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The problem of this study was a comparison of female administrators' self-perceived leadership styles to those of their superordinates' perceptions in five major junior/community college districts in Texas. The population included 59 female administrators submitting biographical information with 53 of the 59 submitting information on their leadership styles. The leadership data were paired with 53 superordinates for comparison of the perceptions of each group.

Three instruments were used to gather data: (1) biographical instrument, (2) Leadership Effective Adaptability Description-Self, and (3) Leadership Effective Adaptability Description-Other. The LEAD-Self instrument was administered to the female administrators and LEAD-Other instrument was administered to their superordinates. A comparison of these scores was made. The biographical questionnaire was administered to the female administrators only.

The findings indicate the typical female administrator was (1) between the ages of 31 and 40, (2) she was married,
and (3) she had from one to three elementary school age children between the ages of six and thirteen. The administrator was most often white and was a middle level manager who felt that her demonstrated leadership ability had obtained her the present position. Several reported problems that they attributed to their "femaleness."

A significant difference was shown when comparing the female administrators' perceptions of their leadership styles and to their superordinates' perceptions of the female administrators' leadership styles and adaptability. No significant difference was shown among the pairs when comparisons of style ranges were made.

In conclusion both groups agreed on the leadership style exhibited most often by female administrators as being high relationship-low task. Even though the female administrators exhibited this dominant style, the majority of the women and their superiors agreed they could span the other styles in an effective manner.

The recommendations are that (1) assertiveness training workshops be included in the curriculum for future administrators, (2) female administrators participate in supervised on-the-job experience of other female administrators, and (3) further study be conducted to determine if leadership styles of females employed are more or less similar to their superordinates.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent efforts of feminist movements have resulted in both victory and frustration for American women in the work force. Even though many women have indeed been promoted to administrative level positions because of legislation, public or individual attitudes have lagged behind liberalized policies. Accordingly, a Gallup poll conducted in 1976 reflects public attitudes relative to the female as supervisor.

... 60% of the female job applicants preferred a male boss and some 63% of the male applicants felt the same. Some reasons for this show of preference have been that women traditionally are too "catty," "petty," not likely to make rational decisions, too emotional, offensively aggressive, and not goal-oriented (3).

Whether or not these views are accurate or mythical is debatable until the situation is analyzed from a concrete and educational point of view. It is in this area—that of education—that facts are needed. While it might well be true that at one time or other women (or men) could exhibit any of the negative characteristics previously mentioned, can one involved in the field of education afford not to apply scientific decision mechanisms or thought processes in order to determine what differences, if any, exist in female
leadership roles in our society? Can females complete a job effectively and efficiently while serving in leadership positions? Are female administrators more likely than not to make irrational, emotionally charged decisions, or are they capable of effectively influencing the activities of an individual or a group in an effort toward implementing objective and goal achievement in various situations?

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present study was that of comparing selected female administrators' self-perceived leadership styles with their superordinates' perceptions of the female administrative leadership styles.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have restricted meaning and are defined as follows for this study:

1. Administrator.--An educational official responsible for the management or direction of an educational establishment, system, or an administrative unit of it (8).

2. LEAD-Self.--An instrument developed at the Center for Leadership Studies, Ohio University, by Hersey, Blanchard, and Hambleton to help gain insight into the self-perception of a leader's behavior (10).

3. LEAD-Other.--The same instrument as the LEAD-Self but written so that a subordinate, superior, or peer could evaluate a leader (10, p. 272).
4. **Leadership Style.**—The behavior an individual employs in accomplishing a task, goal, or objective (10, p. 232).

5. **Major Junior/Community College Districts.**—Those urban districts showing the greatest over-all student enrollment and full-time equivalency ratios. Major districts are multi-faceted institutions (multi-campus/multi-college) actively involved in providing a variety of programs including liberal arts courses, pre-professional, technical/vocational degree and non-degree programs, adult and continuing education for its students (6).

6. **Maturity.**—Defined in Situational Leadership Theory as the capacity to set high but attainable goals (achievement-motivation), willingness and adaptability to take responsibility, and education and experience of an individual or a group. Such variables of maturity should be considered only in relation to a specific task to be performed.

7. **Relationship Behavior.**—The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socio-emotional support, issuing "psychological strokes," and facilitating behaviors (10, p. 104).

8. **Style Adaptability.**—The degree to which an administrator is capable of adjusting style to the appropriateness or demands of a situation (10, p. 235).
9. **Style-Range.**--The extent to which an administrator is able to vary his style of leadership (10, p. 233).

10. **Superordinates.**--Those individuals of "higher degree" in condition or rank of the female administrators (according to organizational charts) or those individuals to whom they answer directly.

11. **Task Behavior.**--The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers). Task behavior also explains what activities each member does and when, where, and how the tasks are to be accomplished. Task behavior is characterized by an endeavor to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of job accomplishment (10, p. 104).

12. **Texas Higher Education Directory.**--A yearly booklet listing all individuals in higher education that are identified as administrators in the state of Texas (22).

**Purposes of the Study**

The purposes of the study were to (1) determine and compare the differences in female administrators' perceptions of their own leadership styles and the way their superordinates view their leadership styles; (2) determine and compare the extent of style "adaptability" of female administrators as perceived by themselves and their superordinates; and (3) determine and compare the self-perceived style-range
capabilities of female administrators and their superordinates' perceptions of the respective range capabilities.

Questions to Be Answered in the Study

In order to effectively implement the study, the following concepts were investigated descriptively and analytically.

1. Will there be a significant difference in the way female administrators perceive their leadership styles and the way their superordinates view their leadership styles?

2. Will there be a significant difference in the style adaptability of female administrators as perceived by themselves and their superordinates?

3. Will there be a significant difference in the style-range capabilities of female administrators and their superordinates' perception of this style-range?

4. What is the average age span of female administrators?

5. What is the marital status, in general, of female administrators?

6. What percentage of these female administrators have children, and in what age range or category are they?

7. What percentage of female administrators represent ethnic minorities?

8. What percentage of female administrators are classified in top and middle-management level positions?
The second battery of questions provided information on a less structured basis; these results may be found in Appendices A and B as well as in Chapter IV.

1. What are some of the major personal and professional problems female administrators encounter on the job that they feel may be attributed to their "femaleness"?

2. What factors—educational background, federal legislation, leadership ability, for example—do female administrators who work in an educational setting consider most influential in getting a job?

Background of the Study

Before 1890 women constituted only 17 percent of all workers in the American labor force. The next ten years produced only a minor increase of 10.1 percent more working women (24). Since 1940, however, women have comprised more than 60 percent of the total increase in the labor force. Within the population of working age women, the percentage of employed women advanced from 28.9 percent in 1940 to 43.4 percent in 1970 (1).

The United States Department of Labor reports that in 1970, 31.6 million women were in the labor force—over twice as many as before World War II when 43.4 percent of women sixteen years of age and over were working. The actual female work force growth, then, has become phenomenal, the
dramatic change in patterns and number in the employment of women being characterized by Drews as a "silent revolution" (1).

Such a rise in female employment is due to a combination of demographic, economic, and social developments as well as increased longevity. Socially, women are bearing and completing their families at an earlier age than before (1, p. 134), and modern conveniences make it practical to do more than mere household chores.

When American society bemoans the scarcity of leadership talent, it is not talking about a lack of people to fill administrative roles or positions but a scarcity of people who are willing to assume significant leadership roles in society and can complete the job effectively (10). Regardless of the make-up of an organization, there is a continuous search for individuals who exhibit the qualities and necessary capabilities to be effective leaders. America, then, needs to tap unused resources in order to supply its workforce with effective and essential leadership.

Woman power is yet another one of this nation's greatest resources. Nevertheless, in spite of the great increase in the number of employed women, they are becoming increasingly concentrated in the relatively less skilled, less rewarded, and, hence, less rewarding fields of work (1).
Relative to education, an area which does contain large numbers of women, several sources propose that some modifications in the professional and preparatory experience of women involved in the field would enhance their chances of successful placement and advancement. Studies by Grace Chisolm (5) and Matina Horner (11), for example, suggested that encouragement from building and district administrators might help to raise the aspiration levels of promising female educators.

Kline and Munsterman (12) showed that of the 219 females and the 430 males involved in this study, (1) the women had been teaching slightly longer than the men prior to entering the U.C.L.A. graduate program; (2) no minority females had been school principals, and only white males had been school superintendents; (3) the men, more often than women, cited personnel administration as an area of specialization; (4) while the females more often were seeking elementary principalships and program directorships, the males more frequently sought superintendencies; and (5) the women tended to expect average annual salaries of about $636 less than did the men.

The National Education Association (19) reported that women hold a mere 1.4 percent of all high school principalships, 5.3 percent of assistant or associate superintendencies, and .6 percent of superintendencies, although they comprise
more than 10 percent of the doctoral degree recipients in educational administration each year. Silver's (21) data suggest that such female underrepresentation in leadership roles is not warranted on the basis of pre-service experience or formal preparation.

Several studies have noted that women lacked "sponsorship" (13). John and Gail McLure (14) point out that thoughtful sponsorship by professors in the graduate programs would help to increase the range of job options available to candidates. Murray (18) indicates that witnesses testifying before the United States House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor attributed the decline in the number of women at the college and university level to (1) the reality and fear of higher admissions standards; (2) well-known facts that women are frequently channelled into feminine related fields; and (3) documented instances of professors and admissions offices discouraging academic advancement for women.

Carroll (4) points out that, according to related literature, there are few women in administration in higher education because (1) women, generally, do not seek administrative positions; (2) males who are leaving a position do not support women for such offices; and (3) in selecting new administrators, those who make such appointments do not search for a woman to fill the vacancy. Since numerous women
are amply qualified for high-level administrative positions, their absence from the administrative ranks must be attributed, as Silver (21) said, to other causes.

For the few women who are already in administrative positions, however, emphasis is placed on the need to establish effective working relationships within the organizational structure. According to Miller, "To be successful, every leader must influence others" (17). Teamwork is indeed involved, for, as Thurow indicated, "productivity is not solely an individual phenomenon" (23).

Although associate or peer expectations and perceptions are important to administrators, Hersey and Blanchard noted a position of caution with regard to peer importance: "The styles and expectations of one's associates are important when a leader has frequent interactions with them, for example, a situation that involves trading and bargaining for resources, such as budget money" (10). The authors further emphasized that some individuals (who are satisfied with their present positions) are not interested in advancement to administrative positions; consequently, they may be concerned about peers, but, in general, associates are significant only when interactions are regular and might have some impact on their overall effectiveness.

It should be pointed out, too, that a "crucial factor in the success of any leadership event" (20) remains heavily
with an individual's followers, for research indicates that followers may accept, reject, or determine whatever "personal power" an administrator may have. Nevertheless, a good leader knows, too, that expectations and styles of subordinates may be changed, altered, adhered to temporarily, or even dismissed. In addition, even though "subordinates [superordinates] can make or break a leader" (17), as noted by Miller, it is so only after a leader has been chosen.

Presently, the major job-related problem of females is that of entering into leadership roles, while the unanswered question is why women are excluded from high-level management positions even though no evidence exists that men have superior executive powers (25). In most instances, this is not controlled by subordinates. "The taste for discrimination" as described by Becker (2) is an employer's prerogative, perhaps more so than a subordinate's, and whether intentional or unintentional, subtle or non-subtle, leads to what Mangum called a "castelike division between sectors of the labor market" (15). The primary sector offers better jobs, better wages and advancement, among other benefits. The secondary sector offers less than these. Minorities and women are more likely than others to be assigned to occupations and industries in the secondary sector. Again, this is not the prerogative of the chain of command from the bottom of the organizational charts upward but rather the opposite.
Another factor present in team relationships is that of the superordinate. A meaningful and relevant facet in this study is provided through an examination of the superior's perception of the administrator and the administrator's perception of how his superordinate perceives him. If a "boss" is very task-oriented, for example, he might expect his subordinate(s) to operate in the same manner. Relationship-oriented behavior could well be evaluated as inappropriate, without consideration of results (10). This is particularly important in that it may directly influence one's leadership style, especially if the two work within the same office or area; it is also important for the female administrator to know her boss' expectations if she wishes to advance in the organization. In addition, Henry noted that "if they are pre-disposed toward promotion, they may tend to adhere to the customs and mores of the group to which they aspire to join rather than those of their peer group" (9). In essence, followers and associates could easily be secondary in importance for the female administrator searching for advancement.

In the work Managerial Woman, Henning and Jardin described twenty-five women who advanced to the top of their organizations as having an exceptionally close working relationship with their bosses early in their careers. Each woman saw her boss as her supporter, her encourager, her teacher,
and her strength within the organization (16). Manley, Chairman of the Board of Time-Life Books, was quoted by Merkins in *Woman's Work* as having attributed her success in the business world to her bosses. "All of them," she stated, "have been very accomplished men who had no personal reasons to hold me back, because they were all going to the top too!" (16).

Crain, Manager of Women's Career Development at International Harvester, Incorporated, Chicago, stated that in her own experiences relative to advancement, she started at the bottom, and when she moved ahead, "it was always with the help of a high level male" (7). "At certain levels," concludes Merkins, the information system in many organizations is an informal "old-boy" network (16) and much of the time women are excluded from these networks (16). Epstein explains that "at certain levels, one must be 'in' to learn the job. You can get 'in' by knowing and having your superior to know you" (25).

For years women have been in the background in paid leadership roles, according to Carroll (4). There are many concerted efforts being made to include more women in the job market on as many levels as they are qualified for—management and leadership are no exceptions, and women in executive positions in higher education are no exception.
Because of legislative and societal changes, women may well be the new resources, all the while looking for the opportunity to expand and fulfill their goals of self-worthiness. Financial reasons are, however, still cited as the strongest motivations for women seeking employment (1).

Significance of the Study

The five major junior/community college districts of Texas included in this study are equal opportunity employers. Some of these institutions are faced with job turn-over and applicants seeking employment at various levels of administration.

The type of leadership qualities required of upper level personnel in the junior/community college involves efficiency and effectiveness. Women, considering themselves to be possessed with these qualities and skills, are consequently demanding a larger part of the administrative job market.

The results of this study have provided previously unavailable empirical data and answered many questions concerning the effectiveness of leadership styles relative to how females see themselves and others see them in their specific administrative roles. The study's significance rests in its (1) identification of the perceptions of leadership styles held by female administrators of themselves, (2) determination of whether or not a relationship does exist between the way females see themselves and the manner in which
their superordinates perceive them, (3) identification of perceived style-range of female administrators, (4) determination of the self-perceived style-range and whether or not it is the same as their superordinates' perceptions of that range, and (5) determination if the style adaptability or effectiveness of female administrators is perceived in the same manner as their superordinates.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to five major junior/community college districts in Texas and to female administrators who were identified through the Texas Directory of Higher Education for 1977-1978. These women were identified by letter (from the presidents of the campuses) as being in administrative positions, a method employed for validation purposes. The superordinates identified in the study were limited to those male or female individuals who were directly in line of delegation of authority to the female administrator and the person to whom the female administrators used in the study answered directly.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


6. Crow, Herman E., President of Tarrant County Junior College, an interview, Hurst, Texas, April 6, 1978.


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Leadership theory is an area which has, especially in recent years, commanded much attention. Literature which concerns many facets of leadership theory abounds, while the area of women in administrative roles lacks specific attention. Only since the early 1960s have references to studies conducted on women holding administrative positions become apparent. As yet, though, such information remains meager.

Today, with opportunities for women in managerial roles becoming more available, very little is known about how to select or place able women in administrative positions. Definitive materials, research results, and recommendations are clearly needed to insure proper selection and placement of women in administrative work (28). Since the literature is indeed so meager, it became evident that a variety of relevant materials in the areas of leadership styles and working women should be explored so that a better understanding of the problem could be developed.

Leadership Styles

One problem which complicates leadership theories is the fact that the term "leading" implies many things. A few selected definitions should be reported in order to reflect
this range. According to Koontz and O'Donnell, "Leadership is the process of influencing people to follow in the achievement of common goals" (18, p. 435). Hersey and Blanchard maintained that

leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation. It follows that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and other situational variables—\( L = f(l, f, s) \) (15, p. 84).

Miller pointed out that "leadership is associated with the person who can carry his own share of responsibility and assist others when they have problems" (22, p. 46), while Terry added that "leadership is the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group objectives" (35, p. 493). Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik stated that "leadership is interpersonal influences exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specialized goal or goals" (34, p. 324). Since so many leadership concepts are in evidence, it might be quite reasonable to assume that this term "leadership" is indeed used in a very broad sense, and it appears impossible to establish a set criterion for leadership.

For a number of years research has revealed that the most common approach to the study of leadership concentrated mainly on the identification of the traits or characteristics of a leader. Physical energies, charisma, friendliness, intelligence, and democratic or autocratic tendencies were
established as necessities for effective leadership. Gibb (12) claimed that a review of the research literature utilizing the trait approach to leadership revealed few significant findings.

According to Schlack, one of the earliest studies of leadership styles was conducted by Lewin, Lippit, and White, who observed the behavior of four similar groups of ten-year-old boys. A record was kept of each group's behavior. The results indicated a definite pattern of leadership styles involving interaction and were labeled autocratic (or demanding), democratic, or laissez faire (28).

Lane (19) and others offered an explanation for this leadership characterization problem by referring to the fact that researchers have not been able to discover specific leadership traits that all leaders share. They contended that on-going organizations are not amenable to simulation, and because of the history, reward structures, conflicts, and membership variables within these organizations, the accuracy of studies of an individual's leadership traits remains questionable.

Jennings stated that "fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used to discriminate leaders and non-leaders" (16, p. 21). Cowley (7) pointed out that some individuals do function as leaders while others merely serve as head men.
Through observation of prison inmates, military units, and university undergraduates, he concluded that leaders were identifiable in the groups but none of the leaders had traits in common. He, thereby, concluded that leadership must be considered in terms of situations in which the leader functions rather than as a trait exclusively.

Empirical data, then, suggest that, in spite of the variety of leadership definitions and the lack of identifiable characteristics, the leadership process is a dynamic one. According to Hemphill, "it varies from situation to situation with changes in leaders, followers, and situations" (14, p. 43).

Situational Leadership Approach Versus Traits

Relative to the situational approach to leadership, the focus is on observed behavior, and thus contradictory to any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential for leadership. Mann (22) concluded that a leader's abilities, aptitudes, and background tend to be more directly related to those goals set by the group of which he is a part. The situational approach has been developed and refined from these conclusions.

Carter and Nixon (4) discovered that when leadership was studied in relationship to the situation, identifiable tasks emerged according to the groups studied, but these tasks were determined primarily by the particular leader's personality situation. In addition, Stinson (33) maintained
that even physical arrangements can influence leadership. In analyzing the interaction process of groups seated at tables, he found that seating arrangements helped to determine the leaders of the group.

Although any attempt to embark upon behavioral characteristics of effective leaders may seem impossible, evidence in the literature indicates that efforts are being made to determine what leaders do that others do not do. Stogdill, Wherry, and Jaynes (32), for example, stated that four variables exist which could be used to analyze the differences in leader behavior: (1) cultural and environmental variables, (2) differences between individuals, (3) differences between jobs, and (4) differences between organizations.

The major emphasis is placed on the behavior of leaders and their groups members relative to the various situations. Hersey and Blanchard (15) contended that most people can increase their effectiveness in leadership roles through education, training, and development for these reasons. From observations of the frequency (or infrequency) of certain leader behavior in various types of situations, theoretical models can be developed which may help leaders make some predictions concerning the most appropriate leader behavior for the situation at hand.

Leadership Processes

In the late 1930s, Chester I. Bernard (2) identified two primary concerns of leadership—those of scientific
management and human relations. One of the major theorists of administration during this time was Frederick Taylor, also a proponent of scientific management. He believed that a leader was to define and enforce performance criteria to meet organizational goals with no thought of individuals or human relations (15).

Taylor's theory was replaced in the late 1930s by a new movement in the area of human relations. Mayo (21), as a result of having conducted studies which sought work improvements, showed that when individuals felt that someone cared, positive changes were evidenced. He concluded that the organization should be developed around the individuals, and consideration for human feelings and attitudes must be taken into account. The functions of the leader became that of facilitating cooperative goal attainment among followers and providing opportunities for their personal worthiness. Hersey and Blanchard (15) stated that, in essence, the scientific management movement emphasized a need or concern for task (output), while the human relations movement emphasized a need or concern for relationships (people).

Early studies conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan found two concepts to be prevalent in an attempt to locate clusters or characteristics that seemed to indicate effectiveness. The concepts were called employee orientation (everyone is important, etc.)
and production orientation (employees are tools to accomplish goals of the organization) (15).

Paralleling these two concepts are authoritarian (task) and democratic (relationship) styles of leader behavior (23). The authoritarian style of behavior, generally called Theory X, is frequently based on the assumption that a leader assumes a position and wields power over people who are innately lazy and unreliable. Theory Y involves the democratic style of a leader who assumes power with the idea that leadership is granted and people are basically self-directed and creative if properly motivated. In addition, some leaders may exhibit characteristics of either of these styles.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (33) discussed a wide variety of styles ranging from one extreme (authoritarian) to the other (democratic). Accordingly, Blake and Mouton (3), in The Managerial Grid, identified five types of leadership based on both concern for production (task) and concern for people (relationship). Their scheme included the impoverished, country club, task, middle-of-the-road, and team leadership styles.

1. Impoverished: The exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate enough for this leader type to sustain organization membership.

2. Country club: Thoughtful attention by this type of leader to the needs of people for satisfying relationships
leads to a comfortable friendly organization atmosphere and work tempo.

3. Task: With this type of leadership, efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.

4. Middle-of-the-road: Relative to this leadership type, adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out work while maintaining the morale of people at a satisfactory level.

5. Team: In this leadership situation, work accomplishment is derived from committed people, while interdependence through a "common stake" in organization purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect.

In summary, empirical data tend to reveal no particular style of leadership to be best nor any basic characteristic or trait peculiar to all effective leaders. It is evident, however, that the effective leader is a product of leader, followers, and situational variables.

Working Women

Women in the World of Work

The struggle to enable women to acquire educational status, equal employment, and equal wages has been by tradition a long, hard process. As far back as colonial times, girls were not expected to receive formal schooling or be a part of school systems, for they were considered
intellectually inferior and too weak to maintain the rigors of academic life (23). During the eighteenth century some schools were opened for girls where emphasis was placed on manners, sewing, embroidery, music, and other skills considered to be feminine. Parker maintained that

a girl in American society and schools is brought up to underestimate herself. She is molded to think of herself as inferior to men by role expectations, peer group pressure, the media, parental training, few strong models, dependency, and passivity (25, p. 310).

Likewise, Faletta stated that "unless proved otherwise, a radiant young woman is assumed to be flaccid of intellect and mean of spirit" (11, p. 34).

Pressures for more consideration and expansion of curriculum development for women's education and women's rights, however, occurred during the nineteenth-century Abolition Movement. During that time period factories began employing women, while industrialization and the war narrowed the traditional division of labor and the roles of the sexes. Today, the women's movement, affirmative action, and other legislative changes have had a tremendous impact on the reexamination and redefining of women's roles in society.

Some present observers see as revolutionary the likely effects of the more than doubling of the working women's over-age-sixteen work force from 20 percent in 1920. Since working women now constitute 41 percent of the labor force and 51.3 percent of the United States population (109,400,000
women to 103,800,000 men), Americans are approaching the time when one out of every two workers will be a woman (26). Economist Eli Ginzburg said that "the pace of change accompanying working women is extraordinary" (13, p. 1) and called this change

the single most outstanding phenomenon of our century. Its long term implications are absolutely unchartable. . . . It will affect women, men and children, and the cumulative consequences will only be revealed in the 21st and 22nd centuries (13, p. 49).

The national longitudinal survey of mature working women showed that the labor force participation of women increased during the years from 1967 to 1972, with legislative, women's attitudinal, and societal changes all being contributing factors. Women became less hampered by child-care responsibilities, female and male attitudes toward working mothers evolved more favorably, and full-time employment for women became more common (17). Work attitudes and job satisfaction and employment attachments soon appeared to be more evident. Nicholson and Roderick (24) found that nearly two-thirds of young white women and more than half of young black women said that they liked their jobs "very much," and no more than 4 percent of either group said they disliked their jobs "very much." Among white women, the perceived chances of obtaining a desired occupation explained their response more than other factors did. However, this was not found to be true among black women. This could indicate that "opportunity" (as
perceived by white women) may be less frequently perceived or present to a lesser degree among black women.

According to the national longitudinal survey, a similar study conducted among highly paid white women revealed that 70 percent were highly satisfied with their employment situation. But even among white women whose pay was relatively low, 60 percent were highly satisfied, compared with 33 percent of low paid black women (17, vol. 1, p. 185).

Barriers to entry and reentry into the work world have been lowered considerably in other ways as well. Women holding extensive work histories tended to have as many children as did women with limited work histories. More attention has been given, however, to the spacing of the offspring. U.S. Department of Labor Statistics indicated that the more education a woman has, the fewer children she expects (40), while Ross (29) determined that more highly educated women tended to space their children closer together than less educated women.

Between 1965 and 1970, the increase in the number of working mothers with young children also caused an increase in the demand for child care (40). Data from several sources indicated that the absence of child care was not an important inhibitor for the working woman; this information, however, can be considered debatable. Debatable or not, it is estimated that full- or part-time day care is needed for several million
children, a service being fulfilled according to the Women's Bureau. A survey conducted by the Child Care Services (38) reported that care for more than 900,000 children is indeed available. Statistics indicated that only one in ten working mothers (aged 35-49) of preschool children used day care center services in 1971 (19), and over half of the women included in the study arranged for their children to be cared for at home by relatives or non-relatives.

The debate also includes such matters as the effect a mother who works actually has on her children. According to Curtis, Dr. Nathan Stockhamer, a director of young adult treatment services in New York, advised in this manner: "Mothering is so complex and the mother-child relationship involves so many factors, one really cannot say that the fact of the mother working is, in itself, harmful" (9, p. 43). Child psychiatrist Alice Trankel agreed, thus stating that the mother-child relationship has so many dimensions that a mother's working proves neither good nor bad (9).

The condition of one's health is very basic to job performance, and literature concerning the health of women and what employers regard as excessive sick leave among women is evident. Studies indicated that there was little or no difference in the absentee rates of men and women. In poverty groups living in a rural-urban fringe of New York, it was found that, among women, medical complaints, nervous symptoms,
and physical and mental disabilities were related to employment. In addition, the job turnover rate for professional women is less than 1 percent higher than it is for men who hold similar positions.

In October, 1968, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics published data indicating that the total job separation rate for women factory workers was 5.5 per 100, compared with 4.8 for men in job turnover rates; job "quits" figures were 3.1 for women and 2.7 for men; lay-offs and other involuntary separations indicated 2.4 for women and 2.1 for men (39). Another study conducted by the Public Health Service showed an average of 5.6 days lost by women and 5.3 by men during the year 1967 (37). The largest financial loss due to absenteeism, according to another study, must be attributed to male workers, the rationale being that men are more apt to stay out longer with chronic illnesses rather than acute illnesses, which are usually attributed to women (10).

The question of why women work is of importance when searching the literature on working women. Stein (30) reported that nearly 5.6 million families in March, 1970, were headed by women and that almost two million of these families were living in poverty. In addition, of the 56.7 million families in the United States in 1976, women headed 7.7 million families. Women, therefore, accounted for 14 percent of all family heads and accounted for 48 percent of all heads of poor families.
It is clear that women work for the same reasons as do men—mostly to provide for the welfare of themselves, their families, or others (36). Many of the working women of America (now totaling nearly 40 percent of the labor force) have never married, or have been widowed, divorced, or separated from their husbands; hence, their entry into the work force is by necessity. Accordingly, there is a large percentage of women who work merely to keep their families above the poverty level—not to provide luxuries (36). The female, then, according to a variety of sources, must overcome many obstacles in the process of entering and being a part of the world of work.

**Women in Higher Education**

Many educators, such as Cless, noted the great inequity in the American educational process.

Higher education in the United States was designed exclusively for the white, upper middle class male. Its procedures, its rigid uninterrupted timetable, and its cost all but prohibit its use by women (5, p. 618).

Likewise, even though teaching in public schools is considered a woman's occupation and women do outnumber men, they have less status, less pay, and less opportunity for advancement than do men. Males also advance more quickly into administrative positions (25), thus indicating that not only the educational process but also educational employment favors the male.
Some 10 percent of doctoral degrees awarded in educational administration each year are granted to women, yet they hold only 7.3 percent of educational administrative positions. Cohen pointed this out by saying that "many women go into teaching, but few are found at the college or university level, and fewer still in the professional ranks" (6, p. 164). In 1972, Arter (1) revealed data indicating that 60 percent of the 118 institutions she surveyed had no top level women administrators, while 21 percent had one and 19 percent had two. Of the institutions investigated, Arter determined that 33 percent had not even considered a woman candidate for top level jobs, and 28 percent had recently appointed one to three women for various openings. Dr. Rita Cooley, as quoted by Cunningham, stated that

the universities tend to think automatically in terms of men when filling a new position. In a sense it is like racism. This discrimination exists at an unconscious level. There is no opportunity for women in administration (8, p. 60).

Other reasons are offered by researchers for the state of affairs in education. For example, it is often thought that men enter teaching as a lifetime commitment--the belief being that women will marry, have children, and stop work--or that absenteeism and turnover rates will be higher among women teachers who are mothers. Since women often receive little encouragement during their teaching careers, they frequently use maternity leaves or marriage as an excuse to
quit. Other beliefs noted by researchers are that men are more effective administrators than women, women have fewer aspirations for leadership roles, and men teachers are more likely to receive the advanced training required for administrative positions (25).

Other analysts stressed the job disadvantages for women that are the results of inadequate investments in education, training, and other human capital resources (40). Silver's (29) data suggested that this underrepresentation by women in leadership roles is not warranted on the basis of pre-service experience or formal preparation. Since numerous women are qualified for high-level administrative positions, their absence from the administrative ranks must, then, be attributed to other causes.

Although women are, at present, only breaking into the ranks as administrators in the field of education, it is clear that much additional information is needed so that, as these numbers increase, proper placement and job success will be better insured.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to compare selected female administrators' perceptions of leadership styles with their superordinates' perceptions of the female administrators' leadership styles.

Procedure for Collection of Data

Permission was obtained from each chief administrative officer of the five major junior/community college districts in Texas for use of their personnel in this study. Female administrators of each district and their superordinates were utilized in a sample of the district, and questionnaires (Appendices F, G, and H) and cover letter (Appendices C and D) were sent to the participants. Each female administrator was asked to complete the questionnaire, a LEAD-Self instrument, and the biographical questionnaire. Each administrator's superordinate was asked to complete only the LEAD-Other instrument.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope was provided for each member of the population studied in order to insure convenience for the administrator and her superior. A request was made in the cover letter to return the biographical questionnaire at the same time the LEAD materials were returned.
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Confidentiality was assured. Variables that affected the responses of administrators and their superordinates were analyzed from the questionnaire, and comparisons of the self-perceived leadership styles and the superordinates' perception of the female administrators' leadership styles were made, with the purpose of discovering a correlation, if any, between the female administrator's perception and her superordinate's perception.

A 51 percent return of paired questionnaires from each campus' female administrator and her superordinates was desired. If a 51 percent return was not obtained after a three to four week period, a follow-up letter (Appendix E) was sent to each female administrator and superordinate in the sample in an attempt to remind each participant of the importance of the study and its possible contributions to educational advancements.

The materials received that could not be paired (i.e., a superordinate but no female administrator or vice versa) were not utilized. All biographical data were used since they were not dependent upon being paired.

Instruments

The three instruments that were utilized in the study were (1) the biographical questionnaire (Appendix F), (2) the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (Self) (Appendix G), and (3) the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (Other) (Appendix H).
Biographical Questionnaire

The biographical questionnaire was designed to obtain from each female administrator information in two major areas: personal information (age, sex, marital status, ethnic background, and number of children) and employment information (titles, influential job acquisition factors, major problems related to job). This questionnaire provided information on ten items and was based, in part, on items suggested by similar questionnaires designed to collect biographical information.

Leader Effective Adaptability Description Instruments

The second questionnaire the women administrators were asked to complete was the Leader Effective Adaptability Description, or LEAD-Self, used in an attempt to determine the leadership style, the style-range, and adaptability of each administrator. The questionnaire the group of superordinates was asked to complete was the Leader Effective Adaptability Description, or LEAD-Other.

The initial publication of the LEAD materials appeared in the February, 1974, issue of Training and Development Journal in an article entitled "So You Want to Know Your Leadership Style?" (3). It was believed that the leadership style pattern was either task or relationship behavior-oriented or a combination of both; thus, the behaviors studied were Task Behavior and Relationship Behavior. The
booklet containing information on the test emphasizes the fact that these dimensions are independent of one another, while implying that an administrator can score high on both task and relationship, low on both task and relationship, or high on one dimension and low on the other.

The questionnaire contained a total of twenty items that portrayed situations in which one of four alternative leader behaviors was to be selected when an administrator was found to be in a specific leadership situation. The choices were as follows: (1) situations involving groups of low maturity (M1), (2) situations involving groups of low to moderate maturity (M2), (3) situations involving groups of moderate to high maturity (M3), and (4) situations involving groups of high maturity (M4). According to Pfeiffer and Jones,

The analysis of LEAD data was first published in Paul Hersey's "Situational Leadership." Some aspects of the article's influence on organizational development appeared in an unpublished dissertation at the University of Massachusetts in 1975 (3).

LEAD-Other is the same instrument as the LEAD-Self; one is written so that not only can an individual determine a personal style, but also a subordinate, superordinate, or a peer can reflect an opinion on the type of leadership another person exhibits. Hersey, Blanchard, and Hambleton explained the mechanics of the LEAD instruments.

The weighting of a +2 to -2 is based on Situational Leadership Theory. The leader behavior with the highest probability of success of the alternatives offered in the given situation is always weighted a +2. The
behavior with the lowest probability of success is always weighted -2. The second best alternative is weighted +1 and the third is -1.

In preparing the 20 situation LEAD instruments, an initial pool of 40 situations and corresponding actions were produced. These situations were reviewed by a team of individuals knowledgeable of the theory and the best 80 situations were selected for further pilot work. Next a group of 85 graduate students enrolled in a management science course were administered the 40 situations after being exposed to the theory. On the basis of item analysis data, the situations were carefully split into two halves to produce approximately parallel forms. The parallel form reliability of the LEAD effectiveness scores was .76. The proportion of agreement in the dominant style determined from each form was .79. Comments of students and item analysis data were used to prepare another draft. The two forms were then administered to a group of 35 middle-level managers at a management training workshop. This time the parallel form reliability of the effectiveness scores was .72. The proportion of agreement in dominant style determined from each form was .77 (1).

Population of the Study

In order to obtain the most complete information available concerning female administrators as well as to insure the most valid group as part of the sample, two methods were employed. A research population was drawn from the Texas Higher Education Directory, 1977-78 in which a roster of all administrators is included. Those names that indicated the likelihood of female gender were chosen from the top five major junior/community colleges listed. The names were then sent to the chief administrator of each campus, requesting permission to include the school in the study and purposely to validate the list of female administrators. Any additions or deletions to the list were requested of these
administrators. Originally, a total population of approximately 150 female administrators was identified. However, upon verification and validation, 93 female administrators were identified. Each female and her superordinate were mailed questionnaires which totaled 186. The number of usable responses totaled 53 pairs. Fifty-nine women returned biographical questionnaires. Because the N was expected to be rather small, no attempt at sampling was to be made.

The following requirements were made of the superordinates chosen. (1) The female administrator answers directly to the superordinates. (2) The superordinate is employed by the junior or community college (as opposed to veterans' office, etc.), and there were no restrictions as to whether the superordinates were male or female.

Five major junior/community college districts' female administrators and their immediate superordinates were involved. The campuses included in the study were the five districts determined to be the largest in Texas.

(1) Dallas County Community College District (with a student body population of 60,800)
   (a) Cedar Valley College
   (b) Eastfield College
   (c) El Centro
   (d) Mountain View College
   (e) North Lake College
   (f) Richland

(2) El Paso Community College District (with a student body population of 9,500)
   (a) Rio Grande Campus
   (b) El Paso Community Campus
Research Design of Study

This study was designed to determine if a correlation between self-perceived leadership styles of female administrators and those of their superordinates was significant. The LEAD-Self and LEAD-Other instruments were administered to each administrator and each of their superordinates and comparisons of data were made. The biographical questionnaire was administered to female administrators only.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

After all instruments were scored, the data for each subject were transferred to keypunch cards for automatic transfer and processing.
Analysis of Biographical Questionnaire

Descriptive and analytical statistics were utilized to explain or illustrate the data collected by the biographical questionnaire. Most of the data analyzed are continuous at an interval level of measurement. Each question, with the exceptions of 9 and 10 will be analyzed, described, and illustrated in a histogram form with representative percentages of each in relation to the list of females responding to the survey. Other data are illustrated and analyzed in chart or graph form.

Question 6 of the biographical questionnaire is open-ended and the most frequent comments are summarized and ranked by frequency of responses in Appendix A. Representative statements will be reported, and direct quotations will be used when possible, but paraphrasing will be done if the particular quotation is lengthy. Question 9 of the biographical questionnaire requests summary of the information on the interest of each participant in the study, while question 10 extends the opportunity for identification (by name) so that a summary of the study might be sent to them. Question 7 responses are ranked by frequency and explained or illustrated in chart form and in Appendix B.

All data analyses may be found in Chapter IV.

Analysis of LEAD Data

The leadership questionnaire yields information which determined style, style range, and style adaptability, as
shown in Figure 1. By matching the number of alternatives chosen by the individual to the corresponding leadership categories (as indicated in the test manual), the individual style of leadership was determined.

Hersey and Blanchard (1) explained the basic leadership styles as shown in Figure 2. Suppose that individual A, upon being asked to describe the behavior chosen in the situations presented, across the twenty situations, chose 5 from quadrant 1 (high task-low relationship), 10 from quadrant 2 (high task-high relationship), and 5 from quadrant 3 (low task-high relationship). No actions were chosen from quadrant 4. The dominant style would then be described as high task-high relationship. The perception of a leadership style on the LEAD data can be determined by choosing an action for each situation and then totaling the number of times an action was used in each of the four quadrants.
Style 3
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Fig. 2.--Score distributions in Quadrants to determine style(s).

Figure 3 is used to explain style also. In Figure 3, the leader has a dominant style of high relationship-low task. None of the answers indicated a style found in any of the other quadrants. The leader has chosen twenty items that would characterize him as high relationship and low task. No item appears in any of the other quadrants. Thus, this is the leader's style.

The style range includes the quadrants where the next highest number was summed. Since Figure 3 does not reflect a range of styles, using Figure 2 as an example, in this case that would be high relationship-low task and low relationship-low task.
The leader's ability to change style to fit different situations varies from administrator to administrator. Some leaders seem to feel comfortable in using one style and feel very hampered when using another and are, hence, limited to one basic style. Thus, an autocratic leader tends to be effective only in situations where this style of leadership can be conveyed or utilized. Another leader may be autocratic, democratic, or laissez faire, depending upon the situation as long as extremism in styles does not occur. This leader can modify the behavior to fit the different situations. Style range is the extent to which this adaptation can be done. In this study, the style range is illustrated in terms of task and relationship as shown in Figures 4 and 5.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Task</td>
<td>High Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3.--Dominant Leadership Style
```
Fig. 4.—Pictorial description of limited style range.

Fig. 5.—Pictorial description of unlimited style range.
In Figure 4, the circle is in a small area, thus indicating limited behavior (in this case, high relationship-low task). In Figure 5, the circle indicates that the leader has the ability to maneuver behavior to include some of all four types of behavior. To determine range or flexibility from the LEAD data, basic and supporting styles must be determined. For instance, where an individual may appear in all four of the four style configurations (high relationship-high task, low relationship-high task, high relationship-low task, low relationship-low task), that person's range becomes styles 1, 2, 3, and 4. On the other hand, for someone who may have had a basic style in style 1 but a supporting style in style 2, the range for that person's style would be styles 1 and 2.

In scoring adaptability, there are twenty situations for which one of four alternatives may be chosen. Each alternative corresponds to a particular leadership style and is assigned a scoring weight that reflects the degree of correctness. The scoring weights assigned are +2 for the correct alternative, +1 for the closest partially correct action, -1 for the next most correct action, and -2 for the most incorrect action. A leader's effectiveness or adaptability score is obtained by summing the scores assigned to the leader based upon their answers to the twenty situations. Style adaptability or effectiveness scores can range from -40 to +40.
In this study, the styles, style range, and effectiveness scores, as perceived by the female administrator and her superordinates' perception of her effectiveness score, are compared. A computation between the two scores using the Pearson's $r$ are drawn in order to determine if a relationship exists and the strength of that relationship.

A computation between the self-perceived style, style range, and style adaptability scores of female administrators was compared to the style, style range, and style adaptability scores of the female administrators as determined by the superordinates. A Pearson's $r$ between the two scores was determined. Nil, in his *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, commented on this.

Often, we are not even interested in prediction or the regression line itself. Rather we wish only to know the strength of the relationship or to obtain the correlation coefficient for other statistical purposes. The Pearson's Corr subprogram is very convenient for such situations since it can easily compute a large number of correlation coefficients without taking the time to display a scattergram or compute a regression equation (2).

Pearson's Product-Moment computes correlations for pairs of variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient $r$ is used to measure the strength of relationship between two interval-level variables. The $r$ is defined as the ratio of covariation to square root of the product of the variation in $X$ and the variation in $Y$, where $X$ and $Y$ symbolize the two variables. This corresponds to the formula
\[
    r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}}^{1/2}
\]

where \( X_i \) = ith observation of variable \( X \)

\( Y_i \) = ith observation of variable \( Y \)

\( N \) = number of observations

\( \bar{X} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i}{N} \) = mean of variable \( X \)

\( \bar{Y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i}{N} \) = mean of variable \( Y \) (2).

Actually, \( r \) is a more easily interpreted measure of association when the concern is with strength of relationship rather than direction of relationship (2). But, the \( r \) will give positive or negative correlations with regards to whether the female administrators perceive themselves in the same manner as do their superordinates relative to style, style range, and style adaptability.

The results of these computations are described, compared, and analyzed through Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences technique and are found in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The purposes of this study were to determine and compare the differences in selected female administrators' perceptions of their own leadership styles and the manner in which their superordinates viewed their leadership styles; to determine and compare the leadership style adaptability of female administrators as perceived by themselves as well as by their superordinates; and to determine and compare the self-perceived leadership style range capabilities of the female administrators and their superordinates' perceptions of these respective range capabilities.

The biographical questionnaire items, analyzed and presented in Tables I through V as well as in Figures 6 through 9, were designed to yield information in the following areas of concern, that is, personal characteristics and job opinions. The findings of the biographical portion of the instrument were presented in each of the two categories, while computation for each variable was recorded for those female administrators who responded to the items.

Ninety-three female administrators employed by major junior/community college districts in Texas were mailed questionnaires. Each of the individuals was listed in the Texas
The resulting biographical data generated by the female administrators are summarized in this chapter, which also includes a comparison of significant differences in perceived leadership styles, style adaptability, and range styles. The findings, organized and discussed relative to (1) personal findings, (2) analysis of job-related opinions, and (3) analysis of leadership data, are presented in both table and figure (histogram) form.

Questions of the "personal findings" category were concerned with the variables of age, marital status, ages and grade levels of children, ethnic groups, and levels of management; then tables categorically indicate response frequencies percentages to each item. In addition, histograms provide a more visible description of materials presented in the tables, for as Borg (1, p. 335) suggested, a graph is particularly helpful in representing non-linear relationships in a study.

Relative to the area of job-related opinions, influential factors in job acquisition and the major personal and professional problems female administrators encounter in their positions as administrators are considered in this study
(see Appendices A and B). Also, in the category "analysis of leadership data," the styles, style ranges, and style adaptabilities of female administrators are determined and compared.

The perceptions of the females, as indicated by their responses, are compared to the females' own superordinates' perceptions with the use of a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The percentage of completed questionnaires ranged from 51 percent to 100 percent per campus.

The female administrators were asked to complete the biographical questionnaire as well as a LEAD-Self data instrument. Their superordinates were, in addition, asked to tell how they thought their female administrators would respond to the individual items by completing the LEAD-Other data instrument. The superordinates were not asked, however, to submit data of biographical nature.

The two sets of questionnaire results, LEAD-Self as completed by the administrative women and the LEAD-Other as completed by the administrators' superordinates, were compared and analyzed to determine the style, style ranges, and style adaptability of each female. A bivariate frequency chart was compiled to facilitate the data; four categories—High Task/Low Relationship, High Task/High Relationship, High Relationship/Low Task, and Low Task/Low Relationship—were included. The chart arranged self-perceived leadership styles across the upper portion, while along the sides appeared the leadership styles that the superordinates
selected for their female administrators. From the categories included in the bivariate frequency tables, the females were assigned a letter for their scores (x), and the females' superordinates were assigned a letter for their scores (y). Using one of the formulas recommended for an (r), a Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation score was computed for each question in order to determine if the (r) exhibited a significant difference in the females' answers and those of their superordinates.

In all, the data were derived from the responses of female administrators representing five major Texas junior/community college districts; ninety-three females were identified as administrators either at top or middle levels in the districts. The number of usable responses included 59 returned biographical questionnaires. LEAD-Self and LEAD-Other usable responses totaled 106, yielding a total of 53 paired questionnaires. The percentages of returns ranged from 54 percent to 60 percent per district (see Appendix M).

In order to elucidate the study's findings, each question is restated and interpreted for discussion in this chapter. Also, interpretations of the findings were provided through charts, histograms, and discussion.

Personal Findings

Question One

What is the age span of the female administrators of
these major junior/community college district administrators?
As the data found in Table I indicate, the majority of the female administrators identified in this study reported to be in the 31-40 age range. As many as 32 women, or about 54 percent, were recorded in the 31-40 age category, while an even distribution of the 21-30 and over 50 age categories was identified. Some 10 women, or about 17 percent, identified themselves as part of the 21-30 age category; the same number--10--of females were identified in the over 50 category. The fewest number of women was found in the 41-50 age category; that is 7 or 12 percent. Relative to female administrator age span, the majority of the females appeared to be centered in the 31-40 age range.

**TABLE I**

**AGE RANGES OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS IN FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to Table I, a histogram (Figure 6) provides additional aid in interpretation of the age spans of female administrators surveyed in this study. The contrast between the number of females per age category becomes more apparent when viewed in this manner.

![Histogram of Age Categories](image)

**Fig. 6.**--A graphic illustration of age categories of female administrators in five major junior/community colleges in Texas.

**Question Two**

What is the marital status of the female administrators? The findings reported in Table II indicated that 29 women, or 49 percent, were married. The next major categories, labelled single and divorced, reported some 13 women, or 22 percent, as single and another 13 women, or 22 percent, as divorced. Only 2 women, or 3 percent, were indicated as widows. Two women chose not to respond to this item.

Accordingly, the data in Figure 7 provide additional interpretation of the marital status of female administrators involved in this study.
TABLE II
MARITAL STATUS OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS IN
FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY
COLLEGES IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two women did not respond.

Fig. 7. --A graphic illustration of the marital status of female administrators of five major junior/community colleges in Texas.

**Question Three**

What percentage of these administrators have children and in what age range or school grade level category are they?
The data reported in Tables III and IV indicate that the majority of female administrators recorded having from 1 to 3 children; 32, or 54 percent, of the female administrators checked this category. Another 24, or 41 percent, of the female administrators reported having no children. A much smaller group of 3, or 5 percent, of the female administrators reported having 4 or more children. In total, 35, or 59 percent, of the women reported having children.

TABLE III

NUMBER OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS WITH CHILDREN IN FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Figure 8 provide further explanation in pictorial form of the surveyed female population relative to their progeny count.

The information in Table IV concerns the second portion of question three. At least 7 women, or 21 percent,
Fig. 8.--A graphic illustration of the number of children of female administrators in five major junior/community colleges in Texas.

reported having children five years of age or under, which included the kindergarten group. Only 3, or 9 percent, of these women reported having children in this category alone, while another 4, or 12 percent, of the women had children in elementary and/or junior high in addition to children in the kindergarten category. The data revealed that at least 11, or 33 percent, of the female administrators had children in the elementary levels of school, their ages typically spanning six through ten. Seven, or 18 percent, of these women, however, reported children in other age ranges as well. Only 8, or 24 percent, of the group reported having children in the elementary grade level exclusively.

The next age category indicated was that of junior high, or the eleven to thirteen years age level. Seven, or 21 percent, of the female administrators reported having
### TABLE IV

**AGE CATEGORIES OF THE FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS' CHILDREN IN FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Female Administrators with Children</th>
<th>Kindergarten 5 and below</th>
<th>Elementary 6-10</th>
<th>Junior High 11-13</th>
<th>Senior High 14-18</th>
<th>College/Career + 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2 of the 35 women reported having children but did not report grade level or age categories.*
children of this age category, and only 4 women, or 12 percent, reported having children in this category only. Three, or 9 percent, of the women reported having children below this age and grade level in addition to children representing the junior high age and grade levels.

Only 3 women reported having children in the senior high category, or a total of 9 percent. Only 1, or 3 percent, reported to be in this category exclusively. Two other women, or 6 percent, had other children in categories younger or older than those represented by this level.

The female administrators reporting children in the over 19 category totaled 12. Thirty-three percent, or 11 women, reported children in this category exclusively, while 1 female administrator reported having children in this category and the senior high age group as well.

**Question Four**

What is the ethnic origin or background percentage of the female administrators studied? The data listed in Table V reveal that, among the female administrators studied, 8, or 14 percent, reported to be black. Only 1, or 2 percent, reported to be in the Chicano category, and 1, or 2 percent, reported to be in the "other" category. The majority of the administrators studied were white, with some 49, or 83 percent, reported in this category.
TABLE V

ETHNIC ORIGIN OR BACKGROUND OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS STUDIED OF FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Backgrounds of Administrators</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Figure 9 provide a visible measure of the racial background of the female administrators surveyed in this study.

Fig. 9.--A graphic illustration of the ethnic origin and background of the female administrators in this study.
Analysis of Job Opinions

Question Five

What percentage of female administrators were classified in top and middle-management levels? Figure 10 represents graphically the numerical breakdown of top and middle level managers among the female administrators involved in this study. The number of females who identified themselves as top level managers totaled 9, or 15 percent. The other 47 women, or 80 percent, were reported to be in the mid-level management category. Three women, or 5 percent, did not respond to this part of the questionnaire and are accordingly indicated in the "other" category found in the figure.

![Bar chart showing female administrators in top, mid, and other levels of management.](chart)

Fig. 10.--Levels of management identified among female administrators in five major junior/community colleges in Texas.

The data presented in Table VI indicate that 9, or 15 percent, of the female administrators perceived themselves as part of top level management in junior/community college
TABLE VI

LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT IN RELATION TO ETHNIC AND AGE BACKGROUNDS OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS OF FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single f</th>
<th>Married f</th>
<th>Widow f</th>
<th>Divorced f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Level (9)*</td>
<td>2 22</td>
<td>6 78 1 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Level (47)</td>
<td>11 23</td>
<td>23 50 2 4 11 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Backgrounds</th>
<th>Black f</th>
<th>White f</th>
<th>Other f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Level (9)</td>
<td>1 16</td>
<td>8 89</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Level (47)</td>
<td>7 15</td>
<td>38 81</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>21-30 f</th>
<th>31-40 f</th>
<th>41-50 f</th>
<th>+ 50 f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Level (9)</td>
<td>1 11</td>
<td>3 33</td>
<td>3 33</td>
<td>2 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Level (47)</td>
<td>9 19</td>
<td>27 51</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>7 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One top level respondent did not reveal her marital status.
systems. A total of 47, or 80 percent, classified themselves as members of the middle management level, while some 5 percent, or 3 women, did not respond to the item.

This table, in addition, provides further breakdown in levels of management relative to ethnic background, age category, and marital status. Data concerning the marital status of top level managers indicated 7, or 78 percent, were married, while only 2, or 22 percent, were single. No top level managers proved to be divorced or widowed. Among middle level managers some 23, or 50 percent, were reported to be married; in addition, 11, or 23 percent, were divorced. Two, or 4 percent, were widowed, and 11, or 23 percent, of the middle level managers were single.

The study of the ethnic backgrounds of top level managers indicated that only 1, or 11 percent, of the top level managers was black, while another 8, or 89 percent, were white. Fifteen percent, or 7 middle managers, were black; 38, or 81 percent, were white. Two, or 4 percent, were in neither category.

Relative to the age factor, a majority of top level managers proved to be between the ages of 31 and 50. Three, or 33 percent, reported to be in the 31 to 40 category, and an additional 3, or 33 percent, reported to be in the 41 to 50 category. The majority of the mid-level administrators were concentrated in the 31 to 40 age range, 27 women, or 57 percent, having indicated this category. Nine, or 19
percent, noted the 21 to 30 age range, and 7, or 16 percent, of those in the mid-level category indicated to be over 50. The least number of mid-level administrators appeared in the 40 to 50 category, with 4 of the female administrators, or 8 percent, reporting here.

**Question Six**

What do female administrators, working in an educational setting, consider to be the most influential factor in getting a job? The data presented in Table VII indicate that the majority of the administrators participating in this study chose category five--that of Demonstrated Leadership Abilities--as being most influential in getting their jobs. "Demonstrated Leadership Ability," as first choice among these women, was indicated most often by 22, or 37 percent.

Second choice for most of the women was that of "Training and Experiential Background." Twenty of the females, or 34 percent, chose this category followed by 18, or 31 percent, who chose "Education" as a preferred second choice.

The third choice cited most often by the women participating in the study was "Education." Twenty-five women, or 43 percent, reported this as their third choice followed by some 12, or 20 percent, citing "Training and Experiential Background" and "Education" most often. Fourth choice appeared to be "Sex," totaling 18 females, or 31 percent. The fifth choice of the six categories was "Federal Legislation," allowing 21, or 36 percent.
TABLE VII
RANKED FREQUENCIES OF INFLUENTIAL FACTORS FOR GETTING PRESENT
POSITIONS AS PERCEIVED BY FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS IN FIVE
MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Federal Legislation</th>
<th>Training &amp; Experiential Background</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Demonstrated Leadership Ability</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>21 35</td>
<td>7 12</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>22 37</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>20 34</td>
<td>18 31</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>12 20</td>
<td>25 42</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>12 20</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>13 22</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>18 31</td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>7 12</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>21 36</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>19 32</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>8 14</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The category chosen last by the greatest number of administrators was that of the option of writing in another category, or simply "Other." Thirty-one women, or 53 percent, chose not to respond in the "Other" category as the sixth choice. However, 28 did respond. Job factors listed in the "Other" category are located in Appendix A.

**Question Seven**

What are some of the major personal and professional problems female administrators encounter on the job that they feel are attributed to their "femaleness" or problems caused as a result of being a female administrator? Table VIII shows that 6 women, or 10 percent, reported that no major problems occurred that they could attribute to their femaleness. Some of the women did not respond to the item—13, or 22 percent, of the female administrators reported no response. Some 40, or 68 percent, reported several problems they attributed to their "femaleness." These may be found in Appendix B.

**TABLE VIII**

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO MAJOR PERSONAL AND/OR PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS OF FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Female Administrators</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the 40, or 68 percent, reporting problems, some responses appeared repeatedly. Those answers most often quoted were pertaining to time management, communications or "network" problems, home and office harmony, lack of advancement, and sexist attitudes. Other reports may be located in Appendix B.

Figure 11 reflects further on the number of females who chose to answer Item 7 of the survey instrument.

![Graph](image)

Fig. 11.--A graphic illustration of the number of female administrators indicating the distribution of responses to major personal and/or professional problems from five major junior/community college districts in Texas.

Analysis of the Leadership Data Questionnaire

The second portion of the survey instrument, LEAD-Self, yielded information on how the women perceived themselves in leadership positions. This questionnaire, introduced in 1954, was designed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Hambleton (2) to determine style, style range, and style adaptability of individuals in leadership positions.
In defining or categorizing style in matters of situational leadership, task and relationships are the two behaviors attended. The proponents of this theory believe that a leader may score high on both task and relationship areas and a leader may score low on both task and relationship. In addition, a leader may score high on one dimension and low on the other. Accordingly, the major categories in which this test places a leader are High Task/Low Relationship and Low Task/Low Relationship. An individual's leadership style is determined by the number of times an individual chooses an answer in a particular category.

The style range is determined by the scores found most often after the particular style has been determined; for example, if a leader scores 15, 10, 5, and 4, respectively, in the categories mentioned, his style would be the category containing 15. The leader is, however, capable of operating in the other categories if necessary.

The style adaptability of a leader is determined by scores reflecting capability of diagnosing a situation well enough to know when to use the particular leadership styles within the capability of style range. A leader may possess one or more style levels and not be effective. This portion of the instrumentation reflects a leader's ability to adapt his style to a particular situation.
In this portion of the survey, female administrators' perceptions of their style, style range, and style adaptability were compared to their superordinates' perceptions of the females' style, style range, and style adaptability. In order to accomplish this task, the LEAD-Other instrument was used by the women's superiors. The two instruments, LEAD-Self and LEAD-Other, were administered to the two groups of administrators, with LEAD-Other containing the same situations as LEAD-Self with the exception of wording alteration used to distinguish between superordinates and subordinates.

Each administrator's answer sheet was coded with the same alphabets as those of her superordinates. When the questionnaires were returned, they were quickly paired. Of the 186 LEAD instruments mailed, 106 usable questionnaires were returned, thus yielding more than the 51 percent return needed for the study. According to the data collected, the following questions, all restated here, were answered in the study. A table of findings and a statistical analysis of the findings for each item are included.

Question One

Will there be a significant difference in the way female administrators perceive their leadership styles and the way their superordinates view their leadership styles? The data in Figure 12 note the initial portion of findings relative to this question.
Fig. 12.--Female administrators' perceptions of their own leadership styles from five major junior/community college districts in Texas.

As the data in Figure 12 indicate, 38, or 72 percent, of the females perceived themselves as possessing the style of High Relationship/Low Task. This was a clear majority. The next largest number of female administrators, 16 or 29 percent, perceived themselves as being in the High Task/High Relationship category. Another 2, or 1 percent, of the females identified themselves as High Task/Low Relationship leader types. None of the female administrators considered their style to be that of Low Task/Low Relationship.
The data in Figure 13 present the information gleaned from the LEAD-Other instrument which was completed by the superordinates of the female administrators. These data reflect the leadership style of the administrators as perceived by their superiors. The High Relationship/Low Task category was perceived most often by the superordinate group. Thirty-five, or 66 percent, of the superordinates responding placed their female administrators in this category, while the second category which the superordinates placed their female administrators into was that of High Task/High Relationship.
Twelve female superordinates, or 23 percent, felt that their female administrators should be placed in this category. Six of the superordinates, or 11 percent, placed the administrators in the High Task/Low Relationship category, while 3, or 6 percent, of the superordinates placed their administrators in the Low Task/Low Relationship category.

In order to facilitate comparison of the differences among the respective groups, a bivariate frequency chart was constructed. The scores of the female administrators were paired into categories across the columns. The scores of their superordinates were placed in the rows.

As is indicated by the data presented in Table IX, 23 pairs, or 39 percent of the female administrators and their superordinates, agreed on their basic leadership styles. These scores, as are all others, are indicated in the row and column immediately under High Relationship/Low Task. In category 3, 20 pairs, or 34 percent, agreed that the female administrators possessed a High Relationship/Low Task style. In category 2, 3 pairs, or 5 percent of the females and their superordinates, agreed that their basic leadership style was that of High Task/High Relationship. Eleven women, or 19 percent, saw their leadership style as that of category 2, High Task/High Relationship, but their superordinates perceived them as High Relationship/Low Task (Category 3). Eight, or 14 percent of the women, perceived themselves to be High
TABLE IX

FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OWN LEADERSHIP STYLES
COMARED TO THAT OF THEIR SUPERORDINATES FROM FIVE MAJOR
JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF (female administrators)</th>
<th>1 High Task/ Low Relationship</th>
<th>2 High Task/ High Relationship</th>
<th>3 High Relationship/ Low Task</th>
<th>4 Low Task/ Low Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HT/HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HT/HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>ø, ø, ø,</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HT/LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LT/LR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ø indicates pairs agree totally on styles
/ indicates a perception by female and her superordinate
Relationship/Low Task (Category 3), while their superordinates perceived them to possess a High Task/Low Relationship style (Category 2). Another 4, or 7 percent, of the female administrators, saw themselves as High Relationship/Low Task oriented (Category 3), but their superordinates perceived them as the opposite, or the High Task/Low Relationship type of leader (Category 1).

The majority of the women and their superordinates, then, were in agreement concerning the predominate leadership style of High Relationship/Low Task.

\[ r = .2998 \]
\[ N = 53 \]

A Pearson's r was computed using the individual female's scores as the x variable and her superordinate's score as a y variable. Utilizing the table of values of r and the formula \[ df = N - 2 \], the r yielded was significant at the .05 level; a significant difference existed, then, in the way female administrators perceived their own leadership styles and the way in which their superordinates perceived their leadership styles.

An analysis of the individual female administrator's scores and her superordinate's scores yielded a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation of .2998. Since the r value of .2998 at the .05 level with 51 degrees of freedom (\[ df = N - 2 \]) does not exceed the specified table value of .274, the conclusion is made that there is a significant difference
between the way females perceived themselves as leaders and the way their superordinates perceived them as leaders.

**Question Two**

Will there be a significant difference between the perceived style range capabilities of female administrators and their superordinates' perception of the style range? As indicated by the data in Figure 14, the majority of the female administrators perceived themselves as able to operate in all of the leadership styles indicated. Thirty-five, or 66 percent,

![Chart showing the female administrators' perceptions of their own style-ranges.]
of the female administrators appeared in the "style + 3 other" category. Fifteen, or 28 percent, believed that they could operate in their own style in addition to two other categories. Only two, or 4 percent, felt that they were capable of operating only in their own style plus one other category. One administrator, or 2 percent, limited her style range to her style only.

As shown by the data in Figure 15, the majority of the superordinates perceived their female administrators to be capable of operating in their own styles plus the three other

![Graph showing perceptions of female administrators' style ranges.](image-url)
categories. Some 38, or 72 percent, perceived this to be true, while another 12, or 23 percent, felt that their administrators could operate in their own styles and only two others. Three, or 5 percent, of the superordinates felt their administrators could operate in their style and in only one other category. Interestingly enough, none of the superordinates limited their administrators to one style only.

As indicated by the data presented in Table X, 24, or 43 percent, of the female administrators and their superordinates agreed on perceptions of style ranges. Their responses indicated that the administrators could operate in Category 4 ("style plus 3 other" categories). Some 13 women, or 24 percent, indicated that they felt they could operate in their own style plus two other categories, while their superordinates thought they could operate in their own style and three other categories. Eleven women, or 21 percent, stated that they could function in their own style but adequately span a range of three others as well. Their superordinates indicated that they could probably operate in their style while spanning a range of only two others. A smaller number of women, 6 or 11 percent, appeared in other categories.

\[ r = .075 \]
\[ N = 53 \]

The Pearson Product-Moment correlation statistical measure was used to determine a correlation coefficient of
TABLE X

SELF-PERCEIVED STYLE RANGES OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND THEIR SUPERORDINATES' PERCEPTION OF THOSE STYLE RANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style Only</th>
<th>Style + 1 Other Category</th>
<th>Style + 2 Other Categories</th>
<th>Style + 3 Other Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Style Only</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Style + 1 Other Category</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER Style + 2 Other Categories</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Style + 3 Other Categories</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Style + 3 Other Categories</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
<td>/,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ø indicates pairs agree totally on styles
/ indicates a perception by female and her superordinate
.075 between the perceived style ranges of female administrators and the perception of the female administrators' superordinates of their leadership styles. Since the $r$ value of .075 at the .05 level with 51 degrees of freedom does not exceed the specified table value of .273, the conclusion is there is no significant difference between the way females perceived their scores of style ranges and their superordinates' perception of their style ranges.

**Question Three**

Will there be a significant difference in the style adaptability of female administrators as perceived by themselves and by their superordinates? The data shown in Figure 16 indicate that 52, or 98 percent, of the females considered themselves effective or able to adapt the appropriate leadership style with the appropriate situation whether the style was a dominant one or not. Only 1, or 2 percent, of the female administrators perceived herself as non-effective relative to situational leadership adaptability.

The data presented in Figure 17 show how the superordinates perceived the female administrators' abilities to adapt their dominant styles or style ranges to particular situations. Forty-three of the superordinates, or 81 percent, thought their female administrators effectively demonstrated this skill. Ten, or 19 percent, of the superordinates felt
Fig. 16.--Perceptions of style adaptability found among female administrators from five major junior/community college districts in Texas.
Fig. 17.--Superordinates' perceptions of female administrators' style adaptability.

their female administrators to be non-effective in accomplishing this task.

In order to compare the two groups of scores, a bivariate frequency table, as shown in Table XI, was constructed. The scores of the administrators were indicated in the columns and, thus, paired with their administrators' scores which were placed in the rows.

Forty-three, or 81 percent of the female administrators and their superordinates, agreed that the administrators were, theoretically, effective in their positions as leaders.
TABLE XI
BIVARIATE FREQUENCY TABLE OF STYLE ADAPTABILITY
OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS’ PERCEPTIONS
COMPIARED TO THEIR SUPERORDINATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF (female administrators)</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Non-effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ø indicates female and superordinate agreed on perceptions
/ indicates a perception by female and her superordinate

Nine, or 17 percent, of the female administrators did perceive themselves as effective but were shown to have superordinates who did not agree. These were, hence, perceived as ineffective. Only 1, or 2 percent, of the female administrators perceived her style adaptability to be that of ineffective and her superordinate did agree. Using the Pearson’s r at the .05 level, a significant difference appeared in these scores of females and their superordinates.

\[ r = .2876 \]

\[ N = 53 \]
The statistical measure determined a correlation of \(0.2876\) between the perceived style adaptability of the female administrators and the perceived style adaptability recorded by their superordinates. Since the \(r\) value of \(0.2876\) at the \(0.05\) level exceeds the specified table value of \(0.273\), a significant difference exists between the two groups' perceptions of administrators' style adaptability.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The liberalization of societal opinions concerning working women coupled with recent federal legislation increasing job opportunities for women has led to the practical need for evidence of administrative astuteness. The purposes of this study, therefore, were to determine and compare the differences in the way female administrators perceived their own leadership styles and the way their superordinates viewed their leadership styles, to determine and compare the extent of female administrators' style "adaptability" as perceived by themselves and their superordinates, and to determine and compare the self-perceived style range capabilities of female administrators and their superordinates' perceptions of those ranges. Initially, a survey of related literature and materials was conducted relative to the different types of leadership theories and situational leadership theories. The literature surveyed and reported represents two main categories, those of leadership styles and working women. With regard to leadership styles, situational leadership theories and leadership traits were discussed. The discussion of working women offered a general
description of the employed woman's world, with particular attention being paid to women involved in higher education.

In addition to information concerning leadership styles, the pertinent literature also revealed the existence of numerous inconsistencies in the hiring of females, especially those women seeking non-traditional jobs. Moreover, such inconsistencies are particularly evident at managerial levels. While data supported the idea that all personnel levels of an organizational make-up should be considered in the leadership survey, a number of women supported the idea that when all administrative personnel levels are concerned perhaps the most influential person in acquiring and succeeding in administrative positions for women is a superordinate. It is at this level that influence, communications networks, and other necessary factors may insure success.

Permission was obtained from each chief administrative officer in the five major junior/community college districts in Texas for the use of their administrative personnel in this study. These administrative females were chosen from the ranks listed in the Texas Higher Education Directory. After the female administrators had been identified, the roster was then sent to the presidents of the respective campuses and a request was made to add or delete personnel where necessary. Some indicated the superordinates of each female administrator; in cases where this was not offered, a
telephone call requesting such information was made. As a result, ninety-one female administrators were identified as full time administrators and were contacted concerning participation in the study.

Three instruments were used to gather the data from administrators for this study. Initially, a biographical questionnaire was administered to the participants in order to collect information in two major areas, those of personal information (age, sex, marital status, ethnic background, and number of children, etc.) and employment information (titles, influential job acquisition factors, major job-related problems, etc.). The superordinates were not asked for biographical data.

The Leadership Effective Adaptability Description (LEAD-Self) instrument was then used to collect data from the female administrators themselves. This instrument was designed to determine leadership style, the style range, and adaptability of each female administrator as she perceived her leadership ability.

In the case of the administrators' superordinates, the Leadership Effective Adaptability Description (LEAD-Other) instrument was utilized. Similar to the LEAD-Self instrument, the LEAD-Other was designed to extract from a superordinate the leadership style, style range, and leadership adaptability of a particular administrator.
Prior to receiving the proper questionnaires, the administrators were sent cover letters reminding them of their invaluable contributions to the study, and confidentiality of responses was assured. In order to promote convenience and save time, a stamped self-addressed envelope was provided so that each member of the population might promptly return his completed questionnaire.

The number of usable responses ranged from 51 percent to 100 percent on each campus. Fifty-nine, or 65 percent, of the biographical questionnaires issued were returned. The number of usable LEAD instrument responses totalled 106, which yielded 53, or 58 percent, of the paired questionnaires.

Ten questions were answered as a result of the data. These queries, coupled with the study's findings, are briefly summarized.

1. Will there be a significant difference in the way female administrators perceive their leadership styles and the way their superordinates view their leadership styles?

2. Will there be a significant difference in the style ranges perceived by the female administrators and their superordinates' perceptions?

3. Will there be a significant difference in the style adaptability of female administrators as perceived by themselves and their superordinates?

4. What is the age span of female administrators in this study?
5. What is the marital status of the female administrators in the study?

6. What percentages of these female administrators have children, and in what age category are they?

7. What percentage of female administrators represent ethnic minorities?

8. What percentage of female administrators are classified in top and middle management positions?

9. What are some major personal and professional problems female administrators encounter on the job that they feel can be attributed to their "femaleness"?

10. What factors do female administrators who work in an educational setting consider most influential in getting a job?

The scores from both the LEAD-Self and LEAD-Other instruments were compared. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was then calculated and tabulated for the critical value of \( r \); the level of significance used was that of .05. The degrees of freedom employed was \( N - 2 \) which yielded a score of 51.

The leadership styles exhibited by the administrators were perceived most often by superordinates and females to be high relationship and low task; a significant difference between the two groups was evidenced. The style ranges were most often perceived to span all four categories—high relationship-low task, high relationship-high task, low relationship-high task, and low relationship-low task.
relationship-high task, and low relationship-low task—by female administrators and superordinates as well. No significant differences were found among the two groups. In addition, the style adaptability was thought by both groups to be generally effective among female administrators. A significant difference appeared among the two groups.

The typical female administrator participating in this study was between the ages of 31 and 40. She was married, had from one to three elementary school age children between the ages of six and thirteen. The female administrator was most often white and was a middle level manager who felt that her demonstrated ability had secured her the job.

Conclusions

The purposes of this study were to compare the differences in the way female administrators perceived their own leadership styles and the way their superordinates viewed their leadership styles, to determine and compare the extent of style "adaptability" of female administrators as perceived by themselves and their superordinates, and to determine and compare the self-perceived style range capabilities of female administrators and their superordinates' perception of the range. The following conclusions about the target population have been drawn.

1. The majority of the female administrators involved in the study were 31 to 40 years of age.
2. The majority of the female administrators were married.

3. Thirty-five female administrators, or 59 percent, had children.

4. The overwhelming majority of the women identified in this study were white. Forty nine or 83 percent of the female administrators were white.

5. The women in this study were most often in middle levels of management as opposed to top level managers.

6. Some major personal and professional problems of female administrators encountered on the job are listed according to their frequency of reporting. Such problems were: (1) time management, (2) budgeting, (3) inability to move ahead in the organization, (4) lack of respect as an administrator, (5) lack of communication, (6) the inability to deal with sexual attitudes and overtones, and (7) working for male administrators who were ineffective as managers themselves.

7. The majority of the women felt that their demonstrated leadership ability was most valuable in helping them to acquire their present positions.

8. A significant difference existed between the female administrators' perceptions and their superordinates' perceptions of leadership styles of the female administrators.
9. No significant differences were found among the two groups in regards to the female administrators' range of styles.

10. In this study, a significant difference was found and correlated among the female administrators and their superordinates' perceptions of style adaptability or effectiveness.

Discussion and Implications

Approximately half of the female administrators and their superordinates agreed that their leadership styles were high relationship and low task. This implies that a leader has a high degree of regard for good personal relationships; opening up channels of communication is characteristic of this type of leader as well. The provision of socio-emotional support, issuing "psychological strokes," and facilitating behaviors for her employees are typical actions of a leader possessing this leadership style. A leader who scores in the high relationship-low task category can be seen as a participatory type of administrator. Her followers share in the decision making process to some degree through the two-way communication channels promoted by her.

The leader high in relationship within the group leans heavily toward the Theory Y of management, yet the "goodness" or "badness" she assesses for an individual is usually issued as a result of personal attachments rather than competency on the job as exhibited by HT/LR. The leader may not be capable of taking people from low levels of maturity and
developing them into employees of higher maturity levels, but this type of administrator is extremely efficient in working with people of average levels of maturity. According to the tenets of situational leadership, this type of leader is more effective at possessing implicit trust in people than in showing concern for facilitating their goal accomplishment. Being participative and supportive are major points for an administrator who appears in this style range. However, it should also be pointed out that this type of leader can be very ineffective in some situations. She may be seen as one primarily interested in harmony. The accomplishment of important tasks may go lacking when the risk of dissonance in relationships or the losing of a "good person" image is evidenced. In addition, discipline problems and the delegation of authority often prove to be difficult tasks for a HR/LT leader to accomplish.

On the opposite end of the continuum, there were very few women who scored in high task-low relationship (HT/LR) or low task-low relationship (LT/LR) areas. If situational leadership could be compared to traditional continuums, these categories would be comparable to authoritative and laissez faire styles, respectively.

In summary, the female administrators and their superordinates agreed that the females were found to be high relationship-low task style of leaders most often. Yet, more
females perceived themselves in this category even when their superordinates did not agree.

In situational leadership, a firm belief exists that an effective leader must possess a combination of task and relationship behaviors. Furthermore, reductions and increases in tasks and relationships are essential and greatly depend on the situation. According to this study, these women were capable of spanning the ranges of leadership styles involving reductions and increases. Very few women restricted their levels to include less than their style in addition to two other categories. This is a "plus" factor in that while the women in this study were primarily HR/LT leaders, they possessed a high potential for being able to move to other leadership styles when necessary.

The type of leader who is not restricted, for instance, to one or two styles would not need to be limited to certain types of groups. High relationship-low task leaders tend to supply positive reinforcement through their "stroking" and other socio-emotional support. This treatment is, however, needed mostly for immature workers. Too much of this same type of positive reinforcement support or relationship behavior for people at high levels of maturity is not positive. In this type of situation, a reduction in relationship and an increase in task may be much more rewarding.

The leaders in this group of female administrators felt they
possessed the ability to function, to some degree, in all of these areas of leadership. In most cases, their superordinates agreed.

Even though the females thought they were much more capable of operating in a wide range of leadership styles than did their superordinates, it must be pointed out that a leader possessing a wide range of leadership styles is often not effective because of the mere abilities; rather, the leader could well be ineffective if the choices taken do not coincide with the situations at hand. In essence, a leader is more capable when demonstrating correct style for the situation than simply possessing many leadership styles. Nevertheless, if the potential for these ranges is not there from which to choose, the leader is less effective.

The female administrators felt that they were overwhelmingly effective in adapting their dominant styles or their supportive styles to a particular situation. Only one female perceived herself to have been ineffective; she, perhaps, was ineffective in that her superordinate agreed with her. Nine other women felt that they were capable or effective in adapting leadership styles appropriately, but their superordinates did not agree. This could suggest a lack of true exposure or openness on the part of both administrators and superordinates. It has been concluded from the study that the administrative participants exhibited basically a
HR/LT leadership style, but the majority possessed the ability to move on to other styles when necessary, style adaptability being the skill or appropriateness with which a leader is able to do this.

Absolutely essential to this process is the diagnostic ability of the female administrators relative to the proper time to apply each style for the most effective results in goals and objectives. The majority of the females involved in this study perceived themselves to be effective in doing this, thus indicating that the females possessed the personal flexibility and range of skills necessary to move from one style to another.

While the majority of the female administrators involved in the study reported to be in the 31 to 40 age span, the distribution of 20 to 30's and +50s were approximately even. A study conducted by Berry and Fitzgerald (2) reported that 46 percent of the responding membership of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors was over 45 years old, while 25 percent was under 30 years old. In another study, Ayers, Tripp, and Russell (1) reported that over 50 percent of the women administrative officers in higher education student personnel appeared in the +50 category.

The present study has recorded younger ages among these junior/community college administrators. The 41 to 50 age range was found least often; yet among these administrative
levels of management, more top level administrators were found between the ages of 41 and 50 than other age ranges.

While a specific date attributed to the beginning of the feminist movement may be debatable, its peak or "sting" has certainly been most observable over the last few years. Also, with the advent of ERA and the passing of Title IX legislation as an influence on the American educational society of late, this age category (41 to 50) and administrative level, as a group, was most susceptible and therefore affected by change. It can be assumed, too, that this age bracket was perhaps most visible, having been in certain teaching situations or some categories of the working world where their demonstrated leadership ability would have been seen by others.

Even though the women's 41+ age category maintained these jobs, they, rather than their administrators, may not have perceived themselves as readily as did some of the younger women, to be able to move into more responsible positions such as that of an administrator. It was not that these women lacked the skills, but rather that they may have been influenced by employer and personal traditions. Nevertheless, the fact that over three times as many female administrators were found in this age category, 31 to 40 (those within the passing of legislation opening up job opportunities for women, the Title IX, and ERA supporters),
probably suggests that more women wanted to break into the administrative ranks but had been previously denied the opportunity to do so.

Over twice as many administrators were married than were representative of other lifestyle situations. Nevertheless, a great portion of the women were single or at least separated from their spouses as a result of choice and/or chance.

Schlack cited a 1966 Gardner study (3) in which she found that among women administrators in higher education, single women were placed in administrative positions more easily than married women. The present study, however, suggests the opposite.

It is not safe to conclude, though, that most of these administrators were married and were functioning from this premise only. According to this study, 29 women, or 49 percent, reported to be in the married category, while 13 women, or 22 percent, reported to be in both the single and divorced categories. This totaled 26, or 44 percent, of the females in this study. Two women, or 3 percent, were listed as widowed. This indicates a total of 28 women, or 47 percent, who were living outside the category labeled marriage. While it is true that relative to this study more women were married, the single category reflected almost identical percentages. With this in mind, the
following implications concerning female motivations in the world of work may be considered. Women may be as free to move up the ladders of success as are other administrators when job transfers are necessary. Without a partner to "depend" on for the basic necessities of life, a female's attitude toward the satisfactions and opportunities her job offers takes on as much relevancy as any male's opinions concerning his job. The female administrator has been placed in the same level of responsibility as that of breadwinner. This is even more true when children are involved. It may be concluded, then, that marital status cannot be viewed as either an influence or a hindrance to the female's capacity as an administrator, for female administrators may be married or single.

In this study, 35, or 59 percent, of the females were found to have children. Twenty-four, or 41 percent, of the female administrators did not have children. Contrary to several other studies (1, 2), then, the majority of the female administrators had children.

The majority of women had from 1 to 3 children, with very few women reporting more than this number. The distribution of children, or the lack of them, was fairly even. Elementary school age children were most often found to belong to the female administrators, while senior high school students were least often reported among the
respondents. The +19 age category, involving college and career, offered no distinct conclusions concerning whether these children were self-supporting or not; at any rate, some 12, or 20 percent, appeared in this category. This would indicate that, in actuality, some administrators did not have the familial responsibilities of "doctoring," "carpooling," etc., the children. The 12 women, or 19 percent, reporting in this category, then, may not have been entirely responsible for the well-being of their children.

In addition, the following points should be noted. Some female administrators had children representing more categories than just one. Also, several women had children in the college and career categories.

In this study, 49, or 83 percent, of the female administrators were white. Whether this figure is entirely representative of white Anglo-Saxon women appears to be debatable. The provision of "other" minority groups was provided, however. One female administrator, for instance, supplied American Indian, while another female administrator reported the Chicano category. Eight, or 14 percent, of the administrators were black.

All of the other groups combined did not constitute a fourth of this group. Most of the schools involved in the study were identified as equal opportunity employers,
"white women" being recognized as a credible attempt in meeting these goals. This finding is perhaps evidenced in this case.

Women are certainly part of the labor market. The present study, as previous studies have also indicated, showed that few women are involved in levels considered to be administrative ones and even fewer women are involved in the upper management levels. In this study involving 59 women, only 9, or 15 percent, indicated that they were top level managers. Another 47, or 80 percent, identified themselves as middle level managers, while 3, or 5 percent, did not respond at all. Problems involving a clear definition of terms or a distinction of terms could well have been the reason for as few women reporting in top levels of management.

Personal factors that could be attributed to whether a female administrator's characterization at a particular level by exhibiting certain traits were not in evidence in this study. This could have been due to the small population of the study. However, among top level administrators, no particular age category proved more profound than another. The ages of the 9 administrators were evenly distributed in the 41 to 50 and +50 categories. The 21 to 30 order was least often found with only 1 administrator
identified at this level. Two female administrators, or 4 percent, appeared in the 31 to 40 age category.

The majority (8) of female top level managers were white. Only 1, or 2 percent, was black, while no Chicano or "others" were reported in this area.

The majority of the top level managers were also reported to be married. Seven, or 12 percent, were reported in this category with 2, or 3 percent, reported as single.

Among middle level administrators almost the same personal characteristics were evidenced. The majority of the females were white and married. However, more appeared to be within the 31 to 40 age category.

Of the 59 females reporting, 40, or 68 percent, reported several problems that they attributed to their femaleness. This was an open-ended question which the females were asked to indicate any information to show personal and professional problems that they might have experienced. Consequently, the answers were not structured well enough to categorize. Some answers were repeated often enough, however, so that one might conclude that such problems were not atypical: (1) time management, (2) budgeting, (3) inability to move ahead in the organization, (4) lack of respect as an administrator, (5) lack of communication, (6) the inability to deal with sexual attitudes and overtones,
and (7) working for male administrators who were ineffective as managers themselves.

The initial conclusion to be drawn here is that one may not agree that any of these problems could be caused simply because an administrator happens to be a woman. Nevertheless, other conclusions may be drawn as well. When problems that are typical problems of any administrator, regardless of sex, are perceived as sexual ones by that administrator, the old self-fulfilling prophecy may be at its peak. In other words, these problems are problems of the female administrator, to the female administrator because she is an administrator.

Several administrators reported no problems that they would attribute to their femaleness. Several other women simply left the item blank. One may readily conclude that these women had no problems; another conclusion might be, however, that a lack of trust regarding confidentiality of the investigator was in operation.

The participants were asked to rank in order of preference, education, federal legislature, training and experiential background, prior leadership ability, sex, and other (a write in) according to how they felt that these factors were influential in acquiring their jobs. The respondents ranked these areas from 1 to 6, with 1
being their first choice, etc. Among these women, the majority considered "demonstrated leadership ability" as being most influential. This ability must have been exhibited in the classroom or in organizations where they had previously participated prior to the current administrative job.

Recommendations

Based upon the data gathered and analyzed in this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. It is recommended that the length of the LEAD instrument be reconsidered. While it is a mere twenty-item questionnaire, it has proved to be bulky and very time consuming for respondents' use. Some respondents involved in this study indicated by memorandum or letter their displeasure in completing such an involved questionnaire. This situation proved to be true particularly when a superordinate had more than one female administrator working in his area. In addition, some of the participants indicated the inadequacy of the choices of response offered by the questionnaire.

2. It is recommended that biographical data be limited and not gathered from anyone within the same district as the investigator. The biographical portion of the present study, although generally well received, did contain items which
evoked no response. One might conclude that respondents were reluctant to divulge personal data to which other district personnel would subsequently have access.

3. It is recommended that future study be conducted to determine the relationship, if any, between biographical constants (such as age, ethnic background, marital status, etc.) and styles of leadership. For instance, compare the leadership style of women who have children (which they have had to lead or direct in some manner) to those of women reported to have no children would be of interest; or to determine if the age of female administrators has a significant bearing on whether the dominant leadership styles would be valuable.

4. It is recommended that additional study relative to administrative superordinates' self-perceived leadership styles be conducted. Since the majority of pairs involved in this study were perceived at the style 3 level, that of high relationship-low task, with such additional study a comparison could then be drawn between leadership styles of both superordinate and administrator groups. Another factor of interest to researchers would be the similarity of administrators' leadership styles relative to the conditions under which they had been hired--to satisfy legislative requirements, for example.
5. It is recommended that further study be devoted to determine the effect that leadership type courses have on administrators' managerial abilities in addition to leadership style ranges. Considered to be an asset to leadership ability, style range might well be affected by assertiveness training classes or management workshops, for example. Observations of administrators prior to and following such courses of study could prove to be valuable in the determination of factors which influence leadership.

6. It is recommended that female administrators participate in supervised on-the-job experience and simulated practical leadership situations (perhaps offered through management classes) so that their diagnostic as well as administrative skills might be sharpened and leadership styles enhanced. While it is essential for administrators to possess leadership styles that they are comfortable with, they must also possess the ability to flexibly adapt the appropriate leadership style to any situation which might arise. Through involvement in practical situations (as opposed to purely theoretical ones) such as in-basket material, group leadership sessions, and most appropriately on-the-job experience, female administrators may become more astute in the diagnosing of situations for application of proper leadership technique.

7. It is recommended that further study be conducted to attempt to determine if the way the female administrators
perceived themselves as administrators is in fact the way they desire to be. For instance, women who perceived themselves as low task-high relationship (as a dominant style) may in fact wish to maintain a high task-high relationship as their dominant style.
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APPENDIX A

INFLUENTIAL FACTORS IN JOB ACQUISITION
INFLUENTIAL FACTORS IN JOB ACQUISITION

When 6 was chosen as a response and comments were rendered, the following were indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1st    | "Demonstrated Performance"  
         | "I met the requirements"  
         | "Ability to get along with co-workers" |
| 2nd    | "Seeing a need and filling it"  
         | "Quality of Past Leadership" |
| 3rd    | "Luck" |
| 4th    | "Supervisor's confidence"  
         | "Prior work experience" |
| 5th    | "Oral communication ability during interview"  
         | "Right timing"  
         | "Personality and attitude" |
| 6th    | "Ethnic background" |
APPENDIX B

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS USED IN THIS STUDY
PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS USED IN THIS STUDY

1. Being able to leave office problems at office
2. Other administrators
3. Opportunity to contribute in peer situations
4. Time management
5. Stereotyping
6. No advancement available within organization
7. Incompetence at higher levels
8. Communications
9. Controlling factors at home and on job
10. Lack of support at top level
11. Abundance of paper work
12. Inexperience
13. Organizational skills
14. Acceptance by other male administrators
15. Discourteously being excluded
16. Acceptance by other male administrators
17. Lack of respect for immediate supervisor
18. Allow subordinates more directions
19. "I think I can't syndrome"
20. Working under men who are less qualified
21. Low priorities of administrators regarding this position
22. Personal and professional responsibilities
23. Sexist attitudes
24. Lack of models
25. Lack of female mentors
26. Sexual overtones
27. Time demands
28. Having to clear every act with Dean or Supervisor
29. Subordinates
30. Insecure female supervisor
31. Family responsibilities
32. Having to leave city to work toward Ph.D.
33. Budgeting
34. Not stern enough
35. Being one of boys
36. Lack of credibility from peer administrator male or female
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS REQUESTING PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY
August 21, 1978

Dear Female Administrator:

I am a doctoral student at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. My major is Higher Education with a specialization in Junior/Community College Administration.

Presently, I am working to complete a dissertation in the area of administration. The title is "A Study of Self-Perceived Leadership Styles of Female Administrators Compared to that of Their Superordinates of Five Major Texas Junior/Community College Districts in Texas." Your institution is a part of the five major districts. I would very much appreciate and value your response to a questionnaire on leadership effectiveness (Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description) and a short biographical questionnaire.

As you know, there is a growing interest and trend to include more and more women in administrative positions in Higher Education as well as business and industry. Presently, most of the persons in the position to place women in upper and middle level positions are males. Some have reservations about females being capable of handling administrative type of jobs. The information gathered in this study should provide some scientific data relating to this matter.

My plan is to compare your ideas about your leadership styles with your superordinates to see if there is a significant difference. I realize this is a busy time of the year for you and I sincerely appreciate your contribution to this effort. I have chosen a 20 item questionnaire on leadership and an 8 item biographical questionnaire. Please respond to all of the questions on both questionnaires. Of course, all of the information will remain confidential. Please return both questionnaires together.

Enclosed is a return, stamped self-addressed envelope for your convenience. If you are interested in the results of this study, please indicate on the biographical questionnaire. I would very much appreciate your response within the next three weeks. Thank you for your prompt consideration.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Branch,
Director of Special Services,
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, Texas 76053
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS SEEKING PERMISSION

TO USE FEMALE SUBORDINATES IN STUDY
August 31, 1978

Dear Administrator:

I am a doctoral student at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. My major is Higher Education with a specialization in Junior/Community College Administration.

Presently, I am working to complete a dissertation in the area of administration. The title is "A Study of Self-Perceived Leadership Styles of Female Administrators Compared to that of Their Superordinates of five Major Texas Junior/Community College Districts." Your institution is a part of the five major districts. I would very much appreciate and value your response to a questionnaire on leadership effectiveness (Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description).

My plan is to compare your ideas about your female subordinates' leadership styles with her perception of the styles to see if there is significant difference. I realize that this is a busy time of the year for you and I sincerely appreciate your contribution to this effort. With this in mind, I have chosen a 20 item questionnaire on leadership. Please respond to all of the questions on the questionnaire. All of the information will remain confidential. However, a code will be used to match each female administrator with her superordinate.

Enclosed is a return, stamped self-addressed envelope for your convenience. If you are interested in the results of this study, please don't fail to contact me. I would very much appreciate your response within the next three weeks.

Thank you for your prompt consideration.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Branch,
Director of Special Services
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, Texas 76053
APPENDIX E

SECOND LETTER REQUESTING RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRES
OF SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES
Dear Administrator,

A few weeks ago you received a letter and a questionnaire seeking your participation in a study of the leadership styles of female administrators. At the present time, I have not received your response. I realize this is a busy time for you; however, I would appreciate your assistance in completing the study.

I am enclosing another questionnaire and envelope for your convenience. Please take time out of your busy schedule to complete and return this important information.

Thank you very kindly.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Branch
Director of Special Services
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, Texas 76053
APPENDIX F

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE USED WITH FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS IN THE STUDY
BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the appropriate box

1. Title__________________________________________

2. Age: 21-30 □ 31-40 □ 41-50 □ above 50 □

3. Current marital status: Single □ Married □
   Divorced □ Widowed □

4. Number of children: None □ 1-3 □ 4 or more □
   Ages and age categories of children:
   Under 5 (Kindergarten or below) □
   6-10 (Elementary) □ 11-13 (Junior High) □
   14-18 (Senior High) □ Above 19 (College or Career) □

5. Ethnic background: Black □ Chicano □
   White □ Other □

6. What would you consider your major personal and/or professional problem(s) as a woman administrator? (Please list according to level of importance.)

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

7. In your opinion, what would you consider to be the most influential factor in attaining your current position? Lease influential? Please number in rank order with "1" indicating the most influential through "6" being the least influential.
   Federal legislation □
   Training and experiential background □
   Education □ Sex □
   Demonstrated Leadership Ability □
   Other □

8. Do you consider your position as top level management □ or as middle level management? □
Please feel free to keep this sheet if you do not care to receive a summary of the study. Otherwise, complete items 9 and 10 and return in the enclosed envelope with your name and address completed.

9. Would you like a summary of the results of this study?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

10. Name ____________________________________________
    Address __________________________________________

APPENDIX G

LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND ADAPTABILITY
DESCRIPTION—OTHER INSTRUMENT USED WITH SUPERORDINATES IN THE STUDY
Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD-Other)
-Form A-

Assume ____________________________
(Name of Leader)

is involved in the situations described in this questionnaire. The instrument consists of typical job situations that involve your leader and one or more subordinates. Following each situation are four possible actions that a leader may initiate. Your task is to select the one action that you think comes closest to what your leader would actually do in the situation. Be honest!

You will indicate your answer to each situation by circling the letter corresponding to your answer on the answer sheet. Find the situation number on the answer sheet. Next, indicate your answer to the question, "What would your leader do?" by circling the letter corresponding to the action you have selected on the LEAD (Actual) section of the answer sheet.

Now go ahead and put both your leader's name and your name on the answer sheet. Next provide your answer to each situation in the instrument.
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1. You have recently been appointed head of a newly organized function. The new staff are more concerned with social activities than with carrying out their responsibilities. Their performance has been poor.

   a. Discuss the situation with the group, but allow members to formulate tasks and responsibilities.
   b. Define roles and responsibilities and supervise closely.
   c. Allow members of the group to define their own responsibilities and tasks.
   d. Discuss the situation with the group and then take the necessary corrective action yourself.

2. Recently you have given certain members of your group a new task. Now you find that there are complaints that the selected group is not willing to do the job. You've selected them for the job because their past job performance has been excellent; they are dependable and work well together. It appears at present that the group is reluctant to resolve the problem of fitting the new task into existing schedules.

   a. You resolve the problem while making sure to encourage future group input in problem solving.
   b. Let the group know about the complaints but allow the group members to resolve the situation themselves.
   c. Act quickly to resolve the problem and direct the work closely.
   d. Discuss the situation with the group at a meeting and try to find out why they are not willing to do the job; don't tell them what to do.

3. The new department which you are now heading has not produced the results expected. In the last week, one key individual has called in sick several times. You feel that she is quickly losing interest in her new job. Your supervisors are expecting results from the department soon, and from this individual in particular.

   a. Incorporate her recommendations but stress expected results.
   b. Allow her to work it out herself.
   c. Take steps to produce results expected and supervise the individual closely.
   d. Participate in a discussion of the problem with the individual but do not intervene directly.

4. One of your subordinates, who usually performs well, with your support and direction, is not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for his welfare. Performance is declining rapidly.

   a. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.
   b. Make yourself available for discussion but do not push your involvement.
c. Talk with the subordinate and then set goals yourself.
d. Intentionally do not intervene.

5. The committee of which you are the chairperson has had a fine record of accomplishment with little direction or support from you. They have been given a similar task to accomplish for the coming year and you want to decide how to manage the situation.
a. Continue to let your group work on the task by itself with little involvement from you.
b. Emphasize the importance of meeting deadlines and accomplishing the assigned task.
c. Talk with the committee members and then set goals and objectives for task accomplishment yourself.
d. Involve your committee members in setting goals and then support but do not direct their efforts.

6. Because of budget restrictions imposed on your department, additional demands have been put on your staff. You have noticed the performance of one of your people is dropping. He seems uncaring in his approach and you have had to remind him about responsibilities.
a. Involve the individual in discussing the problem, and take the necessary steps to correct the situation yourself.
b. Take steps to direct the person to fulfill the additional demands.
c. Allow the individual to find his own solution to the dropping level of performance.
d. Encourage the individual to find a solution to this problem and be supportive of his efforts.

7. The performance of your group has been dropping during the last few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles and responsibilities has helped in the past, since they have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.
a. Allow group to formulate its own direction.
b. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
c. Redefine roles and responsibilities and supervise carefully.
d. Allow group involvement in determining roles and responsibilities but do not be too directive.

8. You stepped into an efficiently run organization. The previous manager tightly controlled the situation. You want to maintain productivity but would like to begin getting the staff more involved in decision-making.
a. Do what you can to make the group feel important and involved.
b. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
c. Intentionally do not intervene.
d. Get the group involved in decision making, but see that objectives are met.

9. You've arrived ten minutes late for a meeting with your group. You expected a great deal of socialization to be going on, but you are surprised to find the group working actively on the assigned task for the session. Usually the group tends to socialize when asked to work independently on a task, but you remember that the group has expressed a great deal of interest in this task and have made suggestions. The task is somewhat different from other tasks the group has worked on.
   a. Let the group continue to work on the task without any direction from you; do not intervene.
   b. Take control immediately and direct the group.
   c. Participate in the discussion with the group and direct their interactions.
   d. Let the group continue in a member-led discussion and provide as much support as possible.

10. At the request of your boss, you recently formed a task force to investigate the use of a new procedure. After the investigation, the group was so enthusiastic about the procedure that you allowed them to adopt and be responsible for the use of the new procedure on a trial basis in their work. Initially, their performance and interest levels were high, but they have now decreased significantly.
   a. Intentionally do not intervene.
   b. Intervene quickly, and direct use of the new procedure.
   c. Get the group involved in a discussion of the procedure, but try not to be directive.
   d. Incorporate all group suggestions and recommendations that are reasonable and then supervise use of the new procedure.

11. Your superior has asked you to consider a change in the work schedule for your group. It seems the present schedule is not working as well as planned. Group members are well aware of the problem and are ready to suggest and try an alternate schedule. They are very competent and work well together as a group.
   a. Allow group involvement in developing the new schedule and support the suggestions of group members.
   b. Incorporate group recommendations, but design and implement the new schedule yourself.
   c. Allow the group to formulate and implement the new schedule on its own.
   d. Design the new schedule yourself and closely direct its implementation.
12. In the past, you've had a great deal of trouble with one of the people you supervise. She has a lackadaisical approach, and only your constant prodding has brought about task completion. However, you recently have noticed a change. The individual's performance is increasing, and you've had to remind her of task completion less and less. She has even initiated several suggestions for increasing her performance.

a. Continue to direct and closely supervise the efforts.
b. Incorporate her recommendations, but see that tasks are completed.
c. Involve the individual in a discussion involving procedures and be supportive of her contributions.
d. Let the individual take responsibility for task completion; do not intervene any longer.

13. You and your superior have recently decided that a new procedure has to be installed in your area if long-term gains are to be obtained. In the past, when new procedures have been installed, your group has been eager to use them, but have lacked the expertise to do so.

a. Closely direct the group in the use of the new procedure.
b. Involve the group in a discussion of the new procedure, but make sure you direct its implementation.
c. Get the group involved in a discussion and encourage their contributions.
d. Allow the group to implement the new procedure without your involvement.

14. One of your subordinates has made a suggestion that makes sense to you. In the past this individual has been able to implement other helpful suggestions in a productive manner with good interpersonal skills.

a. You take charge of the suggestion and direct the individual in its implementation.
b. Discuss the suggestion with the individual but do not direct its implementation.
c. Discuss the suggestion with the individual but you set up the implementation for it.
d. Allow the individual the responsibility of implementing the suggestion without any involvement from you.
15. Your subordinates are very competent and are able to work well on their own. You have generally left them alone and delegated key responsibilities to individual members. Their performance has been outstanding.
   a. Provide continual support and encouragement for group members, but little direction.
   b. Direct and closely supervise the activities of your subordinates.
   c. Continue to leave the group alone.
   d. Work closely with your subordinates as a team, providing direction and support when needed.

16. You have been forced to miss, due to illness in the family, the first two meetings of a committee you have been asked to chair. You have found, upon attending the third meeting, that the committee is functioning well and the stated goals are being accomplished. You are unsure about how you fit into the group and what your role should be.
   a. Let the group continue to work as it has during the first two meetings.
   b. Assume the leadership of the committee and begin to direct its activities.
   c. Do what you can to make the committee feel important and involved, supporting their past efforts.
   d. Support the efforts of the committee, but generally direct their activities.

17. You have been approached to help a group undertake a new project. The members of this group are known for their high performance. They have defined their goals for this project and are now asking for your help as problems have arisen.
   a. Redefine goals and set methods to achieve them.
   b. Attend the meetings but take no definite action.
   c. Work with the group in problem-solving, but you determine and implement the appropriate solution.
   d. Participate with the group in the discussion of the problems but allow members to implement the solutions.

18. You've just attended the weekly meeting of your full- and part-time staffs. You've observed that although the outcome of the meeting was generally favorable, the input of one part-time employee in decision making was minimal. You are concerned and think he is too. He doesn't seem able to get involved on his own. You plan to act on the situation.
a. Do what you can to make the part-time employee feel involved and wanted.

b. Intentionally do not intervene.

c. Get the part-time employee involved any way you can.

d. Get the part-time employee involved in decision making but make sure overall objectives are met.

19. You have been promoted to a new position. The previous supervisor was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has handled its tasks and directions adequately although the performance of group members has not been as good as their potential indicates it should be. Group interrelations are good.

a. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.

b. Discuss the situation with the group and support members' efforts toward improvement.

c. Discuss past performance with the group and then direct the development of new practices.

d. Continue to leave the group alone.

20. In the past you worked closely with your subordinates. Productivity was high and people got along well together. Recognizing their abilities, you felt they could work alone so you redirected your energies to new areas and they have done well working on their own. Now, one person is having difficulties.

a. Redefine goals for the individual and see that objectives are met.

b. Discuss the situation with the individual, but direct that person's efforts toward solving the problem.

c. Discuss the difficulties with the individual and support that person's solutions and actions.

d. Allow the person more time to work out the difficulties alone.
APPENDIX H

LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND ADAPTABILITY
DESCRIPTION-SELF INSTRUMENT USED WITH
FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS IN THE STUDY
Leadership Effectiveness and
Adaptability Description (LEAD)

-Form A-

The purpose of the LEAD-Instrument is to provide individuals with information concerning their leadership effectiveness and adaptability. The instrument consists of typical job situations that involve a leader or manager and one or more subordinates. Following each situation are four possible actions that a leader or manager may initiate. Your task is to select the one action that comes closest to what you would actually do if you were the leader or manager in the particular situation. Be honest! If you are, the information that this instrument provides will be of considerable value to you in helping you understand your leadership effectiveness and adaptability.

You will indicate your answer to each situation by circling the letter corresponding to your answer on the answer sheet. Find the situation number on the answer sheet. Next, indicate your answer to the question, "What would you do?" by circling the letter corresponding to the action you have selected on the LEAD (Actual) section of the answer sheet.

Now go ahead and put your name (or some other identification mark) and date on the answer sheet. Next provide your answer to each situation in the instrument.
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This appendix is a xeroxed copy of the instrument as received from Dr. Hambleton.
1. You have recently been appointed head of a newly organized function. The new staff are more concerned with social activities than with carrying out their responsibilities. Their performance has been poor.

   a. Discuss the situation with the group but allow members to formulate tasks and responsibilities.
   b. Define roles and responsibilities and supervise closely.
   c. Allow members of the group to define their own responsibilities and tasks.
   d. Discuss the situation with the group and then take the necessary corrective action yourself.

2. Recently you have given certain members of your group a new task. Now you find that there are complaints that the selected group is not willing to do the job. You've selected them for the job because their past job performance has been excellent; they are dependable and work well together. It appears at present that the group is reluctant to resolve the problem of fitting the new task into existing schedules.

   a. You resolve the problem while making sure to encourage future group input in problem solving.
   b. Let the group know about the complaints but allow the group members to resolve the situation themselves.
   c. Act quickly to resolve the problem and direct the work closely.
   d. Discuss the situation with the group at a meeting and try to find out why they are not willing to do the job; don't tell them what to do.

3. The new department which you are now heading has not produced the results expected. In the last week, one key individual has called in sick several times. You feel that she is quickly losing interest in her new job. Your superiors are expecting results from the department soon, and from this individual in particular.

   a. Incorporate her recommendations but stress expected results.
   b. Allow her to work it out herself.
   c. Take steps to produce results expected and supervise the individual closely.
   d. Participate in a discussion of the problem with the individual but do not intervene directly.
4. One of your subordinates, who usually performs well, with your support and direction, is not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for his welfare. Performance is declining rapidly.

a. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.
b. Make yourself available for discussion but do not push your involvement.
c. Talk with the subordinate and then set goals yourself.
d. Intentionally do not intervene.

5. The committee of which you are the chairperson has had a fine record of accomplishment with little direction or support from you. They have been given a similar task to accomplish for the coming year and you want to decide how to manage the situation.

a. Continue to let your group work on the task by itself with little involvement from you.
b. Emphasize the importance of meeting deadlines and accomplishing the assigned task.
c. Talk with the committee members and then set goals and objectives for task accomplishment yourself.
d. Involve your committee members in setting goals and then support but do not direct their efforts.

6. Because of budget restrictions imposed on your department, additional demands have been put on your staff. You have noticed the performance of one of your people to be dropping. He seems uncaring in his approach and you have had to remind him about responsibilities.

a. Involve the individual in discussing the problem, and take the necessary steps to correct the situation yourself.
b. Take steps to direct the person to fulfill the additional demands.
c. Allow the individual to find his own solution to the dropping level of performance.
d. Encourage the individual to find a solution to this problem and be supportive of his efforts.

7. The performance of your group has been dropping during the last few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles and responsibilities has helped in the past, since they have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.

a. Allow group to formulate its own direction.
b. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
c. Redefine roles and responsibilities and supervise carefully.

d. Allow group involvement in determining roles and responsibilities but do not be too directive.

8. You stepped into an efficiently run organization. The previous manager tightly controlled the situation. You want to maintain productivity but would like to begin getting the staff more involved in decision-making.

a. Do what you can to make the group feel important and involved.
b. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
c. Intentionally do not intervene.
d. Get the group involved in decision making but see that objectives are met.

9. You've arrived ten minutes late for a meeting with your group. You expected a great deal of socialization to be going on, but you are surprised to find the group working actively on the assigned task for the session. Usually the group tends to socialize when asked to work independently on a task, but you remember that the group has expressed a great deal of interest in this task and have made suggestions. The task is somewhat different from other tasks the group has worked on.

a. Let the group continue to work on the task without any direction from you; do not intervene.
b. Take control immediately and direct the group.
c. Participate in the discussion with the group and direct their interactions.
d. Let the group continue in a member-led discussion and provide as much support as possible.

10. At the request of your boss, you recently formed a task force to investigate the use of a new procedure. After the investigation, the group was so enthusiastic about the procedure that you allowed them to adopt and be responsible for the use of the new procedure on a trial basis in their work. Initially, their performance and interest levels were high, but they have now decreased significantly.

a. Intentionally do not intervene.
b. Intervene quickly, and direct use of the new procedure.
c. Get the group involved in a discussion of the procedure, but try not to be directive.
d. Incorporate all group suggestions and recommendations that are reasonable and then supervise use of the new procedure.
11. Your superior has asked you to consider a change in the work schedule for your group. It seems the present schedule is not working as well as planned. Group members are well aware of the problem and are ready to suggest and try an alternate schedule. They are very competent and work well together as a group.

a. Allow group involvement in developing the new schedule and support the suggestions of group members.
b. Incorporate group recommendations, but design and implement the new schedule yourself.
c. Allow the group to formulate and implement the new schedule on its own.
d. Design the new schedule yourself and closely direct its implementation.

12. In the past, you've had a great deal of trouble with one of the people you supervise. She has a lackadaisical approach, and only your constant prodding has brought about task completion. However, you recently have noticed a change. The individual's performance is increasing, and you've had to remind her of task completion less and less. She has even initiated several suggestions for increasing her performance.

a. Continue to direct and closely supervise the efforts.
b. Incorporate her recommendations, but see that tasks are completed.
c. Involve the individual in a discussion involving procedures and be supportive of her contributions.
d. Let the individual take responsibility for task completion; do not intervene any longer.

13. You and your superior have recently decided that a new procedure has to be installed in your area if long-term gains are to be obtained. In the past, when new procedures have been installed, your group has been eager to use them, but have lacked the expertise to do so.

a. Closely direct the group in the use of the new procedure.
b. Involve the group in a discussion of the new procedure, but make sure you direct its implementation.
c. Get the group involved in a discussion and encourage their contributions.
d. Allow the group to implement the new procedure without your involvement.
14. One of your subordinates has made a suggestion that makes sense to you. In the past this individual has been able to implement other helpful suggestions in a productive manner with good interpersonal skills.

a. You take charge of the suggestion and direct the individual in its implementation.
b. Discuss the suggestion with the individual but do not direct its implementation.
c. Discuss the suggestion with the individual but you set up the implementation for it.
d. Allow the individual the responsibility of implementing the suggestion without any involvement from you.

15. Your subordinates are very competent and are able to work well on their own. You have generally left them alone and delegated key responsibilities to individual members. Their performance has been outstanding.

a. Provide continual support and encouragement for group members, but little direction.
b. Direct and closely supervise the activities of your subordinates.
c. Continue to leave the group alone.
d. Work closely with your subordinates as a team, providing direction and support when needed.

16. You have been forced to miss, due to illness in the family, the first two meetings of a committee you have been asked to chair. You have found, upon attending the third meeting, that the committee is functioning well and the stated goals are being accomplished. You are unsure about how you fit into the group and what your role should be.

a. Let the group continue to work as it has during the first two meeting.
b. Assume the leadership of the committee and begin to direct its activities.
c. Do what you can to make the committee feel important and involved, supporting their past efforts.
d. Support the efforts of the committee, but generally direct their activities.

17. You have been approached to help a group undertake a new project. The members of this group are known for their high performance. They have defined their goals for this project and are now asking for your help as problems have arisen.

a. Redefine goals and set methods to achieve them.
b. Attend the meetings but take no definite action.
c. Work with the group in problem-solving, but you determine and implement the appropriate solution.

d. Participate with the group in the discussion of the problems but allow members to implement the solutions.

18. You've just attended the weekly meeting of your full- and part-time staffs. You've observed that although the outcome of the meeting was generally favorable, the input of one part-time employee in decision making was minimal. You are concerned and think he is too. He doesn't seem able to get involved on his own. You plan to act on the situation.

a. Do what you can to make the part-time employee feel involved and wanted.

b. Intentionally do not intervene.

c. Get the part-time employee involved any way you can.

d. Get the part-time employee involved in decision making but make sure overall objectives are met.

19. You have been promoted to a new position. The previous supervisor was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has handled its tasks and directions adequately although the performance of group members has not been as good as their potential indicates it should be. Group interrelations are good.

a. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.

b. Discuss the situation with the group and support members' efforts toward improvement.

c. Discuss past performance with the group and then direct the development of new practices.

d. Continue to leave the group alone.

20. In the past you worked closely with your subordinates. Productivity was high and people got along well together. Recognizing their abilities, you felt they could work alone so you redirected your energies to new areas and they have done well working on their own. Now, one person is having difficulties.

a. Redefine goals for the individual and see that objectives are met.

b. Discuss the situation with the individual, but direct that person's efforts toward solving the problem.

c. Discuss the difficulties with the individual and support that person's solutions and actions.

d. Allow the person more time to work out the difficulties alone.
APPENDIX I

LEAD INSTRUMENTS SCORING SHEET FOR INSTRUMENTS USED IN STUDY
## Lead Instrument - Scoring Sheet

### LEAD-SELF (Actual), Form A

#### Column I (Style Range) Alternative Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Column II (Style Adaptability) Alternative Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effectiveness Score

\[
\text{Effectiveness Score} = \frac{\text{Sum of Column A}}{2} - \frac{\text{Sum of Column B}}{1} + \frac{\text{Sum of Column C}}{1} + \frac{\text{Sum of Column D}}{2}
\]
APPENDIX J

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE LEAD INSTRUMENTS
May 17, 1978

Dr. Ron Hamilton  
University of Massachusetts  
Department of Academic Education  
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Dear Dr. Hamilton,

Thank you very kindly for your positive response by phone regarding the usage of the new 20 Item questionnaire by Hersey and Blanchard.

Please forward to me the materials (LEAD-Self and LEAD-other) needed for duplication. I am requesting, also, information on test validity, test reliability, and any other information pertinent to the test's usefulness.

Sir, I'm sure you have sensed the panic in my voice by phone that stresses the fact that time is of essence to me. Any consideration, assistance and cooperation you can render with this thought in mind is highly appreciated.

Again thanks very much.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Branch,  
Director of Special Services  
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast

EB/ zm
APPENDIX K

LETTER OF PERMISSION RECEIVED TO USE
LEAD INSTRUMENTS
May 19, 1978

Ms. Elizabeth Branch
Tarrant County Junior College Dist.
Northeast Campus
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, TX 76063

Dear Elizabeth,

Enclosed is a copy of the 20 situation LEAD Instrument (-Self and -Other) and a paper of ours that reports some reliability results. Please send a check to me for $3.00 (made payable to the "University of Massachusetts") to cover the costs of duplication and mailing.

You have our permission to duplicate copies of either instrument for use in your dissertation research. You may not duplicate it for any other uses without our permission.

Good luck to you in your study! Please send me a copy of the finished report.

Sincerely,

/s/ Ron Hambleton

Ronald K. Hambleton
Associate Professor of Education and Psychology

RKH/bmcd

Enclosures
APPENDIX L

TITLES OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS FROM FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES USED IN THIS STUDY
TITLES OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS FROM FIVE MAJOR JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES USED IN THIS STUDY

Director of Career Planning & Placement
Associate Dean of Health Occupations Division
Department Chairman, Associate Professor
Vice President - Instruction
Department Chairman
Chairperson of Division of Communications & Humanities
Director of Health Services
Bursar
Chairman, Mathematics Department
Director of Public Information
Vice President Student Services
Dean Student Development
Dean Student Services
Coordinator Community Services
Director of Public Information
Director of Counseling
Director of Counseling and Behavioral Sciences
Director of Financial Aid
Program Specialist
Assistant Dean
Director of Health Services
Supervisor
Registrar

151
Campus Director

Director of Public Information

Assistant Dean/Community Service

Assistant Director/Community Service

Director of Financial Aide & Placement

Associate Dean

Humanities Division Chair

Public Information Coordinator

Director of Libraries

Director of Personnel

Business/Social Science Division Chairperson

Division Chair

Assistant Dean for Community Service Programs

Assistant Dean and Professor of English

Associate Professor/Assistant Director of Guidance & Counseling Dept.

Program Chairperson Radiologic Technology

Assistant Professor

Supervisor, Health Careers Education

Program Developer - Continuing Education

Campus Nurse

Administrative Assistant to the President

Professor and Department Chairman

Director of Student Publication

Athletic Director - Division Chair - Physical Education

Assistant Director Student Development
Director of Community Services
Dean of Academic Affairs
Assistant to the President
Director of Library Services
Associate Dean of Instruction
Division Chairperson, Humanities
Director of Student Activities
APPENDIX M

RESPONSE RATE OF USABLE RETURNS OF ADMINISTRATORS TO LEAD DATA BY JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS
RESPONSE RATE OF USABLE RETURNS OF ADMINISTRATORS
TO LEAD DATA BY JUNIOR/COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. of Pairs Sent</th>
<th>No. of Usable Pairs Returned</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dallas</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. El Paso</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Houston</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Antonio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tarrant County Junior College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

TABULATION OF RAW DATA FROM LEAD-SELF AND LEAD-OTHER
USED TO DETERMINE LEADERSHIP STYLES
AND STYLE RANGES
TABULATION OF RAW DATA FROM LEAD-SELF AND LEAD-OTHER
USED TO DETERMINE LEADERSHIP STYLES
AND STYLE RANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1 9 6 4</td>
<td>2 5 13 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>5 7 6 2</td>
<td>3 4 11 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>0 8 12 0</td>
<td>1 9 8 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1 4 15 0</td>
<td>9 2 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1 7 11 1</td>
<td>1 3 15 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2 7 11 0</td>
<td>9 2 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>1 6 12 1</td>
<td>4 2 8 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>4 5 8 3</td>
<td>4 6 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>2 7 9 2</td>
<td>6 5 9 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>5 7 8 0</td>
<td>2 6 9 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1 5 12 2</td>
<td>4 9 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>1 6 13 0</td>
<td>2 10 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>1 9 10 0</td>
<td>1 1 17 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>3 9 7 1</td>
<td>5 7 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>5 7 5 3</td>
<td>5 7 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>1 10 8 1</td>
<td>9 5 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>2 7 8 3</td>
<td>2 5 11 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>1 6 9 4</td>
<td>0 2 16 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>2 9 8 1</td>
<td>6 6 7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>1 6 10 3</td>
<td>2 6 10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>4 3 9 4</td>
<td>3 7 8 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>1 4 13 2</td>
<td>5 10 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>2 7 9 2</td>
<td>1 4 14 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>2 10 5 3</td>
<td>1 7 12 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>3 6 10 1</td>
<td>4 4 10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4   8</td>
<td>1  2  17  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>11  5</td>
<td>4  11  4  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>9  0  2  14  4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4  6  8</td>
<td>2  0  2  17  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0  1  16</td>
<td>3  3  11  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0  8  10</td>
<td>2  2  4  11  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0  9  10</td>
<td>1  5  5  8  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O

TABULATION OF RAW DATA FROM LEAD-SELF AND LEAD-OTHER TO DETERMINE LEADERSHIP ADAPTABILITY OR EFFECTIVENESS SCORES
TABULATION OF RAW DATA FROM LEAD-SELF AND LEAD-OTHER TO DETERMINE LEADERSHIP ADAPTABILITY OR EFFECTIVENESS SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 = +15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 = +19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 = +15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 = +17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14 = +10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 = +11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 = +20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 = +19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 = +17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 = +18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20 = +24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 = +22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 = +18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 = +9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 = +19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 = +11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 = +12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 = +22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 = +17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 = +19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 = +15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 = +14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 = +5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 = +17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>0  -5  6</td>
<td>18 = +19</td>
<td>0  -9  2</td>
<td>18 = +11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>-2  -5  3</td>
<td>22 = +18</td>
<td>0  -9  6</td>
<td>10 = +7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>-14 -3  4</td>
<td>12 = -1</td>
<td>-1  -4  4</td>
<td>22 = +21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>0  -6  7</td>
<td>14 = +15</td>
<td>0  -9  3</td>
<td>16 = +10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>-2  -10  3</td>
<td>12 = +3</td>
<td>0  -7  2</td>
<td>22 = +17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>-4  -5  4</td>
<td>18 = +13</td>
<td>0  -11  4</td>
<td>10 = +3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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