognized as the leader of the group..... A B C D E
97. He acts without consulting the group..... A B C D E
98. He keeps the group working up to capacity..... A B C D E
99. He maintains a closely knit group..... A B C D E
100. He maintains cordial relations with superiors..... A B C D E

DIRECTIONS:

PART II - Ideal Behavior

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he (A) *always*, (B) *often*, (C) *occasionally*, (D) *seldom* or (E) *never* acts as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around *one* of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

- e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

- Example: He often acts as described..... A B C D E
- Example: He never acts as described..... A B C D E
- Example: He occasionally acts as described..... A B C D E

-
1. He acts as the spokesman of the group..... A B C D E
 2. He waits patiently for the results of a decision..... A B C D E
 3. He makes pep talks to stimulate the group..... A B C D E
 4. He lets group members know what is expected of them..... A B C D E
 5. He allows the members complete freedom in their work..... A B C D E
 6. He is hesitant about taking initiative in the group..... A B C D E
 7. He is friendly and approachable..... A B C D E
 8. He encourages overtime work..... A B C D E
 9. He makes accurate decisions..... A B C D E
 10. He gets along well with the people above him..... A B C D E
 11. He publicizes the activities of the group..... A B C D E
 12. He becomes anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next..... A B C D E

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

13. His arguments are convincing..... A B C D E
14. He encourages the use of uniform procedures..... A B C D E
15. He permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems. A B C D E
16. He fails to take necessary action..... A B C D E
17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group... A B C D E
18. He stresses being ahead of competing groups..... A B C D E
19. He keeps the group working together as a team..... A B C D E
20. He keeps the group in good standing with higher authority..... A B C D E
21. He speaks as the representative of the group..... A B C D E
22. He accepts defeat in stride..... A B C D E
23. He argues persuasively for his point of view..... A B C D E
24. He tries out his ideas in the group..... A B C D E
25. He encourages initiative in the group members..... A B C D E
26. He lets other persons take away his leadership in the group..... A B C D E
27. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation..... A B C D E
28. He needles members for greater effort..... A B C D E
29. He seems able to predict what is coming next..... A B C D E
30. He is working hard for a promotion..... A B C D E
31. He speaks for the group when visitors are present..... A B C D E
32. He accepts delays without becoming upset..... A B C D E
33. He is a very persuasive talker..... A B C D E
34. He makes his attitudes clear to the group..... A B C D E
35. He lets the members do their work the way they think best..... A B C D E
36. He lets some members take advantage of him..... A B C D E

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

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 37. He treats all group members as his equals..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 38. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 39. He settles conflicts when they occur in the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 40. His superiors act favorably on most of his suggestions..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 41. He represents the group at outside meetings..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 42. He becomes anxious when waiting for new developments..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 43. He is very skillful in an argument..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 44. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 45. He assigns a task, then lets the members handle it..... | A | B | C | D | F |
| 46. He is the leader of the group in name only..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 47. He gives advance notice of changes..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 48. He pushes for increased production..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 49. Things usually turn out as he predicts..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 50. He enjoys the privileges of his position..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 51. He handles complex problems efficiently..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 52. He is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 53. He is not a very convincing talker..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 54. He assigns group members to particular tasks..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 55. He turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 56. He backs down when he ought to stand firm..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 57. He keeps to himself..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 58. He asks the members to work harder..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 59. He is accurate in predicting the trend of events..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 60. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members..... | A | B | C | D | E |

A — Always

B — Often

C — Occasionally

D — Seldom

E — Never

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 61. He gets swamped by details..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 62. He can wait just so long, then blows up..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 63. He speaks from a strong inner conviction..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 64. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members | A | B | C | D | E |
| 65. He is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 66. He lets some members have authority that he should keep..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 67. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 68. He permits the members to take it easy in their work..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 69. He sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 70. His word carries weight with his superiors..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 71. He gets things all tangled up..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 72. He remains calm when uncertain about coming events..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 73. He is an inspiring talker..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 74. He schedules the work to be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 75. He allows the group a high degree of initiative..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 76. He takes full charge when emergencies arise..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 77. He is willing to make changes..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 78. He drives hard when there is a job to be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 79. He helps group members settle their differences..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 80. He gets what he asks for from his superiors..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 81. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 82. He is able to delay action until the proper time occurs..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 83. He persuades others that his ideas are to their advantage..... | A | B | C | D | E |

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

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 84. He maintains definite standards of performance..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 85. He trusts the members to exercise good judgment..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 86. He overcomes attempts made to challenge his leadership..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 87. He refuses to explain his actions..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 88. He urges the group to beat its previous record..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 89. He anticipates problems and plans for them..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 90. He is working his way to the top..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 91. He gets confused when too many demands are made of him..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 92. He worries about the outcome of any new procedure..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 93. He can inspire enthusiasm for a project..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 94. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 95. He permits the group to set its own pace..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 96. He is easily recognized as the leader of the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 97. He acts without consulting the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 98. He keeps the group working up to capacity..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 99. He maintains a closely knit group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 100. He maintains cordial relations with superiors..... | A | B | C | D | E |

LBDQ Form XII - RECORD SHEET

											<u>Totals</u>
1. Representation	1__	11__	21__	31__	41__						()
2. Reconciliation						51__	61__	71__	81__	91__	()
3. Tol. Uncertainty	2__	12__	22__	32__	42__	52__	62__	72__	82__	92__	()
4. Persuasion	3__	13__	23__	33__	43__	53__	73__	73__	83__	93__	()
5. Structure	4__	14__	24__	34__	44__	54__	64__	74__	84__	94__	()
6. Tol. Freedom	5__	15__	25__	35__	45__	55__	65__	75__	85__	95__	()
7. Role Assumption	6__	16__	26__	36__	46__	56__	66__	76__	86__	96__	()
8. Consideration	7__	17__	27__	37__	47__	57__	67__	77__	87__	97__	()
9. Production Emph.	8__	18__	28__	38__	48__	58__	68__	78__	88__	98__	()
10. Predictive Acc	9__		29__		49__	59__			89__		()
11. Integration		19__		39__			69__	79__		99__	()
12. Superior Orient	10__	20__	30__	40__	50__	60__	70__	80__	90__	100__	()

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

SCORING KEY

LBDQ FORM XII

A B C D E

* Starred items are scored

1 2 3 4 5

All other items are scored

5 4 3 2 1

	13.	37.	*61.	84.
	14.	38.	*62.	85.
	15.	39.	63.	86.
	*16.	40.	64.	*87.
	17.	41.	*65.	88.
	18.	*42.	*66.	89.
	19.	43.	67.	90.
	20.	44.	*68.	*91.
	21.	45.	69.	*92.
	22.	*46.	70.	93.
	23.	47.	*71.	94.
	24.	48.	72.	95.
1.	25.	49.	73.	96.
2.	*26.	50.	74.	*97.
3.	27.	51.	75.	98.
4.	28.	52.	76.	99.
5.	29.	*53.	77.	100.
*6.	30.	54.	78.	
7.	31.	55.	79.	
8.	32.	*56.	80.	
9.	33.	*57.	81.	
10.	34.	58.	82.	
11.	35.	59.	83.	
*12.	*36.	60.		

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

A STUDY OF THE LEADER BEHAVIOR OF THE ADULT EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR
IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
AS PERCEIVED BY TWO REFERENCE GROUPS

by

Hercules Pinkney, Jr.

(ABSTRACT)

A great deal of interest in the field of education has been generated in recent years over leadership studies. Researchers and practitioners have evidenced a growing awareness not only about leadership but also with leadership behavior. Associated with every position or status in a social system, such as a public school system, there is a set of socially-defined expectations concerning what is appropriate behavior for a person occupying a leadership position. These expectations constitute a "behavioral model" for the incumbent of a position, providing him with a pattern to which he may adjust his own behavior. In addition, to the extent that the incumbent conforms to these expectations, he permits other persons with whom he interacts to anticipate his behavior in prescribed situations and thus enables the interacting individuals to function collectively as an integrated unit.

Within this framework, the adult education administrator in the Public School System of the District of Columbia, as the officially designated leader in charge of the adult education program in his specific community, was confronted by major sets of responsibilities.

He was responsible to his superiors, his students, his community, but just as importantly, he was also responsive to his own staff. Thus, the purpose of the study was to obtain information to aid in a better understanding of the nature of the leader behavior of the adult education administrator and to provide empirical evidence to serve as a basis for future studies in adult education administration.

To fulfill the above purpose, the study was designed to ascertain the degree of divergence or congruence between the actual and ideal leader behavior of the adult education administrator as perceived by the adult education administrator himself and his instructional staff.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII, was used to measure certain acts of leadership of the adult education administrators. The adult education administrators' self-opinions, as well as, the opinions of their instructional staffs were obtained on 200 items contained in the two parts (actual and ideal) of the instrument.

Twelve variables of leadership were measured regarding the leader behavior of ten adult education administrators of regular adult education centers. The data were gathered in ten separate sessions, following initial interviews of the adult education administrators at their respective centers. This information was requested on the basis of how "does" the adult education administrator behave (real behavior) and how he "should" behave (ideal behavior). A total of ninety-one instructors and ten adult education administrators participated in the ten group interviews.

Two inter-group hypotheses and two intra-group hypotheses in

null form were tested for significance through three analyses of variance procedures: a one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance, a one-way Univariate Analysis of Variance and Multiple Correlated t-Tests.

The results of the study were such that conclusions could be supported to the effect that both reference groups were essentially in agreement about the adult education administrators' real and ideal behavior; differences of opinions were most apparent when real behavior was compared to ideal behaviors from instructors' descriptions of leader behavior; both the expectations of the adult education administrators in describing their own leader behavior and the expectations of the instructors in describing their administrators' leader behavior were scaled slightly higher than descriptions by both groups on real leader behavior; finally, administrators' expectations were considerably higher than those of instructors on ideal behavior.

The research findings also implied a need for a multiple-criteria approach to the study of leader behavior effectiveness and an examination of leader behavior from the standpoint of role differentiation in future leadership studies.