

PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE  
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF COUNTY  
EXTENSION DIRECTORS  
IN OKLAHOMA

By

DELBERT OTIS BLACK

Bachelor of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1955

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1959

Submitted to the  
Faculty of the Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1969

SEP 29 1969

PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE  
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF COUNTY  
EXTENSION DIRECTORS  
IN OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

*Richard P. Jennings*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*H. E. Wrenson*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Edw. C. Burris*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*D. D. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

724752

## PREFACE

County extension directors, as employees of Oklahoma State University, have the responsibility of providing program leadership and administrative supervision of the staff assigned to Oklahoma State University Extension Centers. Their effectiveness, as leaders, can play a crucial role in the success or failure of the educational efforts of the 77 Extension Centers which are located in each of Oklahoma's 77 counties.

The purpose of this study is to determine if there are significant differences in the perceptions and expectations which are held concerning the leadership behavior of county extension directors in Oklahoma. Leadership behavior is measured along two dimensions: Consideration and Initiating Structure. Consideration is behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth. Initiating Structure is behavior that delineates between the leader and members of the staff and establishes patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure.

The author wishes to express his appreciation and sincere thanks to his entire committee, composed of Dr. Richard P. Jungers, Chairman, Dean Helmer E. Sorenson and Professor Edward C. Burriss for their able assistance and encouragement. I wish to express special appreciation to Dr. Richard P. Jungers for his sincere interest and guidance in the preparation and completion of this thesis. Sincere appreciation is also expressed to Dr. William D. Frazier for his helpful suggestions concerning statistical analyses used in this study.

The author wishes to express appreciation to all those employees of the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service who supplied information and assistance which facilitated the completion of this study.

Special gratitude is extended to my wife, Billie June, and to our children, Karen and Jerry, for their understanding and patience which have enabled me to complete this program.

My wife, Billie June, and Mrs. Betti Lynch are due special thanks for the preparation of this manuscript.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
The Problem. . . . .	3
Review of Selected Literature. . . . .	4
Questions Under Investigation. . . . .	12
Limitations. . . . .	13
Summary. . . . .	14
II. METHODOLOGY, INSTRUMENTATION AND DESIGN . . . . .	15
Definition of Terms and Concepts . . . . .	15
Identification of the Sample . . . . .	17
Instrumentation. . . . .	18
Statistical Procedures . . . . .	21
Summary. . . . .	22
III. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	23
Descriptive Analysis of the Data . . . . .	23
Statistical Analysis of the Data . . . . .	30
Differences of Perception and Differences of Expectation Among District Extension Directors, County Extension Directors and Subordinates. . . . .	31
Differences of Perception and Differences of Expectation of County Extension Directors and Subordinates Differentiated by Selected Classi- fication Variables . . . . .	36
Relationships Between the Initiating Structure and Consideration Dimension Scores Real and Ideal, and Between the Real and Ideal Scores on Each Dimension . . . . .	51
Summary. . . . .	53
IV. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	55
Findings . . . . .	56
Implications . . . . .	59
Recommendations. . . . .	61
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	63

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX A - DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS . . . . .	66
APPENDIX B - LETTERS TO RESPONDENTS. . . . .	87
APPENDIX C - STATISTICAL TABLES. . . . .	90

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Numbers of Persons Participating in the Study . . . . .	24
II. Number and Percentage of Respondents in Each Age Category--County Extension Directors and Subordinates . . . . .	25
III. Number and Percentage of Respondents Grouped Into Categories According to Years of Employment in the Extension Service--County Extension Directors and Subordinates. . . . .	26
IV. Total and Percentage of Respondents in Categories of Years of Service in the Educational Profession--County Extension Directors and Subordinates . . . . .	27
V. Formal Academic Training of County Extension Directors and Subordinates. . . . .	28
VI. County Extension Directors Grouped According to Years of Experience as a County Director. . . . .	29
VII. Subordinates Grouped According to Length of Employment Under a Specific County Extension Director. . . . .	29
VIII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Real Scores of District Extension Directors, County Extension Directors and Subordinates. . . . .	31
IX. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Real Scores of District Extension Directors, County Extension Directors and Subordinates. . . . .	32
X. Intra-Positional Differences Between Perceptions on the Consideration Dimension of County Extension Directors' Leader Behavior. . . . .	33
XI. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Ideal Scores of District Extension Directors, County Extension Directors and Subordinates. . . . .	34
XII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Ideal Scores of District Extension Directors, County Extension Directors and Subordinates . . . . .	35

Table	Page
XIII. Intra-Positional Differences Between Expectations on the Consideration Dimension of County Extension Directors' Leader Behavior . . . . .	36
XIV. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Ideal Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and With Different Ages. . . . .	37
XV. Intra- and Inter- Positional Differences Between Expectations on the Consideration Dimension of County Extension Directors' Leader Behavior According to Respondents' Position and Age Group. . . . .	39
XVI. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Ideal Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and With Different Educational Levels . . . . .	40
XVII. Intra- and Inter- Positional Differences Between Expectations on the Consideration Dimension of County Extension Directors' Leader Behavior According to Respondents' Educational Level . . . . .	41
XVIII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Ideal Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and With Different Employment Tenure in the Extension Service . . . . .	43
XIX. Intra- and Inter- Positional Differences Between Expectations on the Consideration Dimension of County Extension Directors' Leader Behavior According to Length of Employment in the Extension Service. . . . .	44
XX. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Real Scores of County Extension Directors by Years of Service in That Position. . . . .	45
XXI. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Real Scores of County Extension Directors by Years of Service in That Position. . . . .	46
XXII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Ideal Scores of County Extension Directors by Years of Service in That Position. . . . .	47
XXIII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Ideal Scores of County Extension Directors by Years of Service in That Position. . . . .	47
XXIV. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Real Scores of Subordinates Classified by Years of Employment Under the Leadership of Their County Extension Directors . . .	48



Table	Page
XXV. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Real Scores of Subordinates Classified by Years of Employment Under the Leadership of Their County Extension Directors . . . . .	49
XXVI. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Ideal Scores of Subordinates Classified by Years of Employment Under the Leadership of Their County Extension Directors . . . . .	50
XXVII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Ideal Scores of Subordinates Classified by Years of Employment Under the Leadership of Their County Extension Directors . . . . .	51
XXVIII. Rank Order Correlations Between Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Real and Ideal Scores of County Extension Directors, Subordinates and Between Initiating Structure and Consideration Scores on the Real and on the Ideal . . . . .	52
XXIX. Rank Order Correlations Between Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Initiating Structure Scores and Consideration Scores of District Extension Directors on the Real and on the Ideal. . . . .	53
XXX. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Real Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and From Different Age Groupings. . . . .	91
XXXI. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Real Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and From Different Educational Levels . . . . .	91
XXXII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Real Scores of Individuals According to Position and Length of Employment in the Extension Service . . . . .	92
XXXIII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Ideal Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and Different Age Groupings . . . . .	92
XXXIV. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Ideal Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and From Different Educational Levels . . . . .	93
XXXV. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Initiating Structure Ideal Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and With Different Lengths of Employment in the Extension Service. . . . .	93

Table	Page
XXXVI. Kruskal-Wallis Test of the Consideration Real Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and From Different Age Groupings . . . . .	94
XXXVII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of the Consideration Real Scores of Individuals From Different Positions and From Different Educational Levels. . . . .	94
XXXVIII. Kruskal-Wallis Test of Consideration Real Scores of Individuals According to Position and Length of Employment in the Extension Service. . . . .	95

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Extension Service has been recognized as one of the largest and most spectacularly successful ventures in American history.<sup>1</sup> Its clientele has been estimated to be ten million people per year. Two-fifths of these people were identified as farmers, one-fifth as urbanites and the remaining consisted of various youths and representatives of agricultural business.<sup>2</sup>

The Cooperative Extension Service received its birth in the enactment of the Smith Lever Act in 1914. The major objective of this act was "... to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same ...".<sup>3</sup> Since enactment of the Smith Lever Act, a number of additional pieces of Legislation affecting Extension have also been enacted.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, the Cooperative Extension Service has recognized the importance of preparing itself to handle changes in its responsibilities. New

---

<sup>1</sup>Hartley C. Grattan, In Quest of Knowledge, (New York, 1955), p. 197.

<sup>2</sup>The Cooperative Extension Service Today: A Statement of Scope and Responsibility, (Washington, April, 1958), p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>H. C. Sanders, ed., The Cooperative Extension Service, (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), pp. 28-29.

extension programs are developing, thus requiring new methods of staffing and organization. As the Cooperative Extension Service comes into contact with new publics, new talents and skills will probably be required of the extension staff. Shannon<sup>5</sup> suggests that it is time for "... agricultural extension to lend its skills and resources to the fashioning of a truly university-wide, community-wide outreach enterprise."

According to Richert,<sup>6</sup> the Cooperative Extension Service will continue to exist only because of its programs. He also suggests that legislators, university administrators and the public are looking at the Cooperative Extension Service today, questioning how well its programs have met the needs of society. Vines, Watts and Parks<sup>7</sup> discuss various alternatives as to the role of Cooperative Extension. One of these alternatives, "... broaden Extension's educational leadership to include all informal educational programs in both rural and urban areas and extend educational programs from all colleges of the university ..."<sup>8</sup> is very similar to the role that has been adopted by the Oklahoma State University Extension Service. With this expanding extension role have come changes in personnel assignments requiring different skills and understandings.

County extension directors throughout Oklahoma are the focal group in this study and they have certainly acquired new responsibilities.

---

<sup>5</sup>Theodore J. Shannon, University Extension, (New York, 1965), p. 64.

<sup>6</sup>Marlys R. Richert, "What Research Shows About Training Needs," Training Extension Workers For The Future, Proceedings of The National Extension Training Conference, (Stillwater, 1962), pp. 62-79.

<sup>7</sup>C. A. Vines, L. H. Watts and R. W. Parks, "Extension's Future," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 4, (Winter 1963), pp. 239-246.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 242.

If they are to effectively fulfill these responsibilities, it would seem imperative that they provide leadership that is amenable to effective group action. With this in mind, this study was instigated in an effort to determine the congruence of perceptions and expectations which were held concerning the leadership behavior of county extension directors in Oklahoma.

### The Problem

The county extension director, as an employee of Oklahoma State University, has the responsibility of overall program leadership and administrative supervision of the staff assigned to the county University Extension Center. According to his job description,<sup>9</sup> specific responsibilities include: "personnel supervision, planning, programming, county organization, budgeting, administrative relationships, interpreting and communicating policy, teaching, reporting and evaluation." All professional county staff extension personnel, one to six persons in each county, are administratively responsible to the county extension director. The county extension director, in turn, is responsible to the district extension director. Both the district extension director and the county staff hold certain perceptions and expectations of how the county extension director does behave and how he should behave as the leader. Likewise, the county extension director has his own opinion as to how he behaves and how he should behave as a leader. If, from these various levels of organization, there is little difference between these perceptions and expectations, the county extension director should not

---

<sup>9</sup>Oklahoma State University Extension Service, Job Description-County Extension Director, (Unpublished Document).

encounter major role conflicts. However, if the perceptions and expectations are in discord, it would appear inevitable that the county extension director would find himself in a position of role conflict. Seeman<sup>10</sup> describes four dimensions or types of role conflict which might contribute to such a situation. He identified these major dimensions of role conflict as: status, authority, institutional and means-ends dimensions. According to Schmidt and Tannenbaum,<sup>11</sup> differences among people occur over facts, methods, goals and values. They identify reasons for differences as being informational (exposure to different information), perceptual (different interpretations) and role (pressure to take a stand because of status or position). These many possibilities of differences emphasize the likelihood of role conflicts within any organization, certainly this is probable within the extension service since the county extension director is responsible to the district extension director, and yet, he must be responsive to his own county staff. The question of how the county extension director should perform as a leader is very important, as both institutional and personal goals (of many persons) are involved. One of the major purposes of this study will be to gain insight as to the needs for pre-service and in-service training programs in the Oklahoma State University Extension Service.

#### Review of Selected Literature

Statutes and roles rooted in social systems are largely determined

---

<sup>10</sup>Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, Vol. 18, (August, 1953), pp. 373-380.

<sup>11</sup>Warren H. Schmidt and Robert Tannenbaum, "Management of Differences," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 38, No. 6, (November-December, 1960), pp. 107-115.

by social norms. As noted by Coutu<sup>12</sup> every person in society holds or occupies certain positions or statuses. With every position, there are socially prescribed duties or functions to be performed as well as rights to be enjoyed. These functions may be called "roles" and every role involves a whole system of behaviors more or less expected and enforced by various groups. Gross, in reviewing the role concept, recognized the following basic ideas which most authors adhere to in the definition of role: that individuals in social positions behave with reference to norms and expectations held by relevant others and by themselves.<sup>13</sup> While roles and statuses may be defined in a number of ways, the following definition presented by Parsons seems most appropriate for this study:

On the one hand there is the positional aspect--that of where the actor in question is "located" in the social system relative to other actors. This is what we call his status... . On the other hand there is the processual aspect, that of what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system. It is this which we shall call his role. ... It should be made quite clear that statuses and roles ... are not in general attributes of the actor, but are units of the social system ... .<sup>14</sup>

Another concept referred to and useful in this study is that of role conflict. Role conflict may occur whenever there is felt conflict on the part of an actor subjected to incompatible role perceptions or

---

<sup>12</sup>Walter Coutu, "Role-Playing vs. Role Taking: An Appeal For Clarification," American Sociological Review, XVI (1951), pp. 180-187.

<sup>13</sup>Neal Gross, W. S. Mason and A. W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of The School Superintendency Role, (New York, 1958), p. 17.

<sup>14</sup>Talcott Parsons, The Social System, (Glencoe, Illinois, 1951), p. 25.

or expectations. Or, as expressed by Gross,<sup>15</sup> role conflict occurs when an actor perceives disparities in norms held by counter-roles and experiences felt difficulty in orienting his role performance. It has also been recognized that less severe role disparities may be present causing an actor to feel slightly disconcerted when exposed to incompatible role prescriptions. This concept labeled "role strain" has been discussed by Goode.<sup>16</sup> Role ambiguity which might well be expected within organizations which are undergoing rapid reorganizational changes, could facilitate role strain or role conflict for persons employed therein. Kahn et al. suggest that the growing complexity of organizations, the rapid pace of technological change in our society, and the pervasiveness of certain managerial practices are all probable causes of role ambiguity.<sup>17</sup> These authors state:

On the whole, the effects of ambiguity resemble those of role conflict. These two conditions nevertheless occur independently of each other. Thus, it is largely by chance that a person may find himself in a work environment that is both ambiguous and conflictful. When this occurs, however, he tends to suffer strains not significantly more severe than those evoked by either conflict or ambiguity alone.

Many university extension service organizations (including the Cooperative Extension Service) have experienced, are experiencing, or will soon be experiencing a variety of organizational and technological changes. Along with such changes come changing roles for the various actors. Often when extension service organizations are reorganized,

---

<sup>15</sup>Gross, p. 248.

<sup>16</sup>William J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, XXV (1960), pp. 483-495.

<sup>17</sup>Robert L. Kahn et al., Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict And Ambiguity, (New York, 1964), p. 94.



the county agent is designated as administrator, chairman, or director of the county staff. As noted by Mees,

The chairman, to be successful in his new role, must immediately broaden his horizons to include home economics, farm and home development, other specialized areas, and 4-H Club work. . . . the real test for a successful county director is whether he can give impartial leadership to all phases of the program and whether he has the administrative ability to coordinate and direct all aspects of the county program.<sup>18</sup>

Arthur E. Durfee<sup>19</sup> aptly describes the changing role of extension supervisors. He sees one of the major duties of the extension supervisor as that of providing leadership in designing new programs to meet new situations. The leadership role of the supervisor is of utmost importance in developing the abilities of subordinate staff members. Denzil O. Clegg<sup>20</sup> found that many persons subordinate to county extension administrators do not have free and stimulating climates for growth and responsibility. Under such conditions, subordinate staff members cannot be expected to eagerly attempt difficult assignments and opportunities. Perhaps one reason for this atmosphere is that leaders are often placed in an ambivalent position when making decisions due to the various role conflicts which they experience.<sup>21</sup>

The importance of good human relations in supervision and in reducing role conflict must not be overlooked. The consideration of students, teachers and laymen individually and collectively is stressed

---

<sup>18</sup>Carl F. Mees, "County Extension Administration," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 2, (Summer, 1963), p. 90.

<sup>19</sup>Arthur E. Durfee, "Changing Role of The Supervisor," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 3, (Fall, 1963), pp. 149-154.

<sup>20</sup>Denzil O. Clegg, "Work As A Motivator," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 3, (Fall, 1963), pp. 141-148.

<sup>21</sup>Seeman, pp. 373-380.

in the "people approach" discussed by Hanne J. Hicks.<sup>22</sup> Many individuals have recognized that leadership is an important part of supervision. Burton and Brueckner in reference to the implication of current knowledge for supervision stated, "The chief function of supervisors is leadership and the stimulation of leadership within the group."<sup>23</sup> These authors also recognize that to be effective leaders, supervisors must work to improve their leadership abilities. They also observed that leadership under democratic conditions is a difficult procedure.<sup>24</sup> Prior leadership research has pointed to two types of interpersonal behavior by which leaders attempt to exert influence and control. The leader can be autocratic, controlling, managing, directing and basically task oriented in his interactions with his group members; or, he can be democratic, permissive, nondirective, and/or considerate of his group members' feelings, and therapeutic in his leadership.<sup>25</sup>

Robert L. Katz<sup>26</sup> indicates that effective administration depends upon three skills: technical, human and conceptual. He concludes that the relative importance of these three skills varies with the level of responsibility. Although the relative importance of these skills do vary, it would seem likely that the supervisory leadership in each of

---

<sup>22</sup>Hanne J. Hicks, "The Supervisor and Human Relations," Educational Supervision in Principle and Practice, (New York, 1960).

<sup>23</sup>William H. Burton and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision A Social Process, (New York, 1955), pp. 190-195.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>25</sup>Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, (New York, 1967), p. 37.

<sup>26</sup>Robert L. Katz, "Skills of an Effective Administrator," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 33, No. 1, (January-February, 1955), pp. 33-42.

these skills is of considerable importance. Fiedler made reference to the fact that there is considerable evidence which demonstrates that the first line supervisor plays a key role in determining group performance, group morale, and job satisfaction.<sup>27</sup> While he was not referring to county extension directors nor their staffs, such an analogy might be made as the county extension director, like the first line supervisor, is in direct, day-to-day contact with his staff.

A slightly different concept of administrative leadership has been identified by Jean C. Evans.<sup>28</sup> He suggests that there are two types of administrators: (1) administrative managers, and (2) administrative leaders. Administrative managers are identified as those individuals concerned primarily with the preservation and survival of the enterprise. These administrators are extensively concerned with human relations, methods of operation, internal coordination and control, personnel management and a wide range of other activities. The administrative leader is seen as one having to do with long-range planning that will lead to optimum educational contributions to society. This viewpoint gives an indication of the multitudinous leadership role required of the supervisor.

About a decade ago, Ratchford<sup>29</sup> stressed the need for designating one person as chairman of the county extension group to provide administrative leadership and guidance. Recognizing merit in such an

---

<sup>27</sup>Fiedler, p. 236.

<sup>28</sup>Jean C. Evans, "Administrative Manager or Leader?", Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 3, (Fall, 1963), pp. 149-154.

<sup>29</sup>C. B. Ratchford, "Modernizing Extension," Report of Proceedings, Western Region Seminar In Extension Supervision, (Madison, 1959), pp. 24-35.

administrative arrangement, in September of 1966, Oklahoma State University staff members previously known as county agents were assigned the new title of county extension directors. Along with the change in title came additional administrative and supervisory activities.<sup>30</sup> While all of these responsibilities are not new to the county extension director, never before have these responsibilities been so positively identified. Definitely, county extension directors have been assigned more responsible roles as administrative and supervisory leaders. In addition, the county extension director will be expected to continue as liaison between the people extension serves and their problems and the resources of the university to aid in solving those problems.

While it is obvious that the county extension director is expected to provide leadership, staff perceptions and expectations of what his leader behavior is and should be may be quite varied. Halpin<sup>31</sup> found the leader's concept of his own behavior to vary considerably from others' perception of his behavior. Cunningham<sup>32</sup> studied the relationship of leader behavior to performance levels of county extension agents and in measuring the leader behavior dimensions of these agents, he found that supervisors and agents often differ in their perceptions as to the leadership behavior of the extension agent. In a study concern-

---

<sup>30</sup>Oklahoma State University Extension Service, Job Description-County Extension Director, (Unpublished Document).

<sup>31</sup>Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, Monograph No. 4 (Columbus, 1956), pp. 55-56.

<sup>32</sup>Clarence J. Cunningham, "Measures of Leader Behavior and Their Relation to Performance Levels of County Extension Agents," (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964).

ing expectations for leadership in the school, Moyer<sup>33</sup> found that the greater the agreement between teacher and principal on the expectations for leadership, the more favorable the attitudes toward the work situation. In contrast, Kahn, et al. note:

Contradictory role expectations give rise to opposing role pressures (role conflicts), which generally have the following effects on the emotional experience of the focal person: intensified internal conflicts, increased tension associated with various aspects of the job, reduced satisfaction with the job and its various components, and decreased confidence in superiors and in the organization as a whole.<sup>34</sup>

Such conflicts are not conducive to the personal health of affected individuals or of the organization as a whole.

A useful tool in measuring leadership behavior used by Cunningham and Halpin was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire,<sup>35</sup> (LBDQ), which measures two dimensions of leader behavior: (1) the Initiating Structure, and (2) Consideration. The first dimension deals with the leader's relationship between himself and members of the work group in establishing well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure. Consideration, the second dimension, refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth between the leader and the members of his staff. This instrument is also structured to obtain, from respondents, information regarding their role expectations (ideal behavior) and role perceptions (real behavior) of given leaders.

---

<sup>33</sup>Donald C. Moyer, "Teachers Attitudes Toward Leadership as They Relate to Teacher Satisfaction," (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954).

<sup>34</sup>Kahn, et al., p. 71.

<sup>35</sup>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, 1957).

Theoretical framework used in development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was limited and the concepts behind the development of the instrument do not constitute a theory. However, this instrument is based upon a paradigm for research on administrative behavior. Administration, according to key concepts in the paradigm, refers to a human activity that involves at least four components:

1. The Task
2. The Formal Organization
3. The Work Group (or Work Groups)
4. The Leader (or Leaders).

The author of this study plans to use the Leader Behavior Questionnaire in an effort to measure the leadership behavior of county extension directors, perceived (Real) and expected (Ideal), as seen by district extension directors, county extension directors and members of the county extension directors' professional staff, subordinates.

#### Questions Under Investigation

Principal considerations under study are:

1. The degree of differences between the district extension directors' and the county extension directors' perception of the leadership behavior of county extension directors.
2. The degree of differences between the district extension directors' and the county extension directors' opinion as to how the county extension directors should behave as leaders.
3. The degree of differences between the subordinates' and the county extension directors' perception of the leadership behavior of

---

<sup>36</sup>Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, (New York, 1966), pp. 28-29.

the county extension directors.

4. The degree of differences between the subordinates' and the county extension directors' opinion as to how county extension directors should behave as leaders.

5. The degree of differences between the district extension directors' and the subordinates' perception of the leadership behavior of the county extension directors.

6. The degree of differences between the district extension directors' and the subordinates' opinion as to how county extension directors should behave as leaders.

Secondary considerations are:

1. The degree of differences between the role perceptions held by county extension directors and by subordinates according to selected classification variables.

2. The degree of differences between the role expectations held by county extension directors and by subordinates according to selected classification variables.

#### Limitations

This study is limited to first order cognitions of role perceptions and role expectations and does not take into consideration how a given subject perceives the expectations and perceptions that others hold for him. Also, no attempt is planned for measuring intervening factors such as morale and job satisfaction. It is recognized that the descriptions of leadership behavior as obtained in the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire refer to leader behavior at a single point in time. As such, it does not describe changing leadership patterns, the sequence

of them, the kind of group in which the patterns were found, nor their relationship to the environment.<sup>37</sup>

### Summary

New Extension Programs requiring new methods of staffing and organization have become a reality at Oklahoma State University and at O.S.U. Extension Centers located throughout Oklahoma. Changes in personnel assignments within Oklahoma's Cooperative Extension Service have become necessary as new programs have developed. One group of extension employees, the county extension directors, recently assumed greater administrative and supervisory responsibilities and in this new role, their performance is critical to the entire extension effort.

The review of literature has indicated that individuals may experience role conflict or strain because of incompatible role perceptions or expectations. Since county extension directors do play a crucial role in determining the success of Oklahoma Extension Programs, the author decided to compare the perceptions and expectations held for their leadership behavior to determine if statistically significant differences were present. Chapter II presents the research methodology, including the system for gathering data, used to answer the questions stated in Chapter I.

---

<sup>37</sup>T. B. Greenfield, "Research on the Behavior of Educational Leaders: Critique of a Tradition," (Unpublished paper read to the American Educational Research Association, New York, February, 1967), p. 4.



## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY, INSTRUMENTATION AND DESIGN

Preceding any attempt to answer the research questions presented in Chapter I, it was necessary to (1) obtain approval of the Oklahoma State University Extension administration for the study, (2) obtain permission to use a copyrighted questionnaire to measure leadership behavior, (3) administer the questionnaire, and (4) analyze the responses.

#### Definition of Terms And Concepts

Frequently used terms in this study require specific definition. Terms which pertain directly to the Extension Service are:

1. Oklahoma State University Extension Service connotes the recent action taken by the O.S.U. Board of Regents, that of administratively combining the University Extension and the Cooperative Extension Service.<sup>38</sup>
2. O.S.U. Extension Centers refer to the location of the offices for Oklahoma State University Extension field staffs.
3. Field Staff, in this study, represents Oklahoma county extension directors and professional extension employees directly responsible to them.
4. County Extension Director, as indicated in the preceding

---

<sup>38</sup>Board of Regents Action, July 1, 1965.

chapter, refers to the position of the employee who has the responsibility of overall program leadership and administrative supervision of the staff assigned to the county University Extension Center.

5. Subordinate Extension Staff refers to those professional field extension employees that are responsible administratively to the county extension director.

6. District Extension Director refers to the position of the person with the responsibility of district supervision (15-17 counties per district) of overall programs and staff. All county extension directors are responsible directly to their district extension director.

7. Position refers to the hierarchical position within the organization.

Sweitzer, et al. present concepts which are similar to those used in this study. These terms as adapted to the current study are defined below:

1. Subjects - District extension directors, county extension directors and subordinates who are presumed to hold first order role cognitions about the county extension directors.

2. First Order Cognition - A cognition held by a county extension director mapping an overt aspect of himself; a cognition held by a district extension director mapping an overt aspect of given county extension directors; and a cognition held by a subordinate or a group of subordinates mapping an overt aspect of their county extension director. Classes of first order cognitions in this study will consist of the

---

<sup>39</sup>Robert E. Sweitzer, et al., Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals, Cooperative Research Project No. 1329, (Stillwater, 1963), pp. 31-32.

expectations of individuals regarding the leadership behavior of county extension directors.

3. Role Expectation - A first order cognition held by a county extension director, a district extension director or subordinates concerning the "Ideal" or should, behavior which is expected of county extension directors.

4. Role Perception - A first order cognition held by a county extension director, a district extension director, or subordinates concerning how given county extension directors do behave as leaders (Real).

#### Identification of The Sample

Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Service field staff personnel make up the total population from which samples for this study were drawn. Subjects include district extension directors, county extension directors and professional members of county extension staffs. The district extension directors, at the time of the study, were located on the campus of Oklahoma State University, and the other respondents were located in 73 Oklahoma State University Extension Centers in 73 of Oklahoma's 77 counties. Extension staff members in the remaining four counties were not included in the study, because of changes in staff assignments occurring in those counties at or near the time of this study. Also, at the time of this study, the state was organized into five administrative districts. One district extension director in each district was responsible for supervision of overall programs and staff in his district and the county extension directors within his district were directly responsible to him. The county extension director's administrative responsibilities include providing personnel

supervision and leadership of the county staff in developing and implementing the total county extension educational program.<sup>40</sup>

All five district extension directors, 73 county extension directors and 142 subordinate extension staff members make up the sample. The 73 county extension directors completed both forms of the LBDQ questionnaire during an Extension Administration Workshop held on the Oklahoma State University Campus. District extension directors were contacted personally and asked to complete a LBDQ "Real" questionnaire form on each of the county extension directors in their district. Once these forms were completed for each of the 73 county extension directors, the district directors were requested to complete the LBDQ "Ideal" form, indicating how they thought the county extension director should behave as a leader as measured by the LBDQ. The LBDQ "Real" questionnaire form was then sent to the remaining field staff and they were asked to respond to statements in the questionnaire reflecting how their county extension director behaves as a leader. Once all of these questionnaires were returned from a given county, the LBDQ "Ideal" form was mailed to those respondents for completion.

#### Instrumentation

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, developed at Ohio State University in the Ohio Leadership Studies, was used in this study.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>J. C. Evans, ed., Self Study of Cooperative Extension Service, (Unpublished Document Prepared for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, February, 1967), p. 182.

<sup>41</sup>Published by the Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. This questionnaire may not be used, either as a whole or in part, without permission.

As described by Halpin:

The LBDQ is composed of a series of short, descriptive statements of ways in which leaders may behave. The members of a leader's group indicate the frequency with which he engages in each form of behavior by checking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom or never. Each of the keys to the dimensions contains 15 items, and each item is scored on a scale from 4 to 0. Consequently, the theoretical range of scores on each dimension is from 0 to 60... .

The form on which the group members describe their leader's behavior is referred to as the "LBDQ-Real, Staff." With modified instructions, this same instrument may be used to measure the leader's own leadership ideology. On this form each item is worded to indicate how a leader should behave, and the leaders answer the questionnaire accordingly. This form is designated as the "LBDQ-Self." Similarly, we may ask the staff members to describe how they believe their leader should behave. Such scores are termed "LBDQ-Ideal, Staff."<sup>42</sup>

As already noted in this study, this instrument was developed to measure two dimensions of leader behavior. These dimensions were identified as:

(1) Initiating Structure, which refers to the leader's behavior in describing 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; and

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

The complete instrument can be seen in Appendix A. The items in the instrument which define each dimension are as follows:

Initiating Structure:

1. He makes his attitudes clear to the staff.

---

<sup>42</sup>Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, pp. 88-90.

2. He tries out his new ideas with the staff.
3. He rules with an iron hand.\*
4. He criticizes poor work.
5. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
6. He assigns staff members to particular tasks.
7. He works without a plan.\*
8. He maintains definite standards of performance.
9. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
10. He encourages the use of uniform procedures.
11. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all members.
12. He asks that staff members follow standard rules and regulations.
13. He lets staff members know what is expected of them.
14. He sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity.
15. He sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated.

Consideration:

1. He does personal favors for staff members.
2. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the staff.
3. He is easy to understand.
4. He finds time to listen to staff members.
5. He keeps to himself.\*
6. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual staff members.
7. He refuses to explain his actions.\*
8. He acts without consulting the staff.\*
9. He is slow to accept new ideas.\*
10. He treats all staff members as his equals.
11. He is willing to make changes.
12. He is friendly and approachable.
13. He makes staff members feel at ease when talking with them.
14. He puts suggestions made by the staff into operation.
15. He gets staff approval on important matters before going ahead.

In addition to the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, other information concerning personal data about the respondents was obtained (Appendix A). Descriptive analyses of these data are presented in Chapter III.

---

\*Scored negatively.

### Statistical Procedures

The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Ranks Test,<sup>43</sup> appropriate for statistical analysis of ordinal data such as contained in this study, was used to describe statistically the degree of difference between k (any number) independent samples. This test produces  $H$  (the statistic used in the Kruskal-Wallis Test), a high  $H$  indicates that the differences among the samples signifies genuine population differences as to the rank ordering of the dependent variable. A low  $H$  indicates chance variations as may be expected among several random samples from the same population. If differences  $\leq .05$  level of significance were found, the Mann-Whitney U Test<sup>44</sup> was used to test for differences between groups. According to Siegel:

When at least ordinal measurement has been achieved, the Mann-Whitney U test may be used to test whether two independent groups have been drawn from the same population. This is one of the most powerful of the nonparametric tests, and it is a most useful alternative to the parametric t test when the researcher wishes to avoid the t test's assumptions, or when the measurement in the research is weaker than interval scaling.<sup>45</sup>

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient<sup>46</sup> ( $\rho$ ) was used to determine the extent of association between the Initiating Structure scores and the Consideration scores (Real and Ideal), and the correlations between the Real and Ideal scores on each dimension for the county extension director group and for the subordinate group. This method of

---

<sup>43</sup>Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences, (New York, 1956), 184-194.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., pp. 116-127.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 202-213.

rank order correlation was also used to determine the extent of association between the Initiating Structure scores and the Consideration scores (Real and Ideal) for the district extension director group.

#### Summary

The majority of the professional field staff personnel employed by the Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Service were included in this study. Respondents representing three hierarchical levels of the organization were, in order of their official administrative authority, district extension directors, county extension directors and staff members subordinate to county extension directors. Respondents from these three groups were asked to respond to two forms of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, the "Real" and "Ideal," indicating how they thought county extension directors do and should perform as leaders. Their responses were then analyzed to determine if they differed statistically in their perceptions or expectations concerning the leadership behavior of county extension directors. Statistical tools used in the study included the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Ranks test, the Mann-Whitney U test and the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient statistic.



## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Descriptive Analysis of The Data

The major purpose of this study was to obtain information concerning the role expectations and role perceptions of county extension directors held by district extension directors, county extension directors and professional staff subordinate to county extension directors. For county extension directors and subordinates, comparisons were also made according to their age, professional experience and level of education. The relationship of the county extension directors' length of service, as a county extension director, to his role expectation and role perception was also considered. A similar comparison was made for subordinates and their length of employment under specific county extension directors. In order to maintain respondent anonymity, general information of the preceding nature was not requested of the district extension directors.

Data illustrating the number and percentage of respondents participating in the study are presented in Table I. As can be seen, response to the study was excellent. In two respondent groups, district extension directors and county extension directors, 100% participation was achieved; and 97.93% participation was attained in the third respondent group, the subordinates. Personal contact made with two of the three non-respondents in the subordinate group revealed the

following reasons for failure to participate: one non-respondent had already made plans to terminate his employment with the Extension Service; another non-respondent had just started to work and did not feel qualified to respond; and, the third non-respondent chose to ignore all requests to participate in the study. Respondents in each of the three positions responded to the LBDQ Ideal form, resulting in 220 responses. For the LBDQ Real form, each county extension director rated himself and was also rated by his district extension director and by his subordinate(s). This resulted in 288 responses. In the subordinate group, 87 of the 142 respondents were women. All other respondents in this study were men.

TABLE I  
NUMBERS OF PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Position	Asked To Participate	Participated	Percent Participating
District Extension Director	$\frac{N}{5}$	$\frac{N}{5}$	100.00
County Extension Director	73	73	100.00
Subordinate	145	142	97.93
Totals	223	220	98.65

The age distribution of county extension directors and subordinates included in this study are presented in Table II. The majority of the

county extension directors were in two age categories; 38.36 percent were in the 36-45 age group and 49.31 percent were in the 46-55 age group. Other respondents in this group included 4.11 percent in the 26-35 age category and 8.22 percent in the 56-65 age bracket. The largest group of subordinates was found in the 26-35 age category and the second largest group was found in the 46-55 age classification. These two categories contained, respectively, 32.40 percent and 23.94 percent of the subordinates. Other respondents were distributed throughout the remaining age categories. As can be noted in Table II, 14.09 percent of the subordinates are 25 years of age or less; and in comparison, none of the county extension directors were this young, with only 4.11 percent less than 36 years of age.

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS IN EACH AGE CATEGORY--  
COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Age Category	25 or Less	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65
County Extension Directors N = 73	---	4.11% 3	38.36% 28	49.31% 36	8.22% 6
Subordinate Staff N = 142	14.09% 20	32.40% 46	19.01% 27	23.94% 34	10.56% 15

Information presented in Table III indicates the approximate tenure of employment in the Extension Service for county extension directors

and subordinates. It is interesting to note that 89.04 percent of the county extension directors have 12 or more years of employment in the Extension Service and that none have less than four years of service. In comparison, subordinates are well represented in four tenure categories and only 2.11 percent of these individuals have less than one year of service. As in the county extension director group, a high percentage of the respondents in the subordinate group (39.44 percent) was found to have 12 or more years of extension service to their credit. In comparing data in Table III with data in Table IV, it can be seen that other employment in the educational profession was at a minimum in the county extension director group as there was only one respondent reclassified when this factor was considered. In the subordinate group, several respondents had been employed in an educational profession other than the Extension Service.

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS GROUPED INTO CATEGORIES  
 ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXTENSION SERVICE  
 --COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Years	County Extension Directors		Subordinates	
	N	%	N	%
< 1	---	---	3	2.11
1-3	---	---	24	16.90
4-7	3	4.11	33	23.24
8-11	5	6.85	26	18.31
12 or More	65	89.04	56	39.44
Totals	73	(100)	142	(100)

TABLE IV

TOTAL AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS IN CATEGORIES OF YEARS  
OF SERVICE IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROFESSION--  
COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS & SUBORDINATES

Years	County Extension Directors		Subordinates	
	N	%	N	%
<1	---	---	1	0.70
1-3	---	---	19	13.38
4-7	3	4.11	28	19.72
8-11	4	5.48	29	20.42
12 or More	66	90.41	65	45.78
Totals	73	(100)	142	(100)

Oklahoma State University's recent emphasis on the continual training of field personnel<sup>47</sup> is reflected in the data in Table V. Almost three-fourths of the county extension directors have earned their MS degree and over one-fourth have taken work beyond the MS degree. Of the subordinates, a majority have taken graduate work toward their MS degree or have already earned the MS degree. Almost one-fourth of the subordinates have taken graduate work beyond their MS degree.

As can be seen in Table VI, 54.79 percent of the county extension directors had served in that capacity for 12 or more years. Only one individual had served less than one year. 16.44 percent had served from 4-7 years and the remaining individuals were equally divided within

<sup>47</sup>Evans, Self Study of Cooperative Extension Service, p. 197.

the 1-3 and 8-11 tenure categories, each representing 13.70 percent of the total sample of county extension directors.

TABLE V  
FORMAL ACADEMIC TRAINING OF COUNTY EXTENSION  
DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Academic Training	County Extension Directors		Subordinates	
	N	%	N	%
Bachelor's Degree	2	2.73	15	10.56
Graduate Work < Master's Degree	19	26.03	70	49.30
Master's Degree	31	42.47	23	16.20
Graduate Work > Master's Degree	21	28.77	34	23.94
Totals	73	(100)	142	(100)

Data in Table VII indicates the tenure of subordinates under specific county extension directors. At the time of this study, a majority of the subordinates had worked one or more years under the supervision of a given county extension director. Approximately two-thirds of the subordinates were classified in two categories, 1-3 years and 4-7 years. As might be expected, few had served for 12 or more years under the same person. Normally, either the county extension director, the subordinate, or both have opportunities to move and to advance in position within this time period.

TABLE VI

COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS GROUPED ACCORDING TO  
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A COUNTY DIRECTOR

Number of Years	N	%
< 1	1	1.37
1-3	10	13.70
4-7	12	16.44
8-11	10	13.70
12 or More	40	54.79
Totals	73	(100)

TABLE VII

SUBORDINATES GROUPED ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT  
UNDER A SPECIFIC COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTOR

Number of Years	N	%
< 1	20	14.09
1-3	60	42.25
4-7	33	23.24
8-11	21	14.79
12 or More	8	5.63
Totals	142	(100)

## Statistical Analysis of The Data

The primary purpose of this part of Chapter III is to present statistical analysis of the data and examine any differences in the perceived and expected leadership behavior of county extension directors. The findings are organized to show:

1. Differences among district extension directors', county extension directors' and subordinates' perception of the leadership behavior of county extension directors.

2. Differences among district extension directors', county extension directors' and subordinates' expectation of the leadership behavior of county extension directors.

3. Differences between perceptions regarding the leadership behavior of county extension directors, held by respondents in the county extension director and subordinate groups according to selected classification variables.

4. Differences between expectations regarding desired leadership behavior of county extension directors, held by respondents in the county extension director and subordinate groups according to selected classification variables.

5. Relationships between the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimension scores (Real and Ideal) and between the Real and Ideal scores on each dimension for each respondent group.

The .05 level of probability was used to judge the significance of all statistical tests.



Differences of Perception and Differences of Expectation  
Among District Extension Directors, County Extension  
Directors and Subordinates

Differences of Perception

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test presented in Table VIII indicate that the degree of difference in the Initiating Structure Real scores of individuals from different position groups is not statistically significant. The calculated  $H$  value of 0.69 was less than the tabled value 5.99 associated with a probability of .05. This implies that there is no significant difference in perception among the three respondent groups on the Initiating Structure dimension.

TABLE VIII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE REAL SCORES OF  
DISTRICT EXTENSION DIRECTORS, COUNTY EXTENSION  
DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Position	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
District Extension Directors	73 <sup>a</sup>	10045.5	137.61
County Extension Directors	73	10640.5	145.76
Subordinates	142	20920.5	147.39

<sup>a</sup>Each of the five district extension directors completed a LBDQ form for all the county extension director respondents under their supervision and this resulted in a total of 73 responses.

$H = 0.69$

df: 2

$70 < p < .80$

Statistical analysis of the data presented in Table IX reveals the degree of difference in the Consideration Real scores of individuals from the three respondent groups was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. The computed  $H$  value of 7.44 exceeded the tabled value of 5.99 associated with the probability of .05.

TABLE IX  
KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION REAL SCORES OF  
DISTRICT EXTENSION DIRECTORS, COUNTY EXTENSION  
DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Position	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
District Extension Directors	73 <sup>a</sup>	12209.5	167.25
County Extension Directors	73	9780.0	133.97
Subordinates	142	19626.0	138.21

<sup>a</sup>Each of the five district extension directors completed a LBDQ form for all the county extension director respondents under their supervision and this resulted in a total of 73 responses.

$H = 7.44$	df: 2	.02 < p < .05
------------	-------	---------------

Comparisons between pairs of groups computed by Mann-Whitney U tests are presented in Table X. Resulting  $Z$  values of -2.83 and -2.18 between the district extension directors and the county extension directors, and between the district extension directors and the subordinates,

respectively, exceeded the critical value of 1.64 (one-tailed probability). These results indicated that district extension directors perceive county extension directors as being higher on Consideration than was perceived by either the county extension directors themselves or by their subordinates. No significant difference was detected on the Consideration Real dimension between the county extension directors and the subordinates where a Z value of 0.11 was obtained.

TABLE X

INTRA-POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS ON THE CONSIDERATION DIMENSION OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR\*

Position	<u>Z</u>	Probability
District Extension Directors vs. County Extension Directors	-2.83	p = .0023
District Extension Directors vs. Subordinates	-2.18	p = .0146
County Extension Directors vs. Subordinates	0.11	p = .4562

\*The Z values presented in the above Table and in Tables XIII, XV, XVII and XIX were derived through the use of the Mann-Whitney U test. A negative sign in the Z value indicates that the mean for the first named position group is higher. The lack of a sign preceding the Z value indicates the mean for the second named position group is higher. A high mean score is indicative of greater emphasis being placed upon the dimension of leader behavior being discussed.

### Differences of Expectation

Data in Table XI reveals that there were no significant differences among Initiating Structure Ideal scores of district extension directors, county extension directors and subordinates. This indicates that these groups of respondents expected county extension directors to administer about the same amount of Initiating Structure. The calculated  $H$  of 0.53 was considerably lower than the tabled value of 5.99 associated with a probability of .05.

TABLE XI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE IDEAL SCORES OF DISTRICT EXTENSION DIRECTORS, COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Position	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
District Extension Directors	5	491.5	98.30
County Extension Directors	73	8346.0	114.32
Subordinates	142	15472.5	108.96
$H = 0.53$		df: 2	.70 < p < .80

The result of the Kruskal-Wallis test as presented in Table XII indicates that the degree of difference in the Consideration Ideal scores of individuals from different position groups was statistically

significant. The calculated  $H$  value of 10.71 exceeded the tabled value of 5.99 associated with a probability of .05.

TABLE XII  
KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION IDEAL SCORES OF  
DISTRICT EXTENSION DIRECTORS, COUNTY EXTENSION  
DIRECTORS AND SUBORDINATES

Position	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
District Extension Directors	5	689.5	137.90
County Extension Directors	73	9397.5	128.73
Subordinates	142	14223.0	100.16
$H = 10.71$		df: 2	.001 < p < .01

Table XIII presents comparisons between pairs of groups computed by Mann-Whitney U tests for the Consideration Ideal dimension. The obtained  $Z$  value of -3.12 calculated between the county extension directors and the subordinates, exceeded the critical value of 1.64. These results indicated that county extension directors think they should show greater Consideration to their staffs than is thought desirable by either district extension directors or subordinates. The data also reveals that the district extension directors, when compared to the subordinates, do place more emphasis on the Consideration dimension than

the latter group. However, the obtained Z value of -1.30 was not statistically significant at the .05 level of probability. An obtained Z value of -0.32 calculated between the district extension directors group and the county extension directors group was not statistically significant.

TABLE XIII

INTRA-POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS ON THE CONSIDERATION DIMENSION OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR

Position	<u>Z</u>	Probability
District Extension Directors vs. County Extension Directors	-0.32	.3745
District Extension Directors vs. Subordinates	-1.30	.0968
County Extension Directors vs. Subordinates	-3.12	.0009

Differences of Perception and Differences of Expectation of County Extension Directors and Subordinates Differentiated by Selected Classification Variables

As the results of statistical tests of data already presented have indicated, statistically significant differences between the county extension director group and the subordinate group occurred only on the

Consideration Ideal dimension. Since this was the result, only those comparisons related to that dimension are considered here. Tables XXX through XXXVIII showing the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test of the remaining comparisons are presented in Appendix C, but are not discussed as no statistically significant differences were present.

#### Differences in Consideration Ideal Scores

The result of the Kruskal-Wallis test is presented in Table XIV. The calculated  $H$  value of 16.05 was greater than the tabled value associated with a probability of .05. This result indicated that significant differences existed among the nine groups. As indicated by the average of the ranks, county extension directors in every age group believe they should place more emphasis upon the Consideration dimension than do any of the subordinate groups.

TABLE XIV

#### KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION IDEAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND WITH DIFFERENT AGES

Position & Age Group (Yrs.)	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
County Extension Directors			
26-35	3	538.0	179.33
36-45	28	3444.5	123.02
46-55	36	4367.5	121.31
56-65	6	881.0	146.83
Subordinates			
< 26	20	1944.0	97.20
26-35	46	4842.5	105.27
36-45	27	2884.0	106.80
46-55	34	2825.5	83.09
56-65	15	1494.5	99.63
$H = 16.05$		df: 8	.02 < p < .05

Comparisons between pairs of groups computed by Mann-Whitney U tests are presented in Table XV. The statistics illustrated in this table indicate that a number of statistically significant differences between various groups were obtained on the Consideration Ideal dimension. A Z value of -1.68, calculated when the 26-35 vs. 36-45 year old county extension directors were compared was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The negative Z value indicates that the younger age group, as compared to the 36-45 year old group, places more emphasis upon the Consideration Ideal dimension. It is interesting to note that those county extension directors in the 26-35 year old group also place more emphasis on the Consideration Ideal dimension than do subordinates in any age group. This was reflected by the negative Z values of -2.55, -1.86, -1.80, -2.37 and -2.20. Also statistically significant differences were found between county extension directors in the 36-45 age category and subordinates in the 46-55 age category; county extension directors in the 46-55 age category and subordinates in the 46-55 age category; county extension directors in the 56-65 age bracket and each of the following subordinate age groups: < 26, 46-55, and 56-65. In each case, negative Z values were presented, thus indicating that for each of the above comparisons, county extension directors placed the greater emphasis upon the Consideration dimension. The only statistically significant difference between pairs within the subordinate group was found between subordinates in the 26-35 and the 46-55 age groups, where a Z value of -1.61 was obtained.

Results of the Kruskal-Wallis test of the data presented in Table XVI indicate a statistically significant difference in the Consideration Ideal scores of individuals classified as to position and level of



TABLE XV

INTRA- AND INTER- POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS ON THE CONSIDERATION  
DIMENSION OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR ACCORDING TO  
RESPONDENTS' POSITION AND AGE GROUP

Position & Age Group (Yrs.)	County Extension Directors				Subordinates				
	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	<26	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65
County Extension Directors									
26-35	0.0	-1.68*	-1.56	-0.94	-2.25**	-1.86*	-1.80*	-2.37**	-2.20**
36-45	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-0.61	1.00	-1.53	-1.26	-0.93	-2.46**	-1.24
46-55	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.85	-1.41	-1.16	-0.94	-2.43**	-1.18
56-65	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-1.87*	-1.47	-1.38	-2.26**	-1.61*
Subordinates									
<26	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.57	0.51	-1.05	0.02
26-35	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.05	-1.61*	-0.08
36-45	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-1.54	-0.33
46-55	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.77

<sup>1</sup>A value for this comparison has been presented elsewhere in this table.

- \* (p < .05)
- \*\* (p < .01)
- \*\*\* (p < .001)

education. Although the degree of difference varies considerably, county extension directors in all four of the different educational groupings placed greater emphasis upon the Consideration dimension than did any of the subordinate groups. The calculated  $H$  of 14.92 slightly exceeds the tabled value of 14.07 associated with the probability level of .05.

TABLE XVI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION IDEAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND WITH DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

Position & Education Level	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
BS	2	221.5	110.75
>BS <MS	19	2170.0	113.66
MS	31	3687.5	118.94
>MS	21	3163.0	150.60
<b>Subordinates</b>			
BS	15	1641.0	109.37
>BS <MS	70	6903.0	98.61
MS	23	2171.0	94.39
>MS	34	3276.0	96.34
$H = 14.92$		df: 7	.02 < p < .05

In Table XVII an analysis of the comparisons between pairs of groups for the Consideration Ideal dimension according to position and educational level is presented. The statistically significant  $Z$  values of 2.12 and 1.91 found respectively between county extension directors with >BS <MS vs. >MS and with MS vs. >MS levels of education indicate

TABLE XVII

INTRA- AND INTER- POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS ON THE CONSIDERATION  
DIMENSION OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR ACCORDING TO  
RESPONDENTS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Position & Educational Level	County Extension Directors				Subordinates			
	BS	>BS <MS	MS	>MS	BS	>BS <MS	MS	>MS
County Extension Directors								
BS	0.0	0.24	0.04	0.66	-0.23	-0.10	-0.30	-0.45
>BS <MS	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.45	2.12**	0.12	-1.21	-1.02	-0.91
MS	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	1.91*	-0.58	-1.47	-1.47	-1.45
>MS	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-2.19**	-3.10***	-3.03***	-3.20***
Subordinates								
BS	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-0.68	-0.83	-0.54
>BS <MS	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-0.18	-0.22
MS	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.16

<sup>1</sup>A value for this comparison has been presented elsewhere in this table.

\* (p < .05)  
\*\* (p < .01)  
\*\*\* (p < .001)

significant differences between these groups. In each of these comparisons, the positive Z value indicates that those county extension directors with graduate work beyond the Master's Degree placed greater emphasis upon the Consideration Ideal dimension. When comparisons were made between position groups by levels of education, county extension directors with graduate work beyond the MS degree placed more importance upon Consideration than did subordinates in each classification of education. This was illustrated by statistically significant negative Z values between county extension directors with >MS degrees and subordinates in the BS, >BS <MS, MS and >MS groups. These Z values were, respectively: -2.19, -3.10, -3.03 and -3.20. It is interesting to note that no other statistical differences were noted either between positional groups or within the subordinate group.

As can be noted in Table XVIII, statistically significant differences were found when Consideration Ideal scores of individuals from different positions and with different tenure of extension employment were compared. The obtained H value of 18.80 exceeded the tabled value of 14.07 associated with a probability of .05.

In Table XIX, an analysis is presented of the comparisons between pairs of groups for the Consideration Ideal dimension according to position and tenure of extension employment. Statistically significant differences between groups within the county extension directors' position were not found to be present. However, statistically significant differences were detected between the following county extension director groups and the following subordinate groups, respectively: 4-7 years vs. 8-11 years, producing a Z value of -1.62; 12 or more years vs. 1-3 years, producing a Z value of -2.59; 12 or more years vs. 8-11 years,

Z value = -3.51; and 12 or more years vs. 12 or more years, Z value = -2.30. County extension director groups in each of the preceding comparisons placed the greater emphasis upon the Consideration Ideal dimension. Statistically significant differences were also found between pairs of groups within the subordinate groups. These differences were detected between those subordinates with 1-3 years vs. 4-7 years of tenure, subordinates with 4-7 years vs. 8-11 years of tenure and subordinates with 8-11 years vs. 12 or more years of tenure. Resulting Z values for these comparisons were, respectively: 1.89, -2.83 and 1.98.

TABLE XVIII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION IDEAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND WITH DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT TENURE  
IN THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Position & Years of Extension Service Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
4-7	3	389.5	129.83
8-11	5	557.5	111.50
12 or More	65	8284.0	127.44
<b>Subordinates</b>			
< 1	3	352.5	117.50
1-3	24	2146.0	89.40
4-7	33	3916.5	118.67
8-11	26	1902.0	73.15
12 or More	56	5673.5	101.31
<u>H</u> = 18.80		df: 7	.001 < p < .01

TABLE XIX

INTRA- AND INTER- POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS ON THE CONSIDERATION DIMENSION OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS' LEADER BEHAVIOR ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Position & Years of Extension Service Employment	County Extension Directors			Subordinates				
	4-7 Yrs.	8-11	12 or More	<1 Yr.	1-3	4-7	8-11	12 or More
County Extension Directors								
4-7	0.0	-0.62	0.11	0.23	-1.36	-0.14	-1.62*	-0.87
8-11	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.50	0.30	-0.70	0.62	-1.27	-0.34
12 or More	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-0.39	-2.59**	-0.80	-3.51***	-2.30**
Subordinates								
<1	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-0.81	0.0	-1.01	-0.54
1-3	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	1.89*	-1.25	0.79
4-7	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	-2.83**	-1.30
8-11	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	--- <sup>1</sup>	0.0	1.98*

<sup>1</sup>A value for this comparison has been presented elsewhere in this table.

\* (p < .05)  
 \*\* (p < .01)  
 \*\*\* (p < .001)

An analysis of the degree of differences between county extension directors' tenure (in that position) and their Initiating Structure Real scores is reported in Table XX. The computed  $H$  value of 8.11 was less than the tabled value of 9.49 associated with the probability of .05 for 4 degrees of freedom. This result indicates that statistically significant differences in Initiating Structure Real scores did not exist among the five tenure categories.

TABLE XX

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE REAL SCORES OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS BY YEARS OF SERVICE IN THAT POSITION

Years As County Extension Director	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<1	1	23.0	23.00
1-3	10	372.0	37.20
4-7	12	385.0	32.08
8-11	10	228.0	22.80
12 or More	40	1693.0	43.32

  

$H = 8.11$	df: 4	.05 < p < .10
------------	-------	---------------

The Kruskal-Wallis test analysis of county extension directors' Consideration Real scores in relation to their tenure as county extension directors is presented in Table XXI. The observed  $H$  value of 1.97 was less than the tabled value of 9.49 necessary for statistical significance at the .05 level of probability. This finding indicates that significant differences in the Consideration Real scores did not exist

between county extension directors in the five tenure categories.

TABLE XXI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION REAL SCORES OF COUNTY  
EXTENSION DIRECTORS BY YEARS OF SERVICE IN THAT POSITION

Years As County Extension Director	N	Sum or Ranks	Average of Ranks
< 1	1	15.5	15.50
1-3	10	407.0	40.70
4-7	12	261.0	38.42
8-11	10	320.0	32.00
12 or More	40	1498.0	37.44
<u>H</u> = 1.97		df: 4	.70 < p < .80

The analysis of county extension directors' Initiating Structure Ideal scores in relation to their tenure as county extension directors is presented in Table XXII. The calculated H value of 3.32 was not found to be statistically significant at the .05 probability level. This result indicates that significant differences in the Initiating Structure Ideal scores were not found between county extension directors in the five tenure categories of <1 year, 1-3, 4-7, 8-11 and 12 or more years.

Data in Table XXIII reveals that there were no significant differences among Consideration Ideal scores of county extension directors in the various county extension director tenure categories. The calculated



H value of 0.85 was far below the tabled value of 9.49 required for significance at the .05 level of probability.

TABLE XXII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE IDEAL SCORES OF COUNTY  
EXTENSION DIRECTORS BY YEARS OF SERVICE IN THAT POSITION

Years As County Extension Director	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
< 1	1	58.0	58.00
1-3	10	356.5	35.65
4-7	12	354.5	29.54
8-11	10	344.0	34.40
12 or More	40	1588.0	39.70

  

<u>H</u> = 3.32	df: 4	.50 < p < .70
-----------------	-------	---------------

TABLE XXIII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION IDEAL SCORES OF COUNTY  
EXTENSION DIRECTORS BY YEARS OF SERVICE IN THAT POSITION

Years As County Extension Director	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
< 1	1	26.5	26.50
1-3	10	332.5	33.25
4-7	12	478.5	39.88
8-11	10	358.5	35.85
12 or More	40	1505.5	37.63

  

<u>H</u> = 0.85	df: 4	.90 < p < .95
-----------------	-------	---------------

An analysis of the degree of differences between subordinates' employment under their county extension directors and their Initiating Structure Real scores is reported in Table XXIV. The derived  $H$  value of 3.88 was not significant at the .05 level of probability. However, the data does indicate that subordinates with the least tenure of employment under their respective county extension directors do perceive greater Initiating Structure from their leaders than do those subordinates that have served, on a given county extension director's staff, for longer periods of time. This is illustrated in average of ranks data of 84.27 and 54.69, respectively, for those subordinates serving less than one year and those serving for 12 or more years under the leadership of their county extension directors.

TABLE XXIV

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE REAL SCORES OF SUBORDINATES CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THEIR COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS

Years of Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<1	20	1685.5	84.27
1-3	60	4336.0	72.26
4-7	33	2180.0	66.06
8-11	21	1514.5	72.12
12 or More	8	437.5	54.69
$H = 3.88$			$.30 < p < .50$
df: 4			

Data in Table XXV reveals the relationship between subordinates' Consideration Real scores and employment tenure under their respective county extension directors. The calculated  $H$  of 2.54 was below the tabled value of 9.49 required for statistical significance at the .05 level of probability. This result indicates that significant differences in Consideration Real scores were not found between subordinates categorized according to their employment tenure under their respective county extension director. It is interesting to note that subordinates tend to score their county extension directors lower on the Consideration Real dimension when they have been employed under the leadership of those individuals for some time. This tendency is illustrated in average of ranks data which varies from 77.95 for subordinates with the least tenure down to 62.19 for subordinates with 12 or more years of employment under the leadership of given county extension directors.

TABLE XXV

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION REAL SCORES OF SUBORDINATES  
CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE LEADERSHIP  
OF THEIR COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS

Years of Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
< 1	20	1559.0	77.95
1-3	60	4538.5	75.64
4-7	33	2197.5	66.59
8-11	21	1361.0	64.79
12 or More	8	498.0	62.19
$H = 2.54$		df: 4	.50 < p < .70

The analysis of subordinates' Initiating Structure Ideal scores in relation to the subordinates' tenure of employment under their respective county extension directors as presented in Table XXVI did not reveal statistically significant differences. The  $H$  value of 2.63 was well below the tabled value of 9.49 required for significance at the .05 level of probability.

TABLE XXVI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE IDEAL SCORES OF  
SUBORDINATES CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER  
THE LEADERSHIP OF THEIR COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS

Years of Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<1	20	1434.5	71.72
1-3	60	3978.0	66.30
4-7	33	2458.5	74.50
8-11	21	1729.0	82.33
12 or More	8	553.0	69.13
$H = 2.63$			$.50 < p < .70$
df: 4			

Statistics presented in Table XXVII indicate that the degree of differences between subordinates' Consideration Ideal scores in relation to tenure of employment under their county extension directors was not significant at the .05 level of probability. The observed  $H$  value of 1.66 was considerably below the tabled value of 9.49 required for significance at the specified level of probability.

TABLE XXVII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION IDEAL SCORES OF SUBORDINATES  
CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE LEADERSHIP  
OF THEIR COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS

Years of Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
1	20	1528.0	76.40
1-3	60	4431.0	73.85
4-7	33	2328.5	70.55
8-11	21	1403.5	66.83
12 or More	8	462.5	57.81
<u>H</u> = 1.66		df: 4	.70 p .80

Relationships Between The Initiating Structure and Consideration  
Dimension Scores Real and Ideal, and Between The Real and  
Ideal Scores on Each Dimension

The data in the top two rows of Table XXVIII reveal positive correlations between how subordinates and county extension directors think county extension directors should behave as leaders (Ideal) and how they perceive county extension directors are behaving as leaders (Real) on both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions. Correlations obtained from analysis of county extension directors' scores on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions (Ideal vs. Real) were respectively, .40 and .58. Corresponding correlations obtained from the subordinate group were respectively, .23 and .29. These results indicate a greater disparity exists between the subordinates' perceptions and expectations concerning the leadership behavior of county extension directors than exists for the county extension

directors themselves. All of these correlations were found to be significant, exceeding the .05 level of probability.

TABLE XXVIII

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE REAL AND IDEAL SCORES OF COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS, SUBORDINATES AND BETWEEN INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION SCORES ON THE REAL AND ON THE IDEAL

Comparison	County Extension Directors N = 73	Subordinates N = 142
Initiating Structure-Ideal, Initiating Structure-Real	Rho = .40***	Rho = .23***
Consideration-Ideal, Consideration-Real	Rho = .58***	Rho = .29***
Initiating Structure-Real, Consideration-Real	Rho = .37***	Rho = .67***
Initiating Structure-Ideal, Consideration-Ideal	Rho = .45***	Rho = .35***

\*\*\*( $p < .001$ )

Analysis of the results in the bottom two rows of Table XXVIII also reveals positive correlations which were significant, exceeding the .05 probability level. These comparisons show correlations between Initiating Structure scores and Consideration scores (Real and Ideal) for both the county extension director group and the subordinate group. The county extension directors, to a greater degree than the subordinates, treat the two dimensions (Real) as if they were independent. This was

indicated by the derived Rho's of .37 for county extension directors and .67 for subordinates. On the Ideal form, the subordinates, to a greater degree than the county extension directors, treat the two dimensions as if they were independent. This was characterized by respective correlations of .35 and .45.

The data presented in Table XXIX reveals a lack of correlation between the Initiating Structure scores and the Consideration scores (Real and Ideal) of district extension directors. Derived Rho's were  $-.08$  for the Ideal form and  $.07$  for the Real form. Neither of these correlations were significant.

TABLE XXIX

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES AND CONSIDERATION SCORES OF DISTRICT EXTENSION DIRECTORS ON THE REAL AND ON THE IDEAL

Comparison	Rho
Initiating Structure-Ideal, Consideration-Ideal (N = 5)	$-.08$
Initiating Structure-Real, Consideration-Real (N = 73)	$.07$

#### Summary

The findings presented in this chapter indicate that district extension directors perceive the county extension directors as showing

more Consideration than was perceived by either the county extension directors themselves or by their subordinates. The findings also show that significant differences in expectations were detected only between the county extension directors and subordinates and these differences were limited to the Consideration dimension. Other data presented in this chapter indicate that positive correlations exist between how county extension directors and subordinates think county extension directors should behave as leaders and how they perceive county extension directors are behaving as leaders on both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions. Positive correlations for these two respondent groups were also noted between Real and Ideal Initiating Structure scores and Real and Ideal Consideration scores. Virtually no correlation was found between the district extension directors' Initiating Structure and Consideration Ideal scores or the Initiating Structure and Consideration Real scores.

In Chapter IV, the purpose and nature of this study will be summarized, the findings will be presented and some implications and recommendations which the present research has for education will be pointed out.



## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if district extension directors, county extension directors and subordinates significantly differed in their perception as to how county extension directors behave as leaders and as to their expectations of how county extension directors should behave as leaders. The county extension director group and the subordinate group were also categorized by selected classification variables and then their responses were analyzed in an effort to detect statistically significant differences which might occur between the classification variables and the respondents' role perception and expectations of the county extension directors' leader behavior.

Participating in the study were five district extension directors, 73 county extension directors and 142 professional extension service employees subordinate to the county extension directors. Each district extension director was asked to indicate how those county extension directors in his district behaved on certain leadership traits. After completion of these forms, each district extension director was asked to complete another form to indicate how he thought county extension directors should perform as leaders. The county extension directors were asked, during an extension administrative workshop held on the Oklahoma State University Campus, to complete similar questionnaires. The respondents in the subordinate group were contacted by mail and

also asked to respond to similar questionnaire forms.

The instrument used to determine the perceived and expected leader behavior of county extension directors was the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire which was developed at Ohio State University. The instrument is designed to measure two dimensions of leadership behavior: Initiating Structure and Consideration. Respectively, these dimensions refer to the leader's behavior in describing 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; and leader behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff.

### Findings

The findings of this study are presented in response to primary and secondary considerations set forth as questions under investigation in Chapter I. These considerations restated in the form of questions are exhibited in this section followed by the findings related to each question.

Question 1: What is the relationship between the district extension directors' and the county extension directors' perception of the leadership behavior of county extension directors?

On the Initiating Structure dimension, the district extension directors and the county extension directors tended to perceive the county extension directors' leader behavior in a similar fashion. However, on the Consideration dimension, statistical analysis indicated that significant differences existed between district extension directors' and

county extension directors' perception of the leadership behavior of county extension directors. The district extension directors saw the county extension directors as showing more Consideration than did the county extension directors themselves.

Question 2: What is the relationship between the district extension directors' and the county extension directors' opinion as to how the county extension directors should behave as leaders?

On each of the two leader behavior dimensions, the district extension directors and the county extension directors tended to agree in their expectations of how county extension directors should behave. No statistical differences were found.

Question 3: What is the relationship between the subordinates' and the county extension directors' perception of the leadership behavior of the county extension directors?

Statistical analysis revealed only chance differences between subordinates' and county extension directors' perception of the amount of Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior exhibited by county extension directors.

Question 4: What is the relationship between the subordinates' and the county extension directors' opinion as to how county extension directors should behave as leaders?

Data analysis indicate that subordinates and county extension directors tend to agree in their expectation of how county extension directors should behave on the Initiating Structure dimension. Statistically significant differences were found between subordinates and county extension directors in the extent of their agreement about how the county extension directors should behave on Consideration. County extension

directors thought they should show greater Consideration to their staffs than was deemed necessary by the subordinates themselves.

Question 5: What is the relationship between the district extension directors' and the subordinates' perception of the leadership behavior of county extension directors?

District extension directors and subordinates do not significantly differ in their perception of the county extension directors' behavior on the Initiating Structure dimension. However, the subordinates did tend to perceive the county extension agents as Initiating more Structure than did the district extension directors. Significant differences were found between these respondent groups for the Consideration dimension. District extension directors perceive county extension directors as showing more Consideration than do the subordinates.

Question 6: What is the relationship between the district extension directors' and the subordinates' expectation of the leadership behavior of county extension directors?

No significant differences were found on either the Initiating Structure or Consideration dimension when the expectations of district extension directors and the subordinates were compared. Although the difference was not significant, the district extension directors did tend to place more emphasis on the Consideration dimension than did the subordinates.

Secondary Question 1: What is the relationship between the role perceptions held by county extension directors and by subordinates according to selected classification variables?

No significant differences were found between selected classification variables and county extension directors' and subordinates'

perception of the county extension directors' leader behavior (determined by scores on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions of leader behavior). The selected classification variables were: age, level of education and tenure in the Extension Service.

Secondary Question 2: What is the relationship between the role expectations held by county extension directors and by subordinates according to selected classification variables?

Classification variables regarding age, level of education and tenure in the Extension Service were analyzed in relation to county extension directors' and subordinates' Ideal scores on both the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions of leader behavior. None of the three variables showed a significant difference to Initiating Structure. Significant differences were found between county extension directors' and subordinates' Ideal Consideration scores and the following variables: age, level of education and tenure in the Extension Service.

#### Implications

The findings presented for Questions 1, 3 and 5 refer to relationships among the district extension directors', county extension directors' and subordinates' perception of the leadership behavior of county extension directors. The respondent groups do not differ significantly in their perception of county extension directors' behavior on Initiating Structure. With this finding in mind, it seems unlikely that major role conflicts will occur between the respondent groups because of differences in the perception of the county extension directors' Initiating Structure behavior. In contrast, significant differences among

the respondent groups were found to be present on the Consideration dimension of the county extension directors' behavior. District extension directors described county extension directors as higher on Consideration than was described by either the county extension directors themselves or subordinates. This alone may not lead to role conflict; however, it does infer that county extension directors may show more Consideration when dealing with the district extension directors than when working with their own subordinates. Halpin, in his study of the leadership behavior of school superintendents reported a similar phenomena.<sup>48</sup>

Findings presented for Questions 2, 4 and 6 refer to relationships among the district extension directors', county extension directors' and subordinates' opinion as to how county extension directors should behave as leaders. Since there were no significant differences among the three respondent groups on the Initiating Structure Ideal scores, the prospect of role conflict on this dimension seems rather remote. Turning attention to the Consideration dimension, it is interesting to note that county extension directors think they should show greater Consideration than do the subordinates themselves. This discovery is also congruent with findings reported by Halpin.<sup>49</sup> In view of the findings reported in this study, it appears that county extension directors are unduly concerned with the Consideration dimension of their leadership behavior.

While some significant differences between various classification

---

<sup>48</sup>Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, p. 77.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 78.

variables and role expectations and role perceptions concerning the county extension directors leader behavior were found, no rational ordering appeared to be present; therefore, it would seem rather presumptuous of the author to make inferences concerning those relationships.

### Recommendations

The recommendations which follow are based primarily upon the findings of the study and the judgment of the writer.

It is recommended that Oklahoma Extension administrators make a genuine effort in helping county extension directors understand and evaluate the role perceptions and expectations that they themselves hold and that others hold for their leadership behavior. It does appear imperative that county extension personnel be cognizant of those expressed perceptions and expectations, as the literature implies that an administrator's behavior is affected by the perceptions and expectations he attributes to others.<sup>50</sup> If the county extension director does know what other people expect of him and how they perceive his leader behavior, he should be able to perform his duties more effectively and more efficiently.

It is recommended that a study be made relating county extension directors' leader behavior to employee satisfaction, morale and effectiveness. The findings of such a study could prove invaluable in detecting topics which should be emphasized in selecting and training of county extension directors.

---

<sup>50</sup>Gross, p. 248-249.

Other components of role analysis of the county extension director position should be researched. An attempt should be made to determine how his own individual needs, abilities, interests and desires affect his leadership behavior. Also what effects, if any, do differing expectations have on the leader behavior of the county extension director?

It is further recommended that studies be conducted to assess relationships between types of leader behavior exhibited by county extension directors and the success or failure of extension staff efforts.

Finally, it is recommended that Oklahoma State University Extension Service administrators continually strive to help county extension directors determine and develop effective leadership traits. Opportunities should be provided for county extension directors to continue formal and informal training designed to help them adequately fulfill their role as an administrator.

The county extension director has very important administrative responsibilities and his ability to understand and work effectively with others is critical to the success of many extension programs.



## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Board of Regents for Oklahoma A. & M. Colleges, July, 1965.
- Burton, William H. and Leo J. Brueckner. Supervision A Social Process. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955.
- Clegg, Denzil O. "Work As A Motivator." Journal of Cooperative Extension. Vol. 1, (Fall, 1963), 141-148.
- Coutu, Walter. "Role-Playing vs. Role Taking: An Appeal For Clarification." American Sociological Review, XVI (1951), 180-187.
- Cunningham, Clarence J. "Measures of Leader Behavior and Their Relation to Performance Levels of County Extension Agents." Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.
- Durfee, Arthur E. "Changing Role of the Supervisor." Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, (Fall, 1963), 149-154.
- Evans, Jean C. "Administrative Manager or Leader?" Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, (Fall, 1963), 149-154.
- Evans, Jean C. ed. Self Study of Cooperative Extension Service, Unpublished Document Prepared for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, February, 1967.
- Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.
- Goode, William J. "A Theory of Role Strain." American Sociological Review, XXV (1960), 483-495.
- Grattan, Hartley C. In Quest of Knowledge. New York: American Book Stratford Press, 1955.
- Greenfield, T. B. "Research on the Behavior of Educational Leaders: Critique of a Tradition." Unpublished Paper Read to the American Educational Research Association, New York, February, 1967.
- Gross, Neal, W. S. Mason and A. W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1956.

- Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Hicks, Hanne J. Educational Supervision in Principle and Practice. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960.
- Kahn, Robert L., et al. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Katz, Robert L. "Skills of an Effective Administrator," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 33, (Jan.-Feb., 1955), 33-42.
- Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, 1957.
- Mees, Carl F. "County Extension Administration." Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, (Summer, 1963), 85-92.
- Moyer, Donald C. "Teachers Attitudes Toward Leadership as They Relate to Teacher Satisfaction." Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954.
- Oklahoma State University Extension Service, Job Description-County Extension Director, (Unpublished Document).
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- Ratchford, C. B. "Modernizing Extension." Report of Proceedings, Western Region Seminar in Extension Supervision, University of Nevada, Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1959.
- Riebert, Marlys R. "What Research Shows About Training Needs." Training Extension Workers for the Future. Proceedings of the National Extension Training Conference: Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University, April, 1962.
- Sanders, H. C., ed. The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Schmidt, Warren H., and Robert Tannenbaum. "Management of Differences." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 38, No. 6, (1960), 107-115.
- Scope Report. The Cooperative Extension Service Today, A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. Washington, D. C.: American Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, April, 1958.
- Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership." American Sociological Review, Vol. 18, (August, 1953), 373-380.
- Shannon, Theodore J. University Extension. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.

New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Sweitzer, Robert E., et al. Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals, Cooperative Research Project No. 1329. Stillwater,

Oklahoma: Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University, 1963.

Vines, C. A., L. H. Watts and R. W. Parks. "Extension's Future."

Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1 (Winter, 1963), 239-246.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

(1)

Ideal. LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a questionnaire on which you may describe the behavior of ~~your county extension director~~ *the ideal leader*. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior without invoking any judgment about the desirability or understandability of that behavior. These questions in no way constitute a "test" of the ability of the person who answers the items. Nor do they involve an evaluation of the effectiveness of the ~~county extension director's~~ *ideal leader's* performance. It is possible, however, from this straightforward description of the frequency with which the ~~county extension director~~ *ideal leader* engages in specific kinds of behavior to identify certain distinct leadership styles.

Your answer will NOT be seen by the county extension director. This questionnaire will be scored and the results analyzed by members of the research staff at Oklahoma State University. The report of the findings will preserve the anonymity of your answers. Thank you.

- DIRECTIONS:
1. READ each item carefully.
  2. THINK about how frequently your county extension director engages in the behavior described by the item.
  3. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
  4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.
    - A. Always
    - B. Often
    - C. Occasionally
    - D. Seldom
    - E. Never

NOTE: The term "group," as used in the following items, refers to ~~you and also to other professional employees under the supervision of your county extension director.~~

*The teachers on your staff.*

Please precede each statement with  
~~"My County Extension Director ..."~~  
*The IDEAL administrator should*

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1. ... does personal favors for group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
2. ... makes his attitudes clear to the group. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
3. ... does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
4. ... tries out his new ideas with the group. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
5. ... puts the blame where it belongs . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
6. ... is easy to understand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
7. ... rules with an iron hand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
8. ... finds time to listen to group members . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
9. ... criticizes poor work. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
10. ... asks for more than group members can get done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
11. ... speaks in a manner not to be questioned . . .	A	B	C	D	E
12. ... keeps to himself. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
13. ... looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
14. ... assigns his group members to particular tasks . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
15. ... makes the decisions on major matters. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
16. ... works without a plan. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
17. ... maintains definite standards of perfor- mance . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
18. ... refuses to explain his actions. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
19. ... resists changes in ways of doing things . . .	A	B	C	D	E
20. ... acts without consulting the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
21. ... is slow to accept new ideas . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

Please precede each statement with

"My County Extension Director ... "

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
22. ... emphasizes the meeting of deadlines . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
23. ... treats all group members as his equal . . .	A	B	C	D	E
24. ... encourages the use of uniform procedures. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
25. ... schedules the work to be done . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
26. ... is willing to make changes. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
27. ... makes sure that his part in the organiza- tion is understood by group members . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
28. ... is friendly and approachable. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
29. ... asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
30. ... fails to take necessary action. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
31. ... makes group members feel at ease when talking with him. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
32. ... lets group members know what is expected of them . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
33. ... can "make a plan of work" . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
34. ... puts suggestions made by the staff into operation. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
35. ... sees to it that group members are working up to capacity. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
36. ... stresses getting the job done . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
37. ... is aware of conflicts when they occur in the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
38. ... gets group approval on important matters before going ahead. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
39. ... sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
40. ... stresses the need for new practices . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

*Ideal* LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate on this questionnaire how you believe ~~county extension directors~~ <sup>administrators</sup> SHOULD behave as leaders. Each item describes a specific kind of leader behavior. Mark the frequency with which you believe ~~county extension directors~~ <sup>ideal leaders</sup> SHOULD engage in each kind of behavior.

The research staff will preserve the anonymity of your answers.

Thank you.

- DIRECTIONS:
1. READ each item carefully.
  2. THINK about how frequently you ~~think county extension directors~~ <sup>the administrator</sup> SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.
  3. DECIDE whether ~~county extension directors~~ <sup>administrators</sup> SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act in the manner described by the item.
  4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected. *go to page*
- A. Always
  - B. Often
  - C. Occasionally
  - D. Seldom
  - E. Never

NOTE: The term "group," as used in the following items, refers to the total professional university staff under the county extension director's supervision.



Please precede each statement with

"County Extension Directors should ... "

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1. ... do personal favors for group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
2.. ... make my attitude clear to the group . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
3. ... do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
4. ... try out my new ideas with the group . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
5. ... put blame where it belongs. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
6. ... be easy to understand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
7. ... rule with an iron hand. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
8. ... find time to listen to group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
9. ... criticize poor work . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
10. ... ask for more than group members can get done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
11. ... speak in a manner not to be questioned. . .	A	B	C	D	E
12. ... keep to myself. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
13. ... look out for the personal welfare of individual group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
14. ... assign my group members to particular tasks . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
15. ... make the decisions on major matters . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
16. ... work without a plan . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
17. ... maintain definite standards of perfor- mance . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
18. ... refuse to explain my actions. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
19. ... resist changes in ways of doing things. . .	A	B	C	D	E
20. ... act without consulting the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
21. ... be slow to accept new ideas . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

Please precede each statement with		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
"County Extension Directors should ... "						
22.	... emphasize the meeting of deadlines. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
23.	... treat all group members as my equal . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
24.	... encourage the use of uniform procedures . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
25.	... schedule the work to be done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
26.	... be willing to make changes. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
27.	... make sure that my part in the organization is understood by group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
28.	... be friendly and approachable. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
29.	... ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
30.	... not fail to take necessary action . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
31.	... make group members feel at ease when talking with me . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
32.	... let group members know what is expected of them . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
33.	... "make a plan of work" . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
34.	... put suggestions made by the staff into operation . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
35.	... see to it that group members are working up to capacity. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
36.	... stress getting the job done . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
37.	... be aware of conflicts when they occur in the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
38.	... get group approval on important matters before going ahead. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
39.	... see to it that the work of group members is coordinated. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
40.	... stress the need for new practices . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

## LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate on this questionnaire how you believe you behave as a leader. Each item describes a specific kind of leader behavior. Mark the frequency with which you believe you engage in each kind of behavior.

In order to compare your perception with those other members of your staff, it will be necessary for you to sign your questionnaire. The research staff will preserve the anonymity of your answers.

Thank you.

- DIRECTIONS:
1. READ each item carefully.
  2. THINK how frequently you engage in the behavior described by the item. How often do you act in the manner described?
  3. DECIDE whether you always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act in the manner described by the item.
  4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.
    - A. Always
    - B. Often
    - C. Occasionally
    - D. Seldom
    - E. Never

NOTE: The term "group," as used in the following items, refers to the total professional university staff under your supervision.

Please precede each statement with "I ... "		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		A	B	C	D	E
1.	... do personal favors for group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
2.	... make my attitudes clear to the group. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
3.	... do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
4.	... try out my new ideas with the group . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
5.	... put the blame where it belongs. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
6.	... am easy to understand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
7.	... rule with an iron hand. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
8.	... find time to listen to group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
9.	... criticize poor work . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
10.	... ask for more than group members can get done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
11.	... speak in a manner not to be questioned. . .	A	B	C	D	E
12.	... keep to myself. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
13.	... look out for the personal welfare of individual group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
14.	... assign my group members to particular tasks . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
15.	... make the decisions on major matters . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
16.	... work without a plan . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
17.	... maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	... refuse to explain my actions. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
19.	... resist changes in ways of doing things. . .	A	B	C	D	E
20.	... act without consulting the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
21.	... am slow to accept new ideas . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
22.	... emphasize the meeting of deadlines. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
23.	... treat all group members as my equal . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

- Please precede each statement with "I ... "
- |   | Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
|---|--------|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 24. ... encourage the use of uniform procedures . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 25. ... schedule the work to be done. . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 26. ... am willing to make changes. . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 27. ... make sure that my part in the organization<br>is understood by group members. . . . . | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 28. ... am friendly and approachable. . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 29. ... ask that group members follow standard<br>rules and regulations . . . . .             | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 30. ... fail to take necessary action . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 31. ... make group members feel at ease<br>when talking with them. . . . .                    | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 32. ... let group members know what is expected<br>of them . . . . .                          | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 33. ... can "make a plan of work" . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 34. ... put suggestions made by the staff into<br>operation . . . . .                         | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 35. ... see to it that group members are working<br>up to capacity. . . . .                   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 36. ... stress getting the job done . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 37. ... am aware of conflicts when they occur<br>in the group. . . . .                        | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 38. ... get group approval on important matters<br>before going ahead. . . . .                | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 39. ... see to it that the work of group members<br>is coordinated. . . . .                   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 40. ... stress the need for new practices . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |

RESPONDENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_

RESPONDENT \_\_\_\_\_  
Name

## LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate on this questionnaire how you believe you SHOULD behave as a leader. Each item describes a specific kind of leader behavior. Mark the frequency with which you believe you SHOULD engage in each kind of behavior.

In order to compare your perception with those other members of your staff, it will be necessary for you to sign your questionnaire. The research staff will preserve the anonymity of your answers.

Thank you.

- DIRECTIONS:
1. READ each item carefully.
  2. THINK about how frequently you SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.
  3. DECIDE whether you SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act in the manner described by the item.
  4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.
    - A. Always
    - B. Often
    - C. Occasionally
    - D. Seldom
    - E. Never

NOTE: The term "group," as used in the following items, refers to the total professional university staff under your supervision.

Please precede each statement with		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
"I should ... "						
1.	... do personal favors for group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
2.	... make my attitude clear to the group . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
3.	... do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
4.	... try out my new ideas with the group . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
5.	... put the blame where it belongs. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
6.	... be easy to understand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
7.	... rule with an iron hand. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
8.	... find time to listen to group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
9.	... criticize poor work . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
10.	... ask for more than group members can get done, . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
11.	... speak in a manner not to be questioned. . .	A	B	C	D	E
12.	... keep to myself. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
13.	... look out for the personal welfare of individual group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
14.	... assign my group members to particular tasks . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
15.	... make the decisions on major matters . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
16.	... work without a plan . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
17.	... maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	... refuse to explain my actions. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
19.	... resist changes in ways of doing things. . .	A	B	C	D	E
20.	... act without consulting the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
21.	... be slow to accept new ideas . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
22.	... emphasize the meeting of deadlines. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
23.	... treat all group members as my equal . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

- Please precede each statement with  
"I should ... "
- |   | Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
|---|--------|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 24. ... encourage the use of uniform procedures . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 25. ... schedule the work to be done. . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 26. ... be willing to make changes. . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 27. ... make sure that my part in the organization<br>is understood by group members. . . . . | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 28. ... be friendly and approachable. . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 29. ... ask that group members follow standard<br>rules and regulations . . . . .             | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 30. ... not fail to take necessary action . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 31. ... make group members feel at ease when<br>talking with me . . . . .                     | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 32. ... let group members know what is expected<br>of them . . . . .                          | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 33. ... "make a plan of work" . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 34. ... put suggestions made by the staff into<br>operation . . . . .                         | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 35. ... see to it that group members are working<br>up to capacity. . . . .                   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 36. ... stress getting the job done . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 37. ... be aware of conflicts when they occur<br>in the group. . . . .                        | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 38. ... get group approval on important matters<br>before going ahead, . . . . .              | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 39. ... see to it that the work of group members<br>is coordinated. . . . .                   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |
| 40. ... stress the need for new practices . . . . .   | A      | B     | C            | D      | E     |

RESPONDENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_

RESPONDENT \_\_\_\_\_

Name



## LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

These questionnaires are provided so that you may describe the behavior of each county extension director in your district. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior without invoking any judgment about the desirability or understandability of that behavior. These questions in no way constitute a "test" of the ability of the person who answers the items. Nor do they involve an evaluation of the effectiveness of the county extension director's performance. It is possible, however, from this straightforward description of the frequency with which the county extension director engages in specific kinds of behavior to identify certain leadership styles.

Your answer will NOT be seen by the county extension director without your consent. These questionnaires will be scored and the results analyzed by members of the research staff at Oklahoma State University. The report of the findings will preserve the anonymity of your answers.

Thank you.

- DIRECTIONS:
1. READ each item carefully.
  2. THINK how frequently the specified county extension director engages in the behavior described by the item. How often does he act in the manner described?
  3. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts in the manner described by the item.
  4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.
    - A. Always
    - B. Often
    - C. Occasionally
    - D. Seldom
    - E. Never

NOTE: The term "group," as used in the following items, refers to the total professional university staff under the county extension director's supervision.

Please precede each statement with

(Name of County Extension Director)

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1. ... does personal favors for group members. . .	A	B	C	D	E
2. ... makes his attitudes clear to the group. . .	A	B	C	D	E
3. ... does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
4. ... tries out his new ideas with the group. . .	A	B	C	D	E
5. ... puts the blame where it belongs . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
6. ... is easy to understand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
7. ... rules with an iron hand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
8. ... finds time to listen to group members . . .	A	B	C	D	E
9. ... criticizes poor work. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
10. ... asks for more than group members can get done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
11. ... speaks in a manner not to be questioned . .	A	B	C	D	E
12. ... keeps to himself. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
13. ... looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
14. ... assigns his group members to particular tasks . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
15. ... makes the decisions on major matters. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
16. ... works without a plan. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
17. ... maintains definite standards of performance	A	B	C	D	E
18. ... refuses to explain his actions. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
19. ... resists changes in ways of doing things . .	A	B	C	D	E
20. ... acts without consulting the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
21. ... is slow to accept new ideas . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
22. ... emphasizes the meeting of deadlines . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

Please precede each statement with

(Name of County Extension Director)

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
23. ... treats all group members as his equal . . .	A	B	C	D	E
24. ... encourages the use of uniform procedures. .	A	B	C	D	E
25. ... schedules the work to be done . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
26. ... is willing to make changes. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
27. ... makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
28. ... is friendly and approachable. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
29. ... asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
30. ... fails to take necessary action. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
31. ... makes group members feel at ease when talking with him. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
32. ... lets group members know what is expected of them . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
33. ... can "make a plan of work" . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
34. ... puts suggestions made by the staff into operation . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
35. ... sees to it that group members are working up to capacity. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
36. ... stresses getting the job done . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
37. ... is aware of conflicts when they occur in the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
38. ... gets group approval on important matters before going ahead. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
39. ... sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
40. ... stresses the need for new practices . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

## LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate on this questionnaire how you believe county extension directors SHOULD behave as leaders. Each item describes a specific kind of leader behavior. Mark the frequency with which you believe county extension directors SHOULD engage in each kind of behavior.

The research staff will preserve the anonymity of your answers.

Thank you.

- DIRECTIONS:
1. READ each item carefully.
  2. THINK about how frequently you think county extension directors SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.
  3. DECIDE whether county extension directors SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act in the manner described by the item.
  4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.
    - A. Always
    - B. Often
    - C. Occasionally
    - D. Seldom
    - E. Never

NOTE: The term "group," as used in the following items, refers to the total professional university staff under the county extension director's supervision.

Please precede each statement with

		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
"The County Extension Director should ... "						
1.	... do personal favors for group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
2.	... make any attitude clear to the group. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
3.	... do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
4.	... try out his new idea with the group . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
5.	... put the blame where it belongs. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
6.	... be easy to understand . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
7.	... rule with an iron hand. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
8.	... find time to listen to group members. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
9.	... criticize poor work . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
10.	... ask for more than group members can get done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
11.	... speak in a manner not to be questioned. . .	A	B	C	D	E
12.	... keep to himself . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
13.	... look out for the personal welfare of individual group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
14.	... assign his group members to particular tasks . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
15.	... make the decisions on major matters . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
16.	... work without a plan . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
17.	... maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	... refuse to explain his actions . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
19.	... resist changes in ways of doing things. . .	A	B	C	D	E
20.	... act without consulting the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
21.	... be slow to accept new ideas . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
22.	... emphasize the meeting of deadlines. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

Please precede each statement with

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
"The County Extension Director should ... "					
23. ... treat all group members as his equal. . . .	A	B	C	D	E
24. ... encourage the use of uniform procedures . .	A	B	C	D	E
25. ... schedule the work to be done. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
26. ... be willing to make changes. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
27. ... make sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
28. ... be friendly and approachable. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
29. ... ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
30. ... not fail to take necessary action . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
31. ... make group members feel at ease when talking with him. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
32. ... let group members know what is expected of them . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
33. ... "make a plan of work" . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
34. ... put suggestions made by the staff into operation . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
35. ... see to it that group members are working up to capacity. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
36. ... stress getting the job done . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
37. ... be aware of conflicts when they occur in the group. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
38. ... get group approval on important matters before going ahead, . . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
39. ... see to it that the work of group members is coordinated. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E
40. ... stress the need for new practice. . . . .	A	B	C	D	E

## GENERAL INFORMATION

(Requested of Subordinates)

In order to classify responses, a limited amount of general information is needed. The research staff will preserve the anonymity of the information you provide.

1. Name of your county extension director \_\_\_\_\_
2. How long have you worked under the leadership of this county extension director? (Include the period when you worked under the same person when he was identified as a county agent.)
  - Years \_\_\_\_\_
  - Months (If less than a year) \_\_\_\_\_
3. How long have you been an employee of the Oklahoma Extension Service?
  - Years \_\_\_\_\_
  - Months (If less than a year) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Total number of years employed in the education profession \_\_\_\_\_
5. Your age category: (Please check one)
  - 25 or younger \_\_\_\_\_
  - 26 - 35 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 36 - 45 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 46 - 55 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 56 - 65 \_\_\_\_\_
6. Your sex:
  - Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
7. Highest degree attained: (Please check one)
  - Bachelors \_\_\_\_\_
  - Masters \_\_\_\_\_
8. Semester hours completed beyond that degree \_\_\_\_\_
9. Marital status: (Please check one)
  - Single \_\_\_\_\_
  - Married \_\_\_\_\_
  - Widow(ed) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Separated \_\_\_\_\_
  - Divorced \_\_\_\_\_

## GENERAL INFORMATION

(Obtained From Personnel Records)

## COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTOR

1. Length of Service as County Agent or County Extension Director:

\_\_\_\_\_

(No. of Years and Months)

2. Length of Service as an Employee of the Oklahoma Extension Service:

\_\_\_\_\_

(No. of Years and Months)

3. Total number of years employed in the education profession \_\_\_\_\_

4. Age \_\_\_\_\_

5. Highest degree attained:

Bachelors \_\_\_\_\_

Masters \_\_\_\_\_

6. Semester hours completed beyond that degree \_\_\_\_\_

7. Marital Status:

Single \_\_\_\_\_

Married \_\_\_\_\_

Widow(ed) \_\_\_\_\_

Separated \_\_\_\_\_

Divorced \_\_\_\_\_



APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO RESPONDENTS

(First Letter Mailed to Subordinate Staff Members)

Dear Colleague:

A study is currently being made attempting to determine how personnel in different levels of the extension organization perceive and expect county extension directors to behave in their roles as leaders. Your opinions, as will be reflected in the enclosed questionnaires (upon completion), are necessary in order to present a broad perspective of the role expectations and the role perceptions of the county extension directors. Total time required for the completion of the questionnaires involved should not exceed 30 minutes.

Your cooperation in this study will be appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

George E. Stroup  
Director of Personnel Development

(Second Letter Mailed to Subordinate Staff Members)

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for completing and returning the "Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire" which was recently mailed to you. Analyses of responses will be done on a group basis and the anonymity of individual answers and responses from individual counties will be maintained at all times.

To complete this study, we need your opinion as to how the county extension directors should behave as leaders. To do this, we are asking you to complete the enclosed form and return it to us. You may note that the items on the questionnaire are identical to those on the first questionnaire. The difference is that on this form we are asking the question, "how should county extension directors behave as leaders?"

Thank you for cooperating in this study. Your cooperation, along with many other persons in the Oklahoma Extension Service will enable us to gain knowledge as to how the role of the county extension director is perceived by personnel in different levels of the extension organization.

Sincerely yours,

George E. Stroup  
Director of Personnel Development

APPENDIX C

STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE XXX

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE REAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND FROM DIFFERENT AGE GROUPINGS

Position & Age Grouping (Yrs.)	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
26-35	3	226.5	75.50
36-45	28	2696.5	96.29
46-55	36	4018.0	111.61
56-65	6	881.0	146.83
<b>Subordinates</b>			
< 26	20	1894.0	94.70
26-35	46	4875.5	105.99
36-45	27	2975.5	110.20
46-55	34	3777.0	111.09
56-65	15	1876.5	125.10
<u>H</u> = 6.50		df: 8	.50 < p < .70

TABLE XXXI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE REAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND FROM DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

Position & Educational Levels	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
BS	2	331.5	165.75
>BS <MS	19	1914.5	100.74
MS	31	3124.0	100.76
>MS	21	2453.0	116.79
<b>Subordinates</b>			
BS	15	1572.5	104.83
>BS <MS	70	7419.5	105.99
MS	23	2522.5	109.67
>MS	34	3884.5	114.24
<u>H</u> = 3.30		df: 7	.80 < p < .90

TABLE XXXII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE REAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
ACCORDING TO POSITION & LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Position & Years of Extension Service Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
County Extension Directors			
4-7	3	198.0	66.00
8-11	5	486.0	97.20
12 or More	65	7138.0	109.81
Subordinates			
<1	3	415.5	138.50
1-3	24	2209.0	92.04
4-7	33	3480.0	105.45
8-11	26	2439.5	93.81
12 or More	56	6855.0	122.41
<u>H</u> = 8.30		df: 7	.30 < p < .50

TABLE XXXIII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE IDEAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND DIFFERENT AGE GROUPINGS

Position & Age Grouping (Yrs.)	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
County Extension Directors			
26-35	3	338.5	112.83
36-45	28	2666.5	95.23
46-55	36	4189.0	116.36
56-65	6	936.0	155.92
Subordinates			
< 26	20	1758.0	87.88
26-35	46	5244.0	113.99
36-45	27	3348.0	124.00
46-55	34	3067.5	90.22
56-65	15	1674.0	111.60
<u>H</u> = 13.59		df: 8	.10 < p < .20

TABLE XXXIV

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE IDEAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND FROM DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

Position & Educational Level	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
BS	2	250.0	125.00
>BS <MS	19	1932.5	101.71
MS	31	3534.0	114.00
>MS	21	2413.0	114.90
<b>Subordinates</b>			
BS	15	1438.5	95.90
>BS <MS	70	8012.5	114.46
MS	23	2133.5	92.76
>MS	34	3506.5	103.13
<u>H</u> = 3.82		df: 7	p = .80

TABLE XXXV

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF INITIATING STRUCTURE IDEAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND WITH DIFFERENT LENGTHS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Position & Years of Extension Service Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
4-7	3	370.5	123.50
8-11	5	491.0	98.20
12 or More	65	7268.5	111.82
<b>Subordinates</b>			
<1	3	314.5	104.67
1-3	24	2310.0	96.23
4-7	33	3757.5	113.86
8-11	26	2456.0	94.46
12 or More	56	6254.0	111.67
<u>H</u> = 3.16		df: 7	.80 < p < .90

TABLE XXXVI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF THE CONSIDERATION REAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND FROM DIFFERENT AGE GROUPINGS

Position & Age Grouping (Yrs.)	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
26-35	3	370.0	123.17
36-45	28	2965.5	105.91
46-55	36	3772.5	104.78
56-65	6	730.5	121.67
<b>Subordinates</b>			
< 26	20	2029.5	101.47
26-35	46	5004.0	108.78
36-45	27	2938.0	108.80
46-55	34	3503.5	103.04
56-65	15	1908.5	127.23
<u>H</u> = 2.48		df: 8	.95 < p < .98

TABLE XXXVII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF THE CONSIDERATION REAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS  
FROM DIFFERENT POSITIONS AND FROM DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

Position & Educational Level	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Directors</b>			
BS	2	231.0	115.50
>BS < MS	19	1876.5	98.76
MS	31	3217.0	103.76
>MS	21	2513.5	119.67
<b>Subordinates</b>			
BS	15	1698.5	113.23
>BS < MS	70	7636.5	109.09
MS	23	2599.0	112.98
>MS	34	3450.0	101.47
<u>H</u> = 1.98		df: 7	.95 < p < .98



TABLE XXXVIII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF CONSIDERATION REAL SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS ACCORDING TO POSITION AND LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Position & Years of Extension Service Employment	N	Sum of Ranks	Average of Ranks
<b>County Extension Director</b>			
4-7	3	317.5	105.83
8-11	5	612.5	122.50
12 or More	65	6907.0	106.26
<b>Subordinates</b>			
< 1	3	290.5	96.67
1-3	24	2429.5	101.21
4-7	33	3811.0	115.48
8-11	26	2297.5	88.35
12 or More	56	6556.0	117.07
H = 4.98		df: 7	.50 < p < .70

VITA

Delbert Otis Black

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF  
COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, January 26, 1933,  
the son of Carmon O. and Essie O. Black

Education: Graduated in 1950 from Wyandotte High School,  
Wyandotte, Oklahoma; Associate in Arts degree from  
Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College,  
Miami, Oklahoma, May, 1953; received the Bachelor of Science  
degree from Oklahoma State University, with a major in Poultry  
Husbandry, in May, 1955; received the Master of Science  
degree from Oklahoma State University, with a major in  
Poultry Science, in August, 1959; completed the requirements  
for the Doctor of Education degree in May, 1969.

Professional Experience: Farm Superintendent, Poultry Science  
Department, Oklahoma State University, April, 1956-April,  
1958; Assistant Extension Poultryman, Oklahoma State  
University, April 1958 to October, 1962; Extension  
Poultryman, Oklahoma State University, October, 1962 to  
Present.

Organizations: Epsilon Sigma Phi, Phi Delta Kappa and Poultry  
Science Association.